

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Tuesday, April 4, 1967 – Wednesday, May 10, 1967

No. 51

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Presenting report, Mr. Auld 1667

Tabling report, select committee on company law, Mr. A. F. Lawrence 1667

Statement re OMSIP, Mr. Dymond 1671

Question to Mr. Dymond re price increase for quinidine, Mr. MacDonald 1671

Questions to Mr. Yaremko re Sudbury district welfare administration board, Mr. MacDonald 1672

Questions to Mr. Randall re Ontario pavilion at Expo, Mr. Sopha 1672

Questions to Mr. Bales re workmen's compensation board hospital, Mr. Young 1674

Question to Mr. Connell re display of artifacts for the Centennial, Mr. Spence 1675

Question to Mr. Randall re HOME programme, Mr. MacDonald 1675

Question to Mr. Stewart re bean producers marketing board, Mr. Spence 1676

Estimates, Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Wishart, continued 1677

Recess, 6 o'clock 1705

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 1967

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Weston collegiate institute, Weston; and in the west gallery, Holy Spirit separate school, Scarborough, St. Madelaine separate school, Willowdale, and Donview Heights junior high school, Willowdale.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, the city of Kingston, being the birthplace of our national game of hockey, was privileged to host during the Easter holidays, the Canadian Centennial midget hockey championships. There were teams from every province in Canada and from the Yukon and Northwest Territories participating in these championships.

We in Kingston were very much impressed with the calibre of hockey that these 15- or 16-year-old boys played. Those who feel that hockey is deteriorating in Canada should have been in Kingston and watched these games and they would agree with me when I say that the calibre of our hockey as played by these midget teams across Canada augurs well for the future of our national game in Canada.

These young men conducted themselves in an exemplary fashion during their stay in Kingston. They were a credit to their provinces, to their teams and to themselves. Not one of the 280 boys participating in the tournament were in any trouble during their stay in Kingston.

The winners of the Canadian midget Centennial championships were a team from Toronto, Ontario. They defeated Saskatchewan 3 to 1 in the semi-finals and Alberta 5-2 in the finals.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to introduce to the members of this Legislature the winning team known as the "Butter Beeps" who are now in the Speaker's gallery of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the annual report of the St. Lawrence parks commission for the period ending December 31, 1966.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the select committee on company law.

On June 22, 1965 the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) in moving that the select committee on company law be appointed, stated that the committee had a very important task before it.

He pointed out the committee was required not only to recommend whatever amendments may be necessary to bring The Ontario Corporations Act up to date, but also to enter upon a full examination of the fundamental principles of corporation law in all its aspects, a task never before undertaken by a legislative body in Canada.

The committee has earnestly attempted, within the time limitations imposed upon it, to carry out those terms of reference.

As is pointed out in the preface to the report, approximately 90,000 form letters were mailed to all corporations incorporated or carrying on business in Ontario. As well, a questionnaire consisting of topics to be studied and researched by the committee was forwarded to interested segments of the public. By this means and as a result of advertisements placed in all daily newspapers and in many of the specialized journals and periodicals in Ontario, we tried to make the public aware of the existence of the committee and its purpose and function.

Many briefs and submissions were made to the committee, some of major and others of minor significance; some briefs were restricted to specific topics and a few attempted to comment on a broad range of corporation law subjects. The committee expresses its indebtedness in the report to all of those persons and organizations who took the time and trouble to prepare and make such submissions.

We state in the introduction to the report that this is an interim report. It is interim only in the sense that the report does not

embrace the entire range of topics within the committee's express terms of reference, but its recommendations are not tentative. In order that the committee might be able to discharge what we considered to be the primary burden placed upon it; that is, to consider the fundamental principles of corporation law in its general aspects, it was necessary, because of our time limitations, to restrict our research and resulting recommendations to the principal problems associated with the ordinary commercial corporation in Ontario.

It is important that I make it clear to the House, therefore, that this interim report does not purport to deal with the specialized types of corporations, such as the cooperatives, insurance companies, loan and trust companies, corporations without share capital, credit unions, finance and acceptance companies or extra-provincial companies. It was our conviction that before a study was made of these specialized types of corporations, we should first address ourselves to the fundamental principles of corporation law as they relate to the ordinary commercial corporation in Ontario. This, Mr. Speaker, therefore, delineated the task which the committee undertook to do.

Even within these self-imposed boundaries, the time available to the committee and its staff did not permit us to examine and study certain aspects of the fundamental principles of corporation law, such as those pertaining to mergers or amalgamations; the rights of dissenting shareholders in the event of various fundamental corporate changes; the purpose, function and scope of the annual return; the securities aspect; the field of corporation finance and the possible strengthening of the protection of the creditor.

It is because these important specific areas have not been dealt with by the committee, and because the committee recognizes the need for study to be given to these specialized types of corporation, that we respectfully submit that the committee be reconstituted.

Also the committee did not again because of time restrictions, make a detailed examination of the jurisdiction, authority or administration of the companies branch of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and how these may be affected, if at all, by the new Department of Commercial and Financial Affairs.

On behalf of the members of the committee, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a significant report. This tripartisan select committee of his House having been given, by its wide terms of reference, important responsibilities in this complex area of commercial affairs, we have attempted to deal primarily with underlying principles and fundamental propositions. We do not bring before the House a piece of draft legislation for the approval or comment of the House, even though we reprint legislation of jurisdictions as examples of some of the solutions we suggest. We table instead, a report which is intended to point out to the Legislature, by its recommendations, the urgent need for fundamental and basic changes in our corporation law.

Much has been said and done in this House in the last two years concerning the securities laws of this province. The implementation of the recommendations of the Kimber report, released in March 1965, was proceeding in this Legislature concurrently with the period of the deliberations of the select committee. This is in keeping with the comments made in this House by the Prime Minister in 1965 in moving the resolution appointing the committee, to the effect that enactment of revised securities legislation should not await any report of this select committee.

It is now widely recognized that the updated and revised securities laws of this province are based on the concept of full and fair disclosure to investors, particularly at the time when companies are undertaking primary distribution of securities to the Ontario public. Coupled now with the new rules as to disclosure in respect of primary distribution to the public, are the insider trading, proxy solicitation, and takeover bid rules of The Securities Act, 1966 and the 1966 amendments to The Corporations Act. These new statutory rules which were passed by this Legislature in 1966, however important they may be in upgrading the standards of commercial and financial activities in the province, cannot of themselves, be complete or wholly effective without a fundamental reappraisal of the bases of our corporation law.

In our interim report, this we have attempted to do. Among all the other subjects, I wish to emphasize the sections relating to the role of the director; the rights of minority shareholders; the role of the auditor and the role of the trustee under trust indentures and I urge the government to move quickly in these four fields particularly.

Other, long overdue, recommendations are made in the report concerning significant aspects of company law such as the method of formation of companies, the abolition of the Provincial Secretary's discretion, the

abolition of the distinction between the public and the private company, the abolition of the doctrine of *ultra vires*, the abolition of the law of charitable uses and the law of mortmain, the formation of professional service corporations, and other areas. Further, this interim report makes new and we hope progressive suggestions as to the establishment of a securities transfer code intended to introduce clarity and equity into the procedures whereby shares of companies are transferred through the facilities of stock exchanges or in the over-the-counter market.

All of these areas, and the others dealt with in the report, were considered by the committee after we commissioned research in depth and we submit the recommendations as being of real substance.

However, the four chapters of the report to which I have already mentioned and which I would like to draw to the attention of the House specifically as requiring immediate attention, are those dealing with the duties and responsibilities of directors; the rights of shareholders; the role of the auditor and the role of the trustee under trust indentures. Many perplexing and controversial features of corporation law are dealt with in these chapters. As the committee points out in the introduction, there are opinions and recommendations in the report with which the chairman and individual members of the committee disagree. However, the committee compromises its individual disagreements in order to arrive at workable recommendations of substance, particularly in these four particular chapters where we have realistically attempted to deal with these four problem areas in a constantly changing and evolving commercial and legal community. A community, by the way, which is facing fierce international and interprovincial competition.

So far as the role of the director is concerned, the committee concludes in the report that the Legislature should enact a legal standard of conduct and care which should prevail in the boardroom; a standard of care which must appeal to the fair-minded director and be compatible with his role as a manager and risk-taker. The suggested standard of care would guide the director in the exercise of his duties and responsibilities as a fiduciary and would considerably up-grade the existing standards as laid down in the decided cases. The result of these recommendations, if implemented, would be that the company director should have available to him an easily understood and plain standard of conduct and care which he must follow in discharging his duties; a standard the breach of which will, under some circumstances, expose him to liability for suit at the instance of the wronged company or a shareholder suing on its behalf.

The committee concluded that the access to the courts at the present time, in order to right wrongs done to companies by directors and other insiders, is wholly inadequate and burdened down with procedural complexities arising from a notorious decision of an English court almost 125 years ago. Chapter X of the report recommends a novel remedy by asking for the introduction into the law of Ontario of a substantive remedy by way of a derivative action, to be brought by a shareholder suing in a representative capacity, to remedy wrongs done to the company where those in control of the company for one reason or another see fit not to pursue the remedies available to the company. The committee has attempted to fence in this derivative suit remedy with adequate protections so that, on the one hand, the would-be plaintiff is not frustrated in his attempt to sue either by procedural difficulties or by lack of funds, and on the other hand the company is protected from harassing or blackmail suits brought or threatened to be brought, by shareholders or their lawyers who seek only under-the-table settlements. We do not want to import American "strike bar" practices into Ontario.

Still dealing with the role of the director, the committee recommends as a corollary to the recommended new standard of conduct and care, that the Ontario law concerning directors' non-arm's length transactions with companies be rewritten so as to ensure full, frank and plain disclosure of the material facts and to ensure that any improper transaction between the director and his company will remain subject to enquiry or attack at the instance of shareholders in circumstances where it is equitable and in the corporate or public interest that such enquiry or attack be made. We are asking, in effect, for a statutory "directors' code of ethics" which will be more easily enforceable.

In chapter VIII a number of far reaching proposals are made whereby individual shareholder's rights can be more readily enforced, whereby shareholders can more readily remove directors during their term of office in those relatively few cases where such removal should be effected in the best interests of the company, and whereby groups of shareholders or individual shareholders may more readily requisition meetings of shareholders

to deal with important matters which, for one reason or another, the directors themselves decline to bring before the shareholders on their own initiative.

Finally, in chapter VIII we propose an essentially new remedy whereby any shareholder, or the Provincial Secretary, may apply to the court for the appointment of an inspector to investigate the affairs and management of a company or to do an audit of its books. This important recommendation will put in the hands of shareholders and the Provincial Secretary, a means whereby necessary investigations can be carried out without waiting for events to occur which may place it beyond the power of the shareholders, the courts, or an administrative agency, to correct mismanagement or abuse of fiduciary office.

The report of the committee analyzes extensively, the role of the auditor in corporation law in this province and, we hope, corrects some popularly held misconceptions. The committee concludes that changes are required in the law to maintain the independence of the auditor in his important task of reporting upon the financial statements of the company. These recommendations would prohibit auditors from being directors, officers, employees or shareholders of companies of which they are the auditor or of any company affiliated thereto. In a further step to assure the independence of the auditor, the recommendations in this chapter require publicly-held companies to provide for an audit committee of the board, of whom a majority shall not be officers of the company or any affiliate, and before whom the auditor has the right and may be required to appear, to discuss the financial statements of the company before they are submitted to the full board of directors for approval.

This recommendation, unique in common law jurisdictions, would give to the auditor a line of communication to the board of directors which has been lacking in the past in those cases where management has attempted to stand between the auditor and the board, or even between the auditor and the shareholders who appointed him. In addition to these recommendations concerning the auditor, the committee has attempted to deal definitely with the vexing and complex question of the role of the auditor of a holding company. Much has been said in this House and in other jurisdictions on this topic, some of it Mr. Speaker, even relevant.

The interim report concludes that the law must require that the auditor of a parent company shall assume responsibility for all aspects of the financial statements of the parent company, including those relating to subsidiaries, whether or not the accounts of the subsidiaries are consolidated. It will no longer be possible for the auditor of the parent company to rely upon the reports of other auditors, at least insofar as his liability as auditor of the parent company is concerned, without stating in his report that, in effect, he assumes no responsibility for the accounts of a particular subsidiary which is audited by other auditors.

Last, Mr. Speaker, among these four fundamental problem areas I wish to emphasize, the committee deals with the role of the trustee under trust indentures. We make recommendations which, if implemented, will require Ontario trust indentures to impose upon indenture trustees a degree of care, diligence and skill which a reasonably prudent trustee would exercise in comparable circumstances; second, that a person should not be appointed an indenture trustee if a conflict of interest exists or will exist in his role as a fiduciary under the indenture; third, that in the exercise of its duties, rights and obligations, the trustee may rely upon the truth of the statements and accuracy of the opinions furnished to it, only if the trustee is acting in good faith and only if the certificates or opinions so furnished conform to high standards specified in our recommendations; fourth, the indenture trustee must give to the security holders, notice of events of default arising under the trust indenture, except in a narrow class of cases; fifth, the trust indenture may not contain "escape clauses" which relieve the trustee from liability from its own negligent acts or failure to act, except again in the narrow class of cases specified in our recommendations; and last, the committee recommends that, consistent with our theories of the avoidance of conflict of interest, that an indenture trustee should not be appointed as a receiver, or as a receiver and manager of the assets or undertaking of the company which is the issuer of the securities under the trust indenture.

Mr. Speaker, we are fully conscious of the fact that the many recommendations in our report, and I have mentioned only a few, taken together with the new provisions of The Securities Act, 1966 and the 1966 amendments to The Corporations Act may well result in applications being made by shareholders and others—to use the phrase in our report taken from the new securities Act—"to a judge of the high court designated by the chief justice of the high court".

In the concluding chapter of our report, the committee, therefore, recommends that the chief justice of the high court of Ontario be asked, by the Attorney General, to designate not less than five judges of the high court as judges who would, in effect, constitute a "companies court" to deal with the specialized proceedings which will undoubtedly arise under the new and complex securities and company law legislation. By this means, not only will the "companies court" judges accumulate the necessary expertise and familiarization in these specialized areas, but the public will thereby have access to this court with a minimum of delay and inconvenience.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, may I close on a personal note. It has been a satisfying and rewarding experience to work with the members of the committee all of whom have worked and studied as a non-political team, in what has been for me, and I believe for them, a stimulating and educational venture. As chairman, I am proud of this report, and proud to have been part of the team. That team has also included a remarkably able and varied staff: we owe a large debt of gratitude to Mr. Robert Davies, our counsel, and to Mr. Lionel Schipper, our associate counsel; our secretaries; our research staff; our consultants and our contributors all are inadequately thanked in the preface to the report, and I would not want to let this occasion pass, on behalf of every member of the committee to express our appreciation to them and to our very efficient office manager, Mrs. Fran Nokes.

Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, table this interim report of the select committee in the hope that its contents will stimulate fresh thinking in the field of commercial and corporation law generally, and in the hope that its recommendations will be implemented by this Legislature as an essential part of our comprehensive overhaul of securities and corporation law.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I ask that that report be placed under my name on the order paper so that it may be called for discussion if any is required.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to advise you and members of the House that many subscribers to the Ontario medical insurance programme have expressed grave concern about the increase in medical fees announced by the Ontario medical association. It appears now, sir, that the association will not alter the stand it has taken in spite of the fact that the profession was fully and clearly advised that The Medical Services Insurance Act provided for benefits to be paid on the basis of the 1965 schedule of fees through the first two years of the programme.

I want, therefore, to assure our subscribers that the new schedule of fees just announced will be used as a basis of claims payment and 90 per cent of the new schedule will be the level adhered to by OMSIP.

To that end, sir, I propose to submit an amendment to The Medical Services Insurance Act as soon as possible, at which time a more complete statement will be made.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Health would permit a question on his statement? As he knows, there were questions before the House on this matter.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Pardon me, sir, I did not know there were questions until I entered the door; and I did not know what they were because I was not in my office all morning.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if I might ask a question based on the Minister's statement, would that be permissible?

I am interested in what sort of liaison the Minister is establishing with the medical profession so that these changes, as they take place in the months and years that lie ahead, can be handled in a more orderly way so the government is not surprised by the actions taken by the profession?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I wonder if the hon. member would be pleased to wait until I introduce the amendment? I cannot give him definitive answers at the present time. I do hope to be in a position to do so then.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions.

My first is to the hon. Minister of Health. What representations, if any, has the provincial government made to the appropriate federal authority in light of the widespread reports that persons suffering from heart trouble are now faced with a 500 per cent increase in prices for quinidine through price management by an international cartel?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, again I have to plead I did not know of this question until I came in and then did not hear it. I can

say this is similar to a question which I believe the hon. member asked last session; I have no further information than I had at that time. I cannot recall what I said then, but it is on record in *Hansard*.

Mr. MacDonald: Well Mr. Speaker, I can refresh the Minister's memory. He said he had written to Ottawa and had not received a reply. Has he not yet received a reply?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I have received a reply. I will get the information from that reply.

Mr. MacDonald: My second question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Social and Family Services. Is the Minister aware of a directive given by John A. Franklin, chairman of the district of Sudbury administration board to P. C. Shark, director of the board, by letter on February 27 that the English language is to be the official language of the office, that the use of any other language must be kept to an absolute minimum and used as a last resort, and that any language used other than English must be translated immediately, sentence by sentence? Does this directive conform with official policy for welfare administration in an area with significant French Canadian and new Canadian population?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, I should say that I am not aware of the directive issued by the chairman of the Sudbury district welfare administration board, which is a municipal organization.

I should, however, like to outline the practice of my department, which is to engage in the relevant communities bilingual field workers who are particularly adept in the use of the French language. In fact, our provincial district welfare administrator in Sudbury, Mr. Benoit Belanger, is thoroughly bilingual.

We have 13 staff members in Sudbury district and eight of them are able to speak more than one language. Seven of these persons can converse in both English and French, and among the total staff six different languages are spoken.

I remind the House that my department, like all other departments, has always attempted to provide interpreters to assist non-English speaking persons in the treatment of their problems. I should say that within the Toronto area alone, we have a most cosmopolitan staff who collectively can speak 29 languages.

The above is in keeping with the general government policy enunciated by me when I was Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship, namely—and I quote remarks which are in *Hansard*—I said:

> The general government policy of this administration is that no person need ever be aggrieved, need ever be deprived of any right or privilege or anything which anyone of his co-citizens is entitled to by reason of not being able to communicate in a language which will make him and his problem understood.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the Minister permit a supplementary question? Do I conclude correctly then that this directive does not conform with official policy?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that I have not seen this directive and I have enunciated the policy as I have seen it. The member can draw his own conclusions.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Economics and Development which will not invite a political answer.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The member will probably get one anyway.

Mr. Sopha: There will be some politics in it.

Is there a contract for catering or for the provision of any other service at the restaurant at the Ontario pavilion at Expo?

If so, to whom is it let?

If it is let to a body corporate, who are the principals of the body corporate?

What are the principal terms and conditions of this contract?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to answer that question of the hon. member for Sudbury.

In answer to the first question, yes.

The second question: Ports of Call International Limited.

The third question: Mr. Paul McNamara, president; Mr. C. Borst, vice-president and general manager and Mr. Ted Forster, secretary-treasurer.

Mr. Sopha: That is a very pregnant answer.

Hon. Mr. Randall: In answer to the fourth question, Mr. Speaker, this is not political and it is not facetious, it is a full answer to the question.

The province hereby retains the company to manage its facilities in the Ontario pavilion

during the period when Expo '67 is open to the public, it being understood that this shall be from April 28 to October 27 inclusive, in the year 1967, and the company agrees to manage the facilities during such period.

The company further agrees to provide such staff and management prior to April 28, 1967 and after October 27, 1967, as may be required to ensure the facilities will be completely operational on April 28, 1967 and to wind up the affairs of the facilities in an efficient businesslike manner, and with dispatch, after October 27, 1967.

The company in managing the facilities shall, subject to the approval of the Minister,

(a) Prescribe classifications for positions, including qualifications, duties, hours of work and salaries.

(b) Select, hire and pay all personnel necessary for the requirements, purpose and intent of the facilities.

(c) Provide and implement, at its cost, up-to-date training techniques for the staff.

(d) Set up and operate a complete purchasing, receiving, issuing and bar stock system for all supplies, both of a general and perishable nature, necessary for the operation.

(e) Order, receive and store all consumable supplies.

(f) Order and supply all table cloths, table napkins, place mats, coasters, ash trays, condiment stands, china, glass, silver and the utensils for the preparation and serving of food and beverages, as designed and approved pursuant to the agreement aforementioned with Fairfield and DuBois, architects.

(g) Prepare and supply both fruit and beverage menus containing a schedule of prices and names for each item.

(h) Establish a complete recipe and formula for all items on the menus.

(i) Order and supply all uniforms, check forms and other equipment for use by the staff.

(j) Supply, prepare and serve the items of food and beverages in accordance with the menus and list approved by the Minister.

(k) Set, clear and clean all tables, chairs and counters.

(l) Wash and sanitize all dishes, glassware, silver and utensils in use of the facilities.

(m) Be responsible for (1) laundry of all clothes and uniforms; (2) maintain the facilities in a clean and hygienic condition at all times; (3) banking of daily cash and credit receipts and the safekeeping of such moneys before deposit; (4) payment of all employees' contributions in respect of pensions, unemployment insurance, compensation, vacations with pay, hospitalization, medicare and other employee benefits as required by the law of contract.

(n) Select, engage and pay all orchestras.

(o) Prescribe special prices for food and drink for the staff at the facilities at certain times and places which shall be designated by the company.

(p) Perform any other matters necessary or advisable to carry out effectively the management functions of the facilities.

Secondly, the company shall inform satisfactory to the Minister:

(a) Prepare planning and operational guides and *pro forma* operating statements; and

(b) Prepare and submit to the Minister, monthly profit and loss statements of the facilities during Expo '67, together with such other financial statements as the Minister shall require.

Three, (a) The company agrees to assist as requested in the development of all advertising and promotional material necessary for the opening and continued operation of the facilities.

(b) The company agrees to apply for all necessary licences and permits for the operation of the facilities.

(c) The company agrees to obtain the approval of the Minister in respect of the source of all stores of food and drink prior to their purchase.

(d) The company agrees to provide the Minister with a payroll statement not more frequent than weekly, nor for a period in excess of one month, showing the actual wages of personnel for the facilities.

(e) The company agrees to require any person, such as the resident manager, engaged in the management of the facilities pursuant to this agreement, to enter into a written contract of service with the company and to obtain the approval of the Minister to the terms thereof before the contract becomes operative.

And, four, (1) the province shall:

(a) Provide and pay for all necessary insurance coverage, including products liability insurance, in respect of the operation of the facilities.

(b) Arrange for and obtain all necessary approvals from the Canadian corporation for the 1967 world exhibition.

(c) Subject to receipt of the statements mentioned in sub-paragraphs two and five of

paragraph three herein, where purchases and services are in accordance with the approvals given by the Minister, be responsible for the cost of supplies, equipment and services necessary for the operation of the facilities.

(d) Pay to the company:

i. Upon its execution of this agreement, the sum of $4,800.

ii. In six monthly instalments within 21 days of the delivery of a monthly statement, a sum equal to six per cent of the gross sales for the preceding month, less the sum of $800; and

iii. Amount equal to the salary of the resident manager, provided the salary does not exceed $1,500 per month, commencing June 1, 1966 and monthly thereafter to termination of his services, together with an allowance of not more than $300 per month in respect of expenses as properly vouchered and approved by the Minister;

iv. An amount equal to the payroll statements as submitted in accordance with this agreement.

v. It is agreed that all items of equipment, including dishes, glassware, silver and utensils and all stores including food and drink acquired for use or consumption at the Ontario pavilion, shall be the equipment and stores of the province.

vi. The Minister shall have the right to review, suspend or revoke any or all approvals granted at any time pursuant to this agreement, and to require the alteration of any menu, formula or recipe used, or intended to be used, by the company.

vii. The company agrees to take all necessary steps to dismiss any member of the staff engaged by the company for the operation of the facilities, upon notification by the Minister to the company of the person, and the filing, in writing, of particulars of the reason or reasons of the Minister for requesting the dismissal of such person.

Mr. Speaker, this contract was negotiated by our department over a period of two years after checking out all the factors to assure ourselves that this facility would be, not only the most efficient, but would enhance the reputation of this province. The contract was carefully examined in every detail by the law officers of the Crown and under their direction, it was approved and drawn.

Mr. Sopha: Was this contract tendered? How were the McNamaras selected? I mean, I know how they were selected, but would you tell us—

Mr. Speaker: The member is not allowed to make a speech—

Mr. Sopha: Well—the McNamaras were selected. I am not naive enough to state that I do not know how they were selected.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I asked the hon. Minister if it was tendered. Could I ask that question?

Mr. Speaker: The member should ask the Minister if he will answer a supplementary question,

Mr. Sopha: Well, I do not want to go through all that—I just want to ask him—

Hon. Mr. Randall: If you do not want the answer you should not ask the question. But I will answer your second supplementary question.

Very few contracts at Expo were tendered. They were by invitation after examining the people that were interested—and that was brought out by the leader of your party last year, when he asked this question.

Mr. Sopha: You are not kidding anybody—

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right—

Mr. Sopha: —we know who the McNamaras are and where they sit—you are not kidding anyone.

Hon. Mr. Randall: To think that way, you must have a criminal mind.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour.

Will the Minister assure the House that the paper tile ceiling in the remainder of the workmen's compensation—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the member desist from interjecting. Another member is asking a question.

Mr. Sopha: Well, did you hear the allusion he made to me—about me having a criminal mind?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Let him do that and we will see how far he can get—

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour.

Will the Minister assure the House that the paper tile ceiling in the remainder of the workmen's compensation board hospital in Downsview, which is in Yorkview riding, will be removed immediately and be replaced by fire resistant or fireproof material?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the workmen's compensation board that this matter, and all others in connection with the fire, are under complete investigation and discussion at the present time.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask the Minister of Public Works, of which I have already given notice. The question is as follows:

Would the Minister tell the House whether the renovations of the two rooms on the main floor of the Parliament buildings for the display of artifacts for the Centennial, will be completed in the year of 1967?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton Centre.

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme). The Minister is not in the House, so I would be happy to have this on the record.

Would the Minister explain why the Centennial project for the city of Hamilton, specifically known as Dundurn castle, has been omitted from the list of historic sites and museums on the department's map of Ontario roads to recreation, Centennial issue?

Some hon. members: Shame, shame.

Mrs. Pritchard: Mr. Speaker—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mrs. Pritchard: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question, if I could put it on the record.

Mr. Speaker: I would advise the member for Hamilton Centre that it is customary to ask the supplementary question after she has asked the Minister her question and he answers.

Mrs. Pritchard: Thank you.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways. He is not in the House but he can take it as notice and answer it when he does return. There is no supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Is the Minister aware of the inconveniences to the inhabitants of Amherst Island because of the unsatisfactory nature of the ferry services?

Second, what steps if any does he intend to take to rectify this situation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I have a question submitted by the hon. member for York South. I have the answer and I would like to give it to him this afternoon. The question was:

> How does the government reconcile the HOME programme's emphasis on single family units with the federal Minister's statement yesterday that "people are not going to get the housing they want in larger cities unless they are prepared to live in apartments"?

Mr. Speaker, in our mind there is no conflict between the objectives of the HOME plan and the federal Minister's remarks. The HOME plan is completely flexible and land will be provided on a leasehold, or agreement of sale basis, for either single detached dwelling units or multiple developments of medium and high density.

In areas where land is very expensive, it is expected that medium density multiple housing, or the town house or garden court variety, will be used fairly extensively.

With the enactment of condominium legislation, ownership of individual dwelling units within multiple developments, will become possible and this will encourage and facilitate the kind of home ownership referred to by Mr. Nicholson. As I said on March 17, when presenting the report on the HOME plan and in reference to condominium legislation, and I quote:

> Very simply, this will permit persons to purchase individual apartment units, or individual row or town houses, within a larger multiple development being disposed of on a stratified title basis. This, I hope, sir, will result in many elderly homeowners who no longer fully utilize their present single family home, and who would prefer apartment living were they able to retain their homeowner status, to purchase accommodation more in keeping with their needs.

This, in turn, will release much needed accommodation for families with children who need the additional space and the safe-play area provided by a rear yard. In a city such as Toronto, where land values are so costly for single family dwellings, high density apartments or expensive town houses are, today, the economically feasible form of construction.

Under the stratified title basis, thousands of people who want to reside in the city proper will, we believe, be able to do so under this scheme. The Ontario housing corporation will also be keenly interested in the development of this type of accommodation to fill housing needs.

The unqualified support of the HOME plan by the Hon. Mr. Nicholson is epitomized in his address to the housing conference held at the Royal York hotel on February 16 this year. At that time he said:

Just last week, you brought forward ambitious proposals for the provincial housing action which would see your field of activity extended far beyond its present boundaries. Basically, this new Ontario programme is directed at widening the opportunity for home ownership among your residents through government assistance, in the provision of serviced land for thousands of new homes.

No other factor has had a more pronounced influence on the cost of housing in recent years than the prices demanded for improved building lots. The situation is such that government intervention is totally warranted and I am certain that Ontario's proposal to make properties available, either on a lease arrangement or at prices well below those on the open market, will be welcomed most enthusiastically.

The programme contemplates extensive use of facilities which have long been a feature of The National Housing Act and I believe it will emphasize again, the potential effectiveness of our national legislation as an instrument of housing growth.

I may say that I have had an opportunity to discuss with Mr. Randall, Ontario's expectations from its entry into this new sphere of activity. I fully share his view that it is a step Ontario must take in order to alleviate to some extent the mounting pressures for housing in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind, and that of the very knowledgeable people in the Ontario housing corporation, that housing, as outlined in the HOME plan, can be provided in the major centres of this province.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourned for the Easter recess the hon. member for Kent East asked a question. I have the answer for it today, sir.

The directors and the secretary-manager of the interim bean board—fees and expenses $6,999.21. Legal fees—$1,511.90; auditing—$3636.62; printing — $1,478.97; advertising — $617.93; miscellaneous office expenses, including rent, telephone, etc. — $1,146.16; making a total of $15,390.79.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a point of order before we go too far, sir. I have been smarting under that defamatory remark made by the Minister of Economics and Development and I appeal to you to have it withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The member does not have a point of order.

Mr. Sopha: Will you hear my point of order?

Mr. Speaker: No. The member does not have a point of order at this time and I would ask him to take his seat.

Mr. Sopha: Well, at what time?

Mr. Speaker: At this time.

Mr. Sopha: I am rising on a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker: You should have risen at the time the Minister was speaking.

Mr. Sopha: Are you saying to me that you will not protect my rights when it stands on the record—are you saying this to me?

Mr. Speaker: I am saying to you that you do not have a point of order at this time and I am asking you to take your seat.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I am rising on a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker: You do not have a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Sopha: How do you know until you hear it?

Mr. Speaker: Because a point of personal privilege does not occur in this manner.

Mr. Sopha: Until you hear it I do not see how you can rule.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I may—

Mr. Speaker: If the leader of the Opposition has any further questions, I would like to have them.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, there were no further questions submitted in my name, to my knowledge, but I would like to bring to your attention, sir, that the hon. Minister said that my hon. friend had a "criminal mind".

I believe this is the point to which the member for Sudbury is referring and I would concur in his position, that this is unparliamentary. Surely the hon. gentleman might withdraw the remark.

Mr. Speaker: I would think that the member should have asked the Minister of Economics and Development to withdraw the remark at the time. I do not think that this is an opportune time to again start a controversy. Therefore I rule it is not in order at this time.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I tried to and you would not permit me—and apparently you do not seem prepared to permit me at this time, to ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. Nixon: Now is the time he could do it.

An hon. member: Any time is the time to withdraw a slur of that kind.

Mr. Sopha: If he were a gentleman, he would withdraw it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, what kind of a mind has he got?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): A very brilliant mind. A mind that you could very well use over there.

Mr. Sopha: Well, any man who would keep that on the record is a charlatan and a mountebank.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The ninth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
(Continued)

On vote 207.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on vote 207, while again—

Mr. Chairman: What section are you on?

Mr. Singer: I was going to explain, sir—while again I may be going back just a little bit, I wanted to clarify a point that we did perhaps already deal with and that is the London court house.

You will recall, sir, that the London court house came under discussion on two occasions —at one time the member for London South (Mr. White) suggested that there was no problem, that it was all cleared up—and just a few hours before we reached this point in the Attorney General's estimates, the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) stated that the problem was well in hand.

Now, in the light of those two statements from those two hon. members, I wonder if there could be an explanation as to why it was reported in the newspaper, that the Middlesex bar association was reported, in a story datelined London, as seriously considering whether or not they should apply for a mandamus order from the Supreme Court to force the proper authorities to build a court house. I am sure the Attorney General would like to clear up the record.

Mr. Chairman: Well, with the concurrence of the House, if it will revert back to this and have the Attorney General respond, this is—

Mr. Singer: Well, either that statement was wrong or the Attorney General's was, and I am sure—

Mr. Chairman: I did not want to open up the issue if this is not with the concurrence of the House.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I would say this. There has been no communication to me that this is in the minds of the bar association over there. The remark I made was that there were discussions going forward between the county and the city officials, towards reaching some agreement for the building of a court house. They have not reached that final stage, apparently, yet.

Mr. Singer: That modifies both statements. Let the record so indicate.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): I am perfectly sure that what I said was that discussions were being held between the city and the county and that there was some hope among the councillors, and among the members of the bar association, that arrangements would be made in the near future. Those arrangements have not been concluded.

The bar association in the county had set the deadline of April 1, if I remember correctly, and when that deadline was not met

to their satisfaction, they proceeded with the legal action which they had forecast.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the record speaks for itself. Certainly what is in *Hansard* is not what the member for London South said today.

Mr. White: Oh, look at *Hansard* and see what I did say.

Mr. Singer: All right, look at it and see.

Mr. Chairman: I think the members of the House will agree that this section has been closed. Is there anything now under outside judicial offices; and the land titles branch?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, under outside judicial offices, I would ask the Attorney General if he would comment about the relations now existing between the sheriff of the county of York, and the government of the province of Ontario, and the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, with respect to the administration of justice.

I had seen a reference, which I do not have with me at the moment, that the Metro chairman, Mr. Allen, had indicated that he would like to enter into discussions with the government of the province of Ontario, and with the county of York, respecting the overall extent of the administration of justice in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and the county of York, in relation to the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I might say first of all to the hon. member that we have discussions quite frequently with the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto, Mr. William Allen, and with the sheriff, and these discussions have been going on for some period of time. We have problems from time to time which we work out, and I think in a reasonably satisfactory way.

The sheriff is appointed by the government, he carries out his duties. The staff which he employs are paid by Metropolitan Toronto. We have had discussions going into the details as to the number of staff required, these with the chairman and his representatives and with the sheriff and with the judges who are sitting in the courts. I think we have reached substantial agreement in our approach to the whole matter.

Mr. Renwick: Well Mr. Chairman, specifically, is the financial arrangement different than it was, say in 1965; is the financial arrangement in 1966 different? Has the province assumed any part of the burden of the operation of the office of the sheriff of the county of York?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, the financial arrangement, Mr. Chairman, is no different. The payment for the salaries of personnel employed by the sheriff is a matter of responsibility of Metropolitan Toronto.

Out of these discussions which I mentioned we have been able to cut back in other areas of personnel, but we are not contributing anything in the way of dollars to the payment. We adjust and study the requirements, which Metropolitan Toronto sometimes has suggested were too great, and we have been able to meet them on many of these areas; after discussion with Metropolitan Toronto officials, with the judges of the courts and with the sheriff's own staff, for the assessment of the work. But we do not contribute as a province.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on this subject, last year when this particular vote was before the House I was discussing with the Attorney General the problem of in-training for these officials, promotion systems, the problem of moving them from one county to another, one court system to another, reviewing pay scales of these people and that sort of thing. I wonder if any progress has been made along that line; if there have been salary adjustments, if there is any programme of encouragement to bring younger people into the kind of service that is represented by these outside judicial offices?

We had quite a bit of discussion on that last year. The Attorney General said that our remarks made some sense and he would look into it and report later. I wonder how far we have gone on this line.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Just before I answer the hon. member, I wonder if I might clarify or perhaps correct something I said to the hon. member for Riverdale.

We do pay the officials in the sheriff's office, his office staff; I perhaps made my remarks too general. I made it appear we did not pay anything. We pay the sheriff and his office staff, but we do not pay court officials and that sort of thing. I just wanted to clarify that.

Now, I do not recall the conversation to which the hon. member for Downsview refers. Was it last year?

Mr. Singer: I think so, perhaps two years ago.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not understand at the moment what officials he is suggesting we should move about from place to place

within the province, if this is what he has suggested.

Mr. Singer: Let me put it in more specific context. There was a considerable problem about an appointment made in the city of Hamilton; and in that context we discussed this whole problem, where you find officials, should there be promotions from inside the service, what salary reviews do you have, what encouragement are you offering to young men to enter into this type of service, are there annual reviews of salaries, and that sort of thing?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well we set up a salary classification within the department. We have reviewed them and arranged for salary adjustments, salary increases.

As for training, I still do not quite follow the hon. member; is he suggesting moving a person from one office to another?

Promotion policy is generally from within the department and within the office. We have the classification ranges set up so that people may qualify and improve their status. That, I think, is all I can say to him.

Mr. Singer: The problem that I referred to at some length last year was the problem in Hamilton where an appointment was made—what was it, as registrar of the Supreme Court in Hamilton—where an outside man was brought in. There was some considerable discussion of this and criticism from within the legal profession that this should have had to be done. At that time I suggested to the Attorney General that it could perhaps make some sense that you train people in the county of York in junior positions and when that type of vacancy came up, say in Hamilton, possibly you could move someone there from Toronto on a higher level, this sort of thing. Or you could move someone from Hamilton to Ottawa; or someone from Ottawa to Windsor.

I suggested the service should be integrated, that these people should be trained, there should be reasonable opportunity for promotion and that sort of thing; because these are very important offices.

The registrar of the Supreme Court, in charge of fixing the lists for the Supreme Court trials in Toronto, has a very important job, and if he was inefficient in his job—and he is far from being inefficient, he is a very capable man—he could considerably hamper the normal course of justice. These are very important jobs and I wonder how much attention has been paid to them.

In recent months I have noticed a policy which I commend. Court registrars, the gentlemen who sit in front of the justices as they hear the cases, are being drawn from a number of retired persons who have been retained. They are people who have retired, say from bank positions and that sort of thing. They are in their early sixties and are quite capable of following this, and those people are doing a good job.

But I am concerned about a continuing type of civil service training, with reasonable opportunity for promotion so you will not get into the fuss that happened in Hamilton last time.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, now that the hon. member refers specifically to Hamilton I recall it. We did appoint in Hamilton, the hon. member perhaps knows, a deputy, in line with our policy. She was a lady. She moved up and took the position and then, I think for reasons of health, she retired from it after a short time.

Then we did not have someone qualified, this is true, because we had used the deputy. She had only been appointed a short time, and there was no one capable in the office of succeeding, nor were we able to find someone we felt would be qualified in the legal profession who wanted the job, so we sought outside help.

That particular situation gave us some trouble, but I think the difficulty is that to go to another area and take somebody away you are creating another vacancy which you have to fill there; and also, people do not like to move from their own community to another.

I do recall, however, that we brought Mr. Charles Sale from Windsor, from the master's office. We do this in seeking competent persons.

I am sure the hon. member will agree that Mr. Sale was a very competent person to come and assist in the office here. We do this wherever it is feasible, but generally our policy is to promote within the department and train within the department. I think we have a good classification range and are attracting good people to these appointments.

Mr. Singer: But I think there is still substantial room for improvement. I do not think The Attorney General's Department has approached the civil service from the point of view of providing a career-type occupation.

It is unusual that a young man leaving school would want to be pointed in this

direction, because in my opinion the salary scales paid are not too attractive and the opportunities for promotion are substantially limited. This is why I would ask what sort of salary reviews there have been. I think the salary scales are too low right across the board, and I think they should be carefully looked at again. I think there should be a real programme within this type of civil service occupation whereby you will attract bright young people and make them anxious and eager to want to be a part of it, and you will encourage them by offering them promotion.

I grant you that if somebody wants to stay in Toronto at a lesser salary than they might get if they were moved to Sudbury, that is probably their choice; but the attractiveness of a senior position at a better salary would perhaps encourage them, as in so many other occupations in other business, as well as in public business. I think this would be a worthwhile effort for The Attorney General's Department to embark upon, because the civil service of our court system is very important. If we have a smooth and capable and properly functioning civil service it makes the whole course of the administration of justice that much easier; I think there is room for improvement.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I agree, Mr. Chairman, with much of what the hon. member has said. I think perhaps it might help to set some of his criticisms or fears aside if I were to tell him that in the classification, the ranges which we have been able to establish—I have now before me the classification list—for example the justice administration officer (2), which I believe would be a sheriff or court registrar, on January 1, 1963, was $9,500. As of the first of January this year, it is $12,000.

Justice administration officer (3) was $11,500 as of January 1, 1963; and as of January 1 this year it is $14,000.

Estate officer (1) was $6,000—

Mr. Singer: You are talking by and large about lawyers there, are you not?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am showing the increases in these court officials.

Mr. Singer: But are these lawyers to whom you are referring? I am not talking about lawyers.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not at all. These are not lawyers. These are—

Mr. Singer: Well when you get to estates—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That may be, but we have a legal classification not called by this title. There has been a very substantial increase in salaries.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Attorney General tell me what the accounting control procedure is to make certain that there is accurate and effective accounting for the revenues of the outside judicial offices?

I refer specifically to the report, of course, of the inspector of legal offices for 1965. I think his statement was that most of the outside judicial offices were audited; but I would like to have a statement from the Attorney General as to just what the procedures are, when we consider that something over $17 or $18 million is brought in by way of revenue and a substantial part of that then transferred to the Treasury.

Specifically then, is the auditing procedure governed entirely through The Attorney General's Department? Does The Treasury Department exercise any supervisory function in connection with the auditing of the accounts of the outside offices and does the provincial auditor have anything to do with auditing the accounts of these offices strung out across the province, but which at the same time derive a very substantial revenue through fees, fines and other items of revenue?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the audits of the outside are done by our own financial controller, our own audit body, at least once a year, sometimes more often, as the occasion may require. Those audits are not audited primarily by the provincial auditor, but the audit which our department does is then subject to review by the provincial auditor.

Mr. Renwick: Does the provincial auditor give any report to The Attorney General's Department or to the controller's department as to the results of the provincial auditor's review; or is his review limited to reviewing just the work which is available within the accounting branch of the Attorney General's office? Is there any procedure by which a spot-check auditing system is instituted throughout the province in the many magistrates' courts and division courts and sheriff's courts?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have an internal audit, what you might call a spot-check audit, to answer that portion of the inquiry, and the provincial auditor does furnish us with a report on our audit.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 207 carried?

Mr. Singer: No, no!

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Have we come to land titles? I observe in this vote there is provision for rent to municipalities for re-survey. I wanted to draw to the attention of the Attorney General the situation in respect of titles in the district of Manitoulin. I can tell the Attorney General that among the Sudbury profession which serves Manitoulin Island there is an extreme reluctance, if not a complete hesitation, to certify a title in Manitoulin Island. I think that is a perfectly correct statement, that no one in the profession who deals in land on Manitoulin Island will certify a title.

Now most of the land on the island is in registry system, and I would like to suggest to the Attorney General, sir, that perhaps the time has come to change the island to the land titles system and that the funds for the re-survey that is required, and all the other very technical work, might well be provided by the provincial government in order that land tenure in Manitoulin Island will become a matter of the same stability as it is in other parts of the province. Surely the residents of Manitoulin Island are entitled to go to bed at night with the assurance that the title is secure and that at some future time some adverse interest will not be advanced against them.

Now probably the best way of doing it would be for the job to be approached from the point of view of doing a township at a time; the boundaries of the township could be established in the first place and then the concession lines run. I can say from my personal experience that the land in Manitoulin is held in lot and concession system within each specific township; and I merely leave it at that.

I realize that this is not a very attractive item of public expenditure, but certainly at some future time somebody in Manitoulin Island is going to suffer very adversely from the insecurity of titles that exists there. There will be some form of a hue and cry about it and one does not know what magnitude it will reach. At the present time, Manitoulin Island has only one part time lawyer; who practises there, I think, one or two days a week; and he comes from Sudbury. Most of the residents of Manitoulin have to go to Sudbury to seek legal advice and to have papers drawn in connection with any real estate transaction in which they might enter.

But the whole point is that the system of registration has developed into chaos on the the island and there must come a point in time where order must replace that chaos. I am suggesting to the Attorney General that the time now has arrived.

In that regard, of course, Mr. Chairman, all of the advantages in the universe do not reside in Toronto. And one of the disadvantages under which the people in the metropolitan area have to labour, is that they live under the registry system.

Mr. Singer: Partly.

Mr. Sopha: Partly. Well, the great majority of the land is held in the registry system, whereas north of the French River most of the land is held under the Torrens system which is immeasurably superior. I cannot put it more modestly than that; immeasurably superior to the registry system as a form of holding land. You will realize, Mr. Chairman, of course, being as learned in these things as you are, that, under the Torrens system, the master of titles, the local master certifies the title.

And you may take the title to be that as it appears on the register because, under the registry system, with each transaction, the title has to be re-certified by the lawyer who is looking after the matter.

Now Manitoulin Island, that little bit of Eden that is in the north part of the Georgian Bay, is a compact, social and homogenous unit, inhabited by a very hardy band of yeomen—descendants of those who first came there in the 1860s and fiercely jealous of their native strand.

I know that many of them who own land there are very anxious. Over the decades, there has grown up a system in which, more or less, the lines and farms are defined as that hedgerow planted by Uncle Obadiah in the last century. That is the accepted boundary but the register at Gore Bay is of no assistance in defining the boundaries, according to the local custom.

So I just refer that to the Attorney General and whoever may be Attorney General next time. It will probably be my friend from Downsview. I am glad he is—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): What about you?

Mr. Sopha: No, I have my sight set on higher things.

Mr. Singer: You want to reply?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well I would just say, Mr. Chairman, that I am also familiar with Manitoulin Island, having practised in Blind

River where I thought it was rather difficult to find a good title you could certify. Manitoulin Island did not seem to be too bad in comparison. However, I know there are problems there.

We have a reasonably substantial vote to assist in the preparation of judge's plans but it is by no means large enough to take care of all the situations which we know of across the province in other areas. To re-survey, if that were necessary, as the hon. member suggests, it might be to re-survey Manitoulin Island.

This would be necessary, if you were to move from registry, into the land titles or Torrens system—you would have to re-survey every foot of land that went under the land titles. That would be a tremendously expensive undertaking, even for a small county such as Manitoulin Island.

I think we would have to approach it township by township if we should decide to do that.

I must say that I have not received any complaints or suggestions from members of the legal profession, or from land owners, who have urged this. They may not know the difficulty or they may not know the uncertainty of the titles.

I certainly concur with him that there are many areas which should be re-surveyed and I think the sooner we could bring them, perhaps under land titles, the better. But to find the funds to do that—I think I might have some difficulty persuading all the members to do that in this year's estimates. It is something to have it noted and something we could consider, perhaps another year. Maybe then I can ask for more money.

Mr. Sopha: May I just add one thing. I wonder if we might not to advantage, begin to consider some ways of providing a stimulus toward the point, eventually, when all land in the province will come under the Torrens system.

To that end, governments might consider at this time, enacting some appropriate legislation setting out some circumstances under which land must go in the Torrens system. For example, one that readily comes to mind, when there is an expropriation by a public body, is that we could enact some legislative procedure whereby it would be required that the land go in the Torrens system at that time.

When a new plan of subdivision was registered for an old farm, we could require the owner, the sub-divider, to put the land in the Torrens system and so on. And then, pecking away at the thing like that, over a decade or two, we would have a goodly amount of the land in this province in that system. Some day, in the day of our grandchildren or great grandchildren, all the lands will be land titles in the province.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add that we do, under our Boundaries Act and The Certification of Titles Act, and I have certain persuasive features there, particularly for municipalities, to bring their territory under The Land Titles Act.

I think it is happening that private subdividers are coming in, too, because they get a certified title.

We can encourage them at least, under present legislation, where a private owner will not get monetary assistance but we do try to encourage the municipalities to come in.

These grants, the money that you are voting for, these judge's plans, do not entirely pay for the surveys, but they are apportioned 35 or 40 or 50 per cent, as we see the need, to bring various areas under land titles from time to time. We are doing I think as much as we can do, with the funds that I have asked for; perhaps we should do more.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have touched on this, I think, every year I have been here, and I have said—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Could I just say this. We did as you know—I think I mentioned this last year—we have asked the law reform commission to give us a study on the whole matter of land reform, and I think while it may not touch a specific situation such as was mentioned by the hon. member for Sudbury, I think they will bring forward some recommendations which will be far reaching in respect to titles, and I think we should receive that report tomorrow.

Mr. Singer: Well, I hope so, hope springs eternal when you sit on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, and this is all we can have—we hear these things from government year after year.

I would be the last person to pretend I am an authority on what goes on on Manitoulin Island. My colleague from Sudbury knows all about that but one interesting sideline in your remark to him, was that you had not heard too much complaint from the profession in that regard.

And this has been my concern, Mr. Chairman. In this one field, our profession—and I hesitate to criticize my own profession—has the least ground possible for being proud of itself because we lawyers, to a large extent, are taking advantage of a bad system and we are charging fees upon fees in regard to certifications of title which should not have to be necessary.

One of the concerns we have today, is the high cost of land and the high cost of housing. When you go to the registry office in the city of Toronto today, you can often see four lawyers attending on closing, each one of whom is going to go back to his own office, charge full fees for searching the same title, make substantially the same report and charge substantially the same fees for doing exactly the same work. Four times instead of once.

Now, I think this is wrong and when the Attorney General expressed this, to my surprise, there has been no criticism from the profession, I say it is not surprising at all.

This has been featherbedding enjoyed by the profession for far too long. And it is a rare group of people who are going to voluntarily eliminate their own featherbedding.

Now, I think the Attorney General has the job to eliminate that featherbedding because he is the chief law officer of the problem in the province of Ontario. And I think it is wrong that this goes on. We complained about it year after year after year. There should be a better system.

What sense does it make that four lawyers searched the same title, four times, on the same deal and charged four times the standard fee of one and a quarter per cent? It makes no sense at all. Who pays it? The poor fellow who is buying the house. It is just as simple as that.

Somewhere along the line we have to reform the system of land registry in the province of Ontario. And we have to take firm measures to do this reformation.

There has been no action taken by this government in this line at all. You nibbled at it. My friend talked about new plans of subdivision. Sure, now there has to be some sort of certification of title but it goes back into the registry office system, it does not go into the land title system.

You do all the work, you put it back into the registry office system and a few years go by, and a few transactions take place, and a few mortgages, and a few discharges, and some litigation—mechanics liens and all these other things that can pile up in a title—and you are back again in exactly the same position, five years from now, as from the time it was originally certified and put back in the registry office.

Surely it lies within the ingenuity of the minds that advise the Attorney General, or within the mind of the Attorney General, himself, to bring about some reformation in the land registry system in the province of Ontario which is wasteful, which is expensive, and which is inaccurate.

I have mentioned this on many occasions, Mr. Chairman, and up to this moment in 1967, on the eve of a provincial election, still nothing has been done.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Apropos to this discussion, I, myself, had pointed out last year that something ought to be done about changing the land registry system. During my tenure on city and Metro council, I moved resolutions asking that the city of Toronto take action to bring all its land under the Torrens system. Since then, I have come to the conclusion that in the light of present advancement in technology, even the Torrens system is outmoded and I have suggested on numerous occasions that this government—this province—could take an enlightened course and peer into the future and prepare for the future.

I say this in reference to computers. It is about time that the government set up a central data computing centre which could also look after land registry. I have already discussed this with people in the city of Toronto, and they say it is feasible—it is also being done in British Columbia and also in some jurisdictions in the United States. What you do is, you have a central data computing centre which would serve in this particular case, all of the province. All land would be given a number as it is presently given an assessment roll number. This government has seen fit to equalize the assessment over the province of Ontario, and this is an asset because each parcel now has a roll number.

Perhaps all you would have to do to those assessment roll numbers would be to put either a letter or a code number in front of the roll number to identify the community. Through the central data processing system you could also feed into it and receive from it information as to zoning, which is a rather confusing situation at the present time. Not

enough lawyers search the zoning and then they find that their clients are in trouble.

You could also, for instance—apropos to the city of Toronto bill, with reference to minimum standards of housing—you could feed questions into it and receive as an answer any cautions that are registered with reference to minimum standards.

The same computer could also act as a central clearing house for all chattel mortgages, bills of sale and automobile registrations. All this information could be given to you at the press of a button. The taxes on a property—whether they are paid or not paid—could be given to you at the press of a button.

Then I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the situation pointed out by my colleague from Downsview would not arise, because one certificate fed out of this computer would satisfy all four of those solicitors. There would in essence be a guarantee by the people who run the computer, the Ontario government, that those are the facts pertaining to this piece of land. All he would have to be doing is to give each of those four solicitors, or three of them, photostatic copies of the original statement coming out of the computer.

The saving to the taxpayers would be astronomical. It is agreed that to set up the system initially would also cost a considerable amount of money; but we are entering into a computer age, everything is becoming too complicated, we have too many registry offices to search, we have too many different bodies to enquire of. All this information could be given out by a computer.

Today in the United States, for instance, if you want a synopsis of the law on any topic, you can send to a central computer agency and they will give you all the leading cases in the law on a given subject. As they were able to do this with such a comprehensive matter as the common law of England, case law; surely they could do it with this.

Now of course this is in essence peering 20 to 25 years into the future, but it may be sooner than that. I would suggest that in about 10 years we will have to face up to that problem, and I think the time to start facing up to that problem and preparing to cope with it is this very minute. This government ought to be taking some action toward implementing a central data computing service for this province.

Mr. Chairman: Is the land titles branch carried, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We are doing what the hon. member suggests. We are approaching that in the personal property security field and I would hope that the law reform commission, in dealing with land titles, may make some recommendations in this regard.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, just by way of a postscript to this discussion; in the city of Toronto registry office there used to be a gentleman named Sam Dodds, who was the assistant registrar. He was there for years, he was there when I was a student and perhaps some of the lawyers who practise in Toronto may remember him. Now Sam Dodds knew more about titles in the city of Toronto than I think anybody either before or since. I remember him telling me one day that he really could not understand all this nonsense that the lawyers went through in these long and complicated searches and pages and pages of requisitions. He suggested that if somebody would give him two dollars for every title in that registry office he would be prepared to certify them all and he guaranteed that he would end up a very wealthy man and I believe him, I believe him!

Unfortunately, our profession binds up all this lore in great mysticism and we attach such great importance to things that are so by and large meaningless in this. I suppose it is an effort to justify the fees that we charge in searching these titles. I think this is wrong and I would hope that the Attorney General would do something about it.

Mr. Chairman: Land titles branch; carried. The official guardian's branch.

Mr. Singer: Yes, on the official guardian's branch, I could not get at this earlier when we moved the accounting from where it was done, I guess by the accountant's branch in The Attorney General's Department to the public accountant, but I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what the explanation is for the unusual way in which moneys were handled by the official guardian's branch?

Why there have been cheques sit in files in that office for a couple of years without being deposited! What happens to the interest; why it was necessary for Mr. Justice Haines to make an unusual order—and I wonder about the legality of that order—directing that certain infants' funds go into a trust company so that the infant could be secured a return on the money of six per cent rather than the four per cent standard rate.

What happens to the money after it gets into the hands of the official guardian; why he only pays out four per cent if the money is being invested at six per cent; why the infant should not be protected as best he can without the unusual type—and I suggest perhaps slightly illegal type—of direction that was given by Mr. Justice Haines on that occasion. Why funds under $500 are not credited with any interest at all, both in this branch and the public trustee's branch—I am going to come to that in a moment.

In other words, why the government is trying to make a profit out of this thing; and I think this has been happening.

It just does not make sense to me. We have government employees who run these offices and they are in charge of public money. I am not suggesting that any of them have taken the money and put it into their own pocket, but I am just suggesting that we have had several years of very sloppy administration here to the harm of these infants, because their interests have not been properly protected.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, to deal with the first matter that the hon. member raised about certain cheques remaining for some time on file in the office of the official guardian, we became aware of that last year —almost a year ago—and in April of last year I directed an inquiry into the situation having heard some complaints about that situation.

I have a note here, it is a memorandum from the comptroller of my department to the Deputy Minister, that pursuant to the instructions given by the department he began the examination of the procedures in the office of the official guardian on April 15, 1966. In this connection he said:

> I examined all files on the desks of the solicitors and found there were many files to which cheques usually made payable to the accountant of the Supreme Court of Ontario and often certified, were affixed.

There were cheques waiting in those files.

Mr. Singer: Some for over two years!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Some for quite some time! This memorandum is detailed as to what was discovered, and the memorandum concludes:

> As a result of the foregoing I sought and obtained the approval of Mr. F. T. Watson, the then official guardian for the establishment immediately—

that was April 22, 1966—

> —of the following procedures:
> (1) the collection of all cheques from the files.

This was a year ago.

> These were placed in the custody of the official guardian's administrative officer for lock-up in the office safe. Each cheque was first photo-copied and the copy was placed on the appropriate file for the information of the solicitor concerned.
>
> Second, the administrative officer was instructed to prepare a list of all cheques and securities in his possession at the close of business each Friday and present it to the official guardian at the opening of business on the following Monday morning. This listing was intended for the purpose of acquainting the official guardian not only with the details of negotiable instruments which had been received but also to emphasize the date of receipt so that he could take the action considered necessary to expedite the final disposition of each item. In addition to the corrective action mentioned above I requested deposit immediately with the accountant of the Supreme Court of Ontario of the Canada savings bonds which remained in the custody of the official guardian. Effect was given to this request on October 12, 1966.

Well now the hon. members know, I think, of the appointment last year of Mr. E. M. Henry, Q.C., as the official guardian and I am glad to report that he immediately embarked on a programme which resulted in the payment into court of all outstanding items. These have all been cleared up.

We started our check-up on that almost a year ago, in April of last year. The situation has changed with the change in personnel; that part of it.

Mr. Singer: All right, that is part of it. Yes, are you going on to the second thing?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Now then, with respect to the investment of court funds, I am reading from The Judicature Act in section 107, under certain rules and this is statutory. Section 107 says—it is headed: Investment of Court Funds:

> The finance committee shall continue to be composed of three persons who shall be appointed by and hold office during the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and notwithstanding this or any other Act the finance committee has the control and management of the money in

court and the security in which it is invested and the investment of such money.

Subsection 2: The finance committee may provide for the payment of interest upon any money paid into court and may fix the rate of interest so paid.

3. The finance committee may establish such reserve funds as it deems expedient in the management of the money in court.

4. Money paid into court shall be invested in the name of the accountant of the Supreme Court of Ontario.

5. Any money that is available for investment shall be invested in securities issued by or guaranteed as to principal and interest by Ontario or Canada or by any agency of either.

6. Where an investment in debentures of a municipal corporation is made the validity of the debentures is not thereafter open to question but they shall be deemed to be valid.

7. The finance committee may employ a trust company to make the investment of money paid into court or as custodian of the securities representing investments of the money on such terms and conditions as are agreed. When an amount exceeding $50,000 is in court to the credit of an account for investment the accountant may if so directed by the finance committee notwithstanding any order for payment out of court withhold payment for three months to enable him to realize upon the securities in which money in court is invested.

Now there are three other sections which I think are not particularly relevant here but the matter, I think it is quite clear, is controlled by a statutory provision of The Judicature Act as to the authority of the finance committee of the government to invest the funds and to see to its payment out and its investment in proper securities.

I think the hon. member's criticism is directed to the point that not as high a rate of interest might have been paid as could have, or should have, been paid. This I have taken up with the finance committee and have asked that a meeting of the finance committee be convened to consider this matter, and this will come about shortly. But I would point out this: while Mr. Justice Haines or the court may direct in a particular case, where funds were not needed for—I think he said in that case it was clear the funds were not needed for at least five years—most of the money, or a great deal of the money that comes in, is required to be paid out on a revolving basis. It may be a week or a month or quarterly or so on, or as need is shown by application and affidavit of an infant.

No trust company, no bank, as far as I am aware, would take such money on what amounts to a current account and pay better than perhaps the standard low rate of interest. They are not going to pay six per cent on a current account. I am unaware of any that do. If you can invest it in GICs, or in a large bank, long term investment of at least two or three or five years, you can obtain a higher rate of interest. So I think it has to be borne in mind that the official guardian, in those funds which come through his hands, is subject to the fund revolving and being paid out in every case perhaps on some different terms.

My hon. friend the member for Downsview, I think knows the situation relating to lawyers' trust accounts. Moneys come in; they may be required next week or next month or three months from now, depending on when a deal is closed or the estate is finished; and the money that is in the lawyer's hands has to be paid out. I am not sure that he pays any interest on those at all.

Mr. Singer: I do not get any.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, you do not get any.

Mr. Singer: My instructions are—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Although I believe that now the law society will permit a floating area of a trust fund to be invested provided that if demand is made the interest be accounted for. But it is not possible to get a high rate of interest on those revolving funds. My main answer is that I have asked the finance committee to review this whole situation.

Mr. Singer: Well that is a partial answer only, but as the Attorney General read those sections with which I am familiar my doubts recurred about the legality or the correctness of Mr. Justice Haines' decision. I just wonder how he could make such an order in view of those particular sections of The Judicature Act.

I do not think anyone would want to question that order because it is for the better of the infant and the infant is going to get a better break because that order was made.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: May I just advise the hon. member, as I recall that situation Mr. Justice Haines appointed a trust company

guardian on the application of the trust company. Now surely you do not suggest that was not legal.

Mr. Singer: No, no; but on the handling of the funds it is my understanding that the handling of those funds should have been in the normal way, not by someone outside, but by the official guardian. It was an unusual or unique procedure.

Now I would hope nobody would appeal it, but I would hope going along with it would be an amendment to the section of The Judicature Act, and I just wonder whether it is sufficient that this finance committee of three is going to deal with these funds in perpetuity in the way they have been doing, because the infant does not seem to get that to which the infant is entitled; and that is a good rate of interest. There are a number of ways; the Bank of Montreal, for instance, has raised its rate of interest on savings accounts; and there are a variety of ways where far better than court interest can be realized.

Now it is not an answer, to my mind Mr. Chairman, to read me that section of The Judicature Act. That section of The Judicature Act is an old one. It was designed for different days and I do not think the infant is getting the break to which he is entitled.

I would like to know, and I do not know whether these figures are available, how much money has been made on these funds. Has the province been making a profit on this investment? At what rate has the province invested and what has been the return? What was the return, say in the fiscal year 1966, on all the moneys directed by the official guardian?

How much profit was made? What was the interest earned on that? And how much was credited to the individual infants' accounts and how much was credited eventually to the government fund, to the consolidated revenue fund?

In other words, I would like to know whether or not the government made a profit on this. My suspicion is that they might have.

An hon. member: What is wrong with a profit?

Mr. Singer: Well, should the government make a profit at the expense of people under 21 whose funds it is holding in trust? Do you think that is a fair thing? My friend up there in the far reaches who says "what is wrong with a profit"? Does the government have a job to steal money from infants who are in its charge?

Well, that may be the Tory view of how affairs of government should be run, and if that is the Tory view, let the Minister stand up and say so. But I think those figures should be made available.

Now what about funds under $500? Why is interest not paid on that? When we come to the next one, the public trustee branch, I am going to tell the Minister about a specific case where the public trustee held on behalf of two incompetents, two amounts of approximately $500. He held them for 20 years and at the end of 20 years, one of these incompetents died and the heirs of the incompetent got back only $500.

Now if that money had been invested anywhere at the most nominal rates of bank interest, that fund would have doubled in that period. And when the heirs of that incompetent inquired they were told, "Well, that's too bad, we never pay interest on amounts under $500." What sense does that make?

That fund must have earned interest and again did the consolidated revenue make a profit out of this? If the government is making profit out of infants and incompetents, then I think it is a very wrong thing that this government is doing.

Mr. Chairman: That is the public trustees branch.

Mr. Singer: Well, has the Attorney General any figures along those lines?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I cannot give the member the figures as to what the member says the government makes. I think perhaps we would have to get that from the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton). I can only answer again, that I have asked the finance committee to review this whole matter and let me know what the answers are on how this fund is administered.

On the $500 item, I can find no reference in any Act to that effect, it must be one of the rules of the finance committee. But I shall find this out.

Mr. Singer: Well, are there rules to the finance committee? Are they available, are they printed? Typewritten? Mimeographed? Do we know how these things are governed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not have them but I am sure there are rules of the finance committee.

Mr. Singer: It is a very, very grave field, Mr. Chairman, we do not seem to know how this thing is being run at all. There are these criticisms and I would have hoped that the Attorney General would have been able to give us some information.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The accountant of the Supreme Court of Ontario has the procedures; he knows them; and I am sure he would be familiar with them. I have not got them at my fingertips here.

Mr. Chairman: Official guardian branch carried? The public trustees branch.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to repeat what I said. I coupled the two things together but the same criticisms are there; the same inefficient system, in my opinion, is used in looking after funds in charge of the public trustee. I do not think those people whose funds are in the charge of the public trustee are getting the care and attention that they should in the administration of those funds.

Again I am not suggesting there is any dishonesty, but I am suggesting that those moneys are not invested to the best interest of the beneficial owners of those funds, and I give you again, the example of this incompetent who was in a provincial hospital, entitled to the sum of $500, which at the end of 20 years, was still $500. I think that is completely inexcusable.

Mr. Chairman: The public trustees branch carried. The probation services branch.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, why is this vote, the probation services branch, not under The Department of Reform Institutions? Is it not part and parcel of the parole system?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, the answer, I think, is that we have had discussions, and in some jurisdictions, it is fair to say that probation is associated with a department such as Reform Institutions. I do not know if they use that name, but probation services, generally, are associated with the court and actually with proceedings up to trial in advising the magistrate or the judge about the persons who are appearing before the court.

That is really where one of the great values of that probation service is—in pre-sentence or pre-trial advice. If it particularly indicates that juveniles, or persons placed on probation, are not sent to an institution such as would be covered by The Department of Reform Institutions, the probation officer then has a duty to interview the person who came before the court to see the home, to talk with parents, to counsel and advise.

So, in a very large sense, the probation service is related to court procedures. I am not for a moment saying that there might not be some advantages in associating probation with parole.

We have had, I may tell you, discussions looking into the possibility of doing this, which, as I mentioned, is being done in some other jurisdictions.

We are studying to see if there are advantages that could be accomplished, but I think the probation service personnel regard themselves very different and very distinct, from parole persons.

They are advising, seeking to keep people from getting into institutions, and not trying to look after them when they are inside the wall. That is the function of the probation officers.

Mr. Sargent: The vote is up $700,000 this year. Is that for increased personnel, is there an upgrading of their salaries or what is the reason for the increase?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: A large part of it is increase in personnel. We are seeking, and hope to get, 20 additional probation officers. Our whole staff, I can tell you, is up to the full capacity, some of them, I think, carrying more case loads than they should. We need new personnel and we are seeking to obtain 20 under this vote—and there is some increase in salaries.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the Minister, in respect to the case load of the probation officers, what the average case load is now?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The provincial average work load of probation officers in Ontario for 1966, at the end of 1966, was 84. That, I admit, was high.

Mr. Young: This means that some must run over 100.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: At the end of 1966, there were six counties with work loads over 100. There were 18 counties with work loads from 80 to 100 units and there were 11 counties with work loads from 70 to 79. We need the extra probation officers.

Mr. Young: Well then, Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister what the outlook is for getting these 20? Are they available, is there some hope they will be available soon,

to bring down this burden of case loads, because when you get up to the hundred mark, the thing is twice what it ought to be.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We will have no difficulty, I think I can assure the hon. member, in getting our complement, as soon as we have the authority of this vote to do so.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in that regard, the report of the crime commission in the United States reported that the average should be a 35 to one ratio, to do a good job on this; so if you are hiring only 20 new probationers, you are a long way off the pace with a ratio from 84 to 35.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They use a different basis of computation, quite different from ours. Our average is considered a fair average; a reasonable average is considered to be 50, and I am the first to admit that 80 is very high.

It keeps a very dedicated person pretty busy to carry that. But a great many of them work long hours and do tremendous work. We need the extra officers. But the comparison with the U.S. crime commission report is not valid really.

Mr. Sopha: I would like to ask the Attorney General whether it is constitutionally feasible for us to so order it in this province, that no one, we stipulate that no one, suffers a term of imprisonment without a pre-sentence report?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Just off-hand, I think that would come into the area of criminal law, and I doubt if we could just legislate it to that effect without getting outside our jurisdiction. I do not know what the hon. member himself might think. It is a procedural thing, but it is the criminal code which lays down the procedural rules of criminal trials. I think we would be getting beyond our depth if we tried to do that as a province.

Mr. Sopha: Well, if we agree that in 1967 we have revised the Gilbertian words and we make the punishment fit the offender, and the administration of justice being a provincial matter, then is there not some stimulus we can give to judicial officers, to encourage them in every case where the offender, having been convicted, is in danger of suffering a term of imprisonment; and in every case, before sending the person to a penal institution or reformatory, they will have an investigation carried out into his background and his complicity in the offence?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We do a great deal to encourage all courts dealing with persons charged with criminal offences to get pre-sentence reports. I have statistics here which are rather interesting, I think, to show the great number of such reports that were obtained through the past year.

We do as much as we can, or at least we do a great deal, to encourage this sort of thing and it is a very valuable service which is rendered to the courts.

This present load of the probation officers—I do not know if these are totalled, but they are set forth by counties and the figures are shown for family counselling, preventive counselling appearances, pre-sentence reports, social histories and pre-release reports. It then shows the workload per individual officer in all that field, and a great deal of it is taken up with pre-sentence reports.

Mr. Sopha: But we are aware that there are still instances of the prehistoric, the quasi-Neanderthal method of dealing with these fellows; such as the young fellow who at two o'clock in the morning, throws a rock for some reason, known only to himself, through the plate-glass window of a trust company, and at ten o'clock, or sometime between ten and noon, he is sentenced to three months imprisonment for wilful damage—and that is not the only illustration, I know of others.

The assault committed at seven o'clock in the morning: I remember that one very vividly, assault by a number of youths, committed at seven o'clock in the morning and between ten and twelve they had all, I think six or eight of them, been wrapped up with six months to think about, in the afternoon, thinking about six months imprisonment staring them in the face, and that still goes on.

Now I have never been satisfied that sufficient enlightenment goes out from Queen's Park, and if the senior staff here are, as I am sure they are, progressive and reform-minded and enlightened people—I know many of the senior staff who seem to be such, who seem to have all those perquisites—I am not at all satisfied that that outlook disseminates itself among the Crown attorneys.

I can conceive that the Attorney General could merely say to the Crown attorneys, it might be a good idea to have them all in once a year, and say, "Here is the way, gentlemen, that we want things done out there. Now one of the things we want done is that you suggest to the court that no one goes to jail without a pre-sentence investigation on him."

It would be the easiest thing in the world for the Crown attorney to get up on his feet and make that suggestion to the magistrate. I do not think it is telling any tales out of school to say that we still have a good many magistrates who are impressed with Crown attorneys.

We will be getting more that are less impressed with Crown attorneys and that is a very salutary and very helpful development—the less impressed the magistrate is by the presence of the Crown attorney. I do not have to persuade my friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) of that, he will see what I am getting at.

In other words, the magistrate should not be beholden to Crown attorneys, but here is a device that the enlightened nerve centre of The Attorney General's Department could use to just disseminate this among the Crown attorneys and say, "It is your task, it is your job to see that this rule is followed, that there is a pre-sentence report on everyone."

Now I observe, and it probably is a recent innovation, that in the magistrates' courts, there is a probation officer present every morning.

It is just great now to see—since the legal aid system came in—it is just great to see what goes on. Would you mind, Mr. Chairman, if I tell it?

At nine-thirty the legal aid duty counsel arrives and he announces that he is the defender of the liberties of the subject to everyone. He gets through to everyone who is imprisoned except those who are still about three parts per thousand from their profligacy of the night before, but all the rest hear him and he then holds a private court with them—and this is only a week old. It is great.

Then I notice there is a probation officer present in the court now, as it should be. It is the easiest thing in the world—I do not see any great difficulty in that—that where the person is convicted of possession of stolen goods, or breaking and entry, or some other heinous offence, that in every case the magistrate says: "You will be remanded into custody and there will be a pre-sentence investigation prepared."

Well, could anything be simpler than that procedure, and we employ these probation officers within the ensuing week. They are directed that they go over and interveiw the fellow and find out something about him; make a report in writing to the magistrate; it does not have to be discursive but hitting the main items, who he is, what kind of a home he came from, what he has been employed at, what level of education, and whatever those sociologists call it—what his siblings are.

They use all these sociological terms in them—who his siblings are and what assets he has got, what prospects, what record. Heavens, a form could be drawn up—that is an inviting thing to the bureaucracy—draw up a form, they are delighted with that.

Some of them, I am sure, sit up all night thinking what should go on the form, and the magistrate has it before him. Then we can totally revise W. S. Gilbert, I hope it is W. S. Gilbert, we totally revise his famous credo, and the punishment fits the offender, the person who is before the court.

That is the human way, that is the completely human way and the dignified way, of dealing with individuals on whom society has put the mark of Cain. We have said that we will be immaculately fair with you—before we separate you forcibly from society we will ascertain everything that ought to be said in your favour.

Now, just to go back again to my illustration, there might have been ten thousand reasons why the boy threw the rock through the trust company window. There might have been many mitigating factors in that, and to be humane about it, it is a little more than the stiff application of the formula, reading the section of the code, which says: Everyone who commits wilful damage guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for—whatever it is—a number of years. Instead of the magistrate just looking at the boy and sending him to jail for three months, he acquaints himself with the nature of that boy's mind when he picked up the rock and threw it through the trust company window.

Maybe having done that, the boy would not have received three months—he might have received 14 days, he might have received probation.

Any number of things might have happened to him; he might have been fined in lieu. There is another advantage, of course, to this remand, which is that it gives the opportunity for relatives or friends to come forward and say a word on his behalf, but of course I must hastily add that under the new system, inaugurated last week, this is not going to happen.

The boy is now going to have counsel. I happened to see three there yesterday who had stolen a car and taken it to Winnipeg before they were apprehended. They were represented by the legal aid lawyer on pleas of guilty. They were remanded for a pre-

sentence report and, so help me, one of them had a head of hair on him that if he made a contract with the barber it would have taken the barber half a day to cut it off, you could hardly see his face, so that will be one beneficent effect.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I hope they give him a hair cut!

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 207 carried?

Mr. Singer: No, before we pass that vote, Mr. Chairman, just as a postscript and to underline what my friend has said, I did ask a question, the Attorney General remembers, about Magistrate Langdon, who appeared from the press to have been slapped over the wrist by someone because he was asking for too many pre-sentence reports, and the Attorney General in answering my question chose very careful and very pleasant language to somewhat remove that thought from my mind. But he did not completely satisfy me, and I would like to know why Magistrate Langdon, or any magistrate in the province of Ontario, cannot have as many pre-sentence reports as he wants.

In fact I go along completely with what my colleague from Sudbury says; there should be a pre-sentence report almost automatically for everyone who is convicted. Now what is the real story with Magistrate Langdon?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not every case, I must say off hand, deserves a pre-sentence report, in my opinion.

There is the person who is returned many times to the court—recidivist, clear and simple. I do not think there is much point in getting a pre-sentence report on that person.

We just do not have the facility, in the second place, to provide a pre-sentence report for every case.

I think perhaps there is something to be said in the case that the hon. member for Sudbury cited where the chap threw the rock through the window at five o'clock in the morning and at eleven o'clock he was found guilty. One of the things we used to say about justice, it should be swift. Now perhaps before his sentence, then, we could take time to get the pre-sentence report; but not in every case.

I am not sure I hold with this at all. I think we can go a long way to assisting the court. Magistrate Langdon was asking for it in every case, almost, and we just could not afford it; and there is no provision to do such for him.

Mr. Singer: I am not happy with that. If Magistrate Langdon has interpreted his responsibilities in such a way that it is not satisfactory to the Atorney General, then I think the Attorney General has an onus to remove Magistrate Langdon from the bench, but I would not believe that a magistrate—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I did not suggest that it was unsatisfactory.

Mr. Singer: Well yes you did. You said he was acting in a way that you could not accommodate and there was a limit as to how many pre-sentence reports he could get. Now if the magistrate believes he is entitled to get pre-sentence reports, then I think he should get them. I would go as far as my friend without any reservation; I would go as far as my colleague from Sudbury and say that those should be almost automatic.

I think someone made a serious error in disciplining Magistrate Langdon, because that is in effect what was done. Nobody said that he was a bad magistrate in so many words, but what you did say to him, or what officials did—and I am using the collective "you", I am not saying the Attorney General said it—what was said to Magistrate Langdon was: "You are putting us to too much trouble; you are upsetting the whole civil service; you are bothering us; you are making us work too hard; you are asking for too many pre-sentence reports and we are going to stop you from getting them".

I would say then that there was improper interference, from someone for whom the Attorney General is responsible, with the course of administration of justice.

Now if the answer is that Magistrate Langdon was acting improperly, and that is the only conclusion I can come to from what the Attorney General has said, then the Attorney General has a responsibility for removing Magistrate Langdon.

I do not believe he was acting improperly. I think he was acting properly and I think he was improperly interfered with.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the hon. member will refer back to the answer which I put on *Hansard* he will find that question was fully, and in my opinion correctly and properly answered. There was nothing suggested that Magistrate Langdon was unsatisfactory in his performance; but there were reasons and they were set forth in that answer. I do not think I will repeat them here again.

Mr. Singer: Well Mr. Chairman, this is one of the faults of the procedures in this House. The question and answer procedure does not give us an opportunity to really get down to the basic facts. We are at the mercy of the Minister who answers the question, who will only tell us as much as he wants to. This is the time when we can explore it, and I have been attempting to explore it. From what the Attorney General tells us he is unsatisfied—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not agree with you.

Mr. Singer: All right then: Why can Magistrate Langdon not get as many pre-sentence reports as he wants?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Because we do not agree he should have every one. I do not agree with your opinion or his attitude.

Mr. Singer: All right! You have now established my point.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Right! That is what I told you before.

Mr. Singer: All right! Then the Attorney General is in fact saying that the magistrate, in asking for them, is acting in a manner that he should not; therefore is it fair to conclude that he is not acting properly in his magisterial capacity?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, No! Not at all!

Mr. Singer: Therefore, if that is your attitude you should remove him.

I do not think you should remove him, I think you should make available to him any pre-sentence reports that he asks for.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member is just drawing conclusions to suit himself. I do not say he is unsatisfactory. I do not agree with his view. I do not agree with the hon. member's view; but that does not say I find them unsatisfactory. His view of the necessity of pre-sentence reports in every case I just do not agree with, nor do I agree with the hon. member in that point of view; but I am not disciplining the magistrate and I have no thought of removing him. That is purely brought up by the hon. member to draw a conclusion—as he charges sometimes, "a straw man that he can shoot down"—I do not agree with that at all.

Vote 207 agreed to.

On vote 208:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 208, public safety division; the member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: On this vote we are asked to spend $2,376,000, up about $800,000 from last year; and in 1963 the government denied that there was any organized crime in this province. It was proved later that there was; and here we are in support of public insurance, we are spending $2.3 million to guarantee that there will be a minimum of gangsterism and such goings on in Ontario. Using averages as a guide line, here the authorities tell us that there is $50 billion in a year being spent in the United States in gambling—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I wonder if the hon. member would permit me to draw to his attention that this vote has nothing to do with crime—at least not in the general sense at all. It is the fire marshal's office, the office of the assistant Deputy Attorney General, the fire college, emergency measures branch, supervising coroner and inspector of anatomy, and the centre of forensic science. This is not a police or crime vote in any particular sense that I can observe, and I do not think the hon. member's remarks are in order on this particular vote.

Mr. Sargent: You may be right, but I want to find out where we can talk about it. Under the OPP possibly, that would be under vote 211. But where does your research for crime come into your vote here?

Mr. Chairman: Will the member stick to the public safety division as outlined by the Minister—the fire marshal's office, the assistant Deputy Attorney General, fire college—and you can—

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask, in this regard, regarding the Attorney General's office then, I see you have increased that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the provincial police insofar as they are related to the criminal area, is vote 211; but in vote 202 I think we dealt with the police commission. If the hon. members' inquiries relate to that, we dealt with police commission under vote 202, we will be dealing with the provincial police under vote 211.

Mr. Sargent: All right, thank you.

The point I want to ask then—speaking of the Attorney General's office or the office of the assistant Deputy Attorney General—this will not probably hit any pay dirt, but I would like to ask the Attorney General: To his knowledge is there now, or has any of his staff, any wire tapping equipment or surveil-

lance equipment or anti-surveillance equipment?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No!

Mr. Sargent: Then I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister is very lax in the administration of this job. If he does not have the technology to fight—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Do you want to get some bugs in the building?

Mr. Sargent: Well I would like to suggest to you, sir, that there are groups of people who can go into your office and tell you whether it is bugged or not and they can tell you in about five seconds by this equipment. If you do not have it, if your assistant Attorney General does not have it, then you are away behind times today; you do not know what is going on!

I think it is a shocking thing that the Attorney General of this province tells us that none of his staff has the equipment to fight crime in such things as this. I would ask if he has any standardized communication plans for this province? This is public safety we are talking about!

Mr. Chairman: Would the member please stick to the particular vote 208, the public safety!

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know—a man would have to be a genius to find out where he can talk about crime in this province.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 202 was the vote of the Ontario police commission; and you can speak under the Ontario provincial police at vote 211 as well.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the Attorney General a question concerning the bus tragedy that took place in the county of Essex, in which there were eight children killed when a truck carrying sand turned over onto the bus: Has the Attorney General found, as a result of the investigations, some type of information, that could be relayed, to prevent such an incident from recurring?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I could say this: We had considered holding an inquest into that particular matter, then a criminal charge was laid and the matter came on for hearing.

In such cases where there had been an accident, or an incident causing death and a criminal charge is laid and a hearing takes place and all the evidence produced, our general policy has been that unless there is something overlooked or escapes in the court hearing, which is usually much more full and complete than an inquest, there is no particular point then in holding an inquest in addition to a prosecution hearing.

So while we were considering whether we should proceed with an inquest, the charges were laid, the hearing has proceeded and I have a complete report of the case, of the evidence. There was nothing particular that could be added to what was known.

Mr. Newman: Well Mr. Chairman, if I may pursue that, did the Attorney General find in the inquest some recommendations made that could be sent on to The Department of Transport?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There was no inquest held. It was a case; the Queen against LaFrancoise—a court hearing—so we did not have an inquest. As I pointed out, we do not have an inquest in such circumstances.

Mr. Newman: Then from the court case, were there any recommendations made?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have a complete report of the case and of the evidence given. What was your question?

Mr. Newman: I was asking the Attorney General if from the court hearings any recommendations were made that could be passed on to The Department of Transport so that this type of accident that did happen would not happen again, because I understand there was some mechanical failure that could have been remedied.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The evidence would seem to make it very clear that it was just a case of negligent driving. That is all.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The next question I would like to ask of the Attorney General, is under public safety.

Would the licensing of amusement rides come in? One year ago we had a serious tragedy on Bob-lo Island in which one of the concessions, I think it was a whip or one of the concessions that you find in amusement parks, broke loose, or tore loose, and three people were killed.

Now immediately after there was quite a clamour for the licensing of concessions on a provincial basis rather than a municipal basis,

because a lot of municipalities do not have staff competent to examine such types of concessions. It only seemed logical at the time time that provincial authorities could hire individuals, or staff, competent enough to look into the reasons for such a tragedy and at the same time look into the safety, the worthiness, of the mechanical ride so that we would not have the mechanical ride failing and suffer tragedy as did happen in this case.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member would agree that this perhaps should come under the safety inspection branch of The Department of Labour, rather than the Attorney General?

Mr. Newman: If this would come under The Department of Labour, I would be glad to put it there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I was going to say it does not come under the Attorney General. I think there was some discussion previously as to whether it should come under, possibly The Department of Labour, which does inspect mechanical items in industry; machinery, equipment, and that sort of thing. There is a licensing provision, a permissive license provision to municipalities, I believe in The Municipal Act, on this sort of thing, whether it is followed out or not I do not know, but as to inspection itself, it does not come within The Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Newman: I have another question on public safety that I would like to present to the Attorney General, and that is the safety of women driving in automobiles by themselves. While they are in municipalities they are under protection of municipal police forces, but on their way home in the evening they find themselves quite often pursued by other cars. Is there some method or some protection that can be given to these young ladies; or some type of distress signal that can be adopted on a provincial basis so that these individuals, or young ladies, driving a car will not be molested by the pursurer in another vehicle?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know; we can only provide a certain level of policing in the whole province. The suggestion I think has been made that the only thing they might do, if there are no police in view, is to lock the doors of the car and drive to some station, or perhaps get to a police station or some place where they may be under some protection.

I do not think I can very well suggest the detail to which they might go. They could have someone accompany them to give protection, but I can only say to the hon. member that we can only provide a certain level of police surveillance and they cannot be everywhere at once.

Mr. Newman: Has The Attorney General's Department thought of some type of standard distress signal so that the individual driving a car could alert others?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I had not thought of that.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 208 agreed?

Mr. Singer: No; let us do it item by item.

Mr. Chairman: All right; the member was bringing up items that had to do with the whole general vote, so shall we deal with the office of the assistant Deputy Attorney General? Is there anything further under that particular vote? Or the fire marshal's office?

Mr. Sopha: I wanted to ask—if I may borrow the word used by the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald)—about something I have always been intrigued by in respect of this office.

I would like to find out to what extent the services of the fire marshal's office are available to fire insurance companies. I got the impression that every time some shack burns down in some obscure region of the province, or a house burns, that the insurance company on the risk rushes up to the fire marshal's office and activates his officials to conduct an investigation which is carried out largely on behalf of the insurance company. And to that end he has the right under his appropriate statute to make an investigation of witnesses under oath. I have got the impression that that investigation, that taking of evidence under oath, is thereupon made available to the insurance company.

Now I would like to ascertain if that is the practice. Is that the normal practice? Does the fire marshal, in other words, to put it shortly and bluntly, does the fire marshal spend a good deal of his time working for insurance companies?

Second, does he make available the results of his investigation to those companies? Or in short is he a buttress, is he there to be used by them to buttress their case in resisting the claims made under fire policies?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, first of all the fire marshal does not work for insurance companies in any sense of the word.

What we are interested in and what the fire marshal's office is interested in, is the investigation of fire; what caused its outbreak, its origin and all the facts relating to it. The fact that the property destroyed happens to be insured is incidental, and in many cases there is no insurance. I am sure the hon. member would not suggest that we should not, as a part of our investigation, which verges on the prevention of crime, arson particularly, investigate fires! But the insurance I can assure him would be incidental.

Many fires are investigated where there is no insurance at all. The insurance has no bearing on whether a fire is investigated or not, except that it may be an indication of fraud as well as arson in the origin of that fire.

Now for making the results of the investigation known; yes they are made known. That is proper; there is not much use carrying out the investigation unless the facts are known. If an insurance company requires them I am sure they would be made available.

But the investigation is not done, if I could say it this way, not done at the request of the insurance company, it would be done anyway. An insurance company may bring to the attention of the fire marshal, I think they properly should, peculiar circumstances which they have discovered. The very fact that there is a very large amount of insurance would be one of the circumstances, one of the *res* surrounding the fire, and they should be investigated; but investigations are not done with any relation to the fact that the properties are insured.

Mr. Sopha: Well does the initiative in any of these cases come from the insurance company?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No!

Mr. Sopha: Am I being told then that the fire marshal gets a copy of every newspaper published in this province and he comes down to his office on Monday morning and he spreads all those newspapers on the floor and he looks and he says: "Ho hum, where have we had a fire this weekend?"

Now I doubt that very much. You have fires occur where there is not even a police investigation, there is nothing to alert the police that there is anything awry in the fire. I strongly suspect, and I put it to the Attorney General, that the insurance company faced with a claim, might call the fire marshal, saying, "A house which we insured in Foleyet burned down over the weekend." They give him the initiative and out go his legions. I know this to occur, I know it occurs; out go his minions, armed with their statutory powers.

I have been at some of the hearings conducted by them and I know that the initiative for those hearings and that investigation came from the insurance company.

Now I am not saying there is anything wrong in that. Having said that, I am not saying there is anything wrong; but I am saying this: If the fire marshal's office spends a goodly proportion of its time doing the hand work of the insurance companies, then the insurance companies should pay. Of this amount of $625,000, a proportionate amount should be recouped from the insurance companies. In other words, if we are providing a service to them to assist them in carrying out their business then they should pay the shot. And I say that unhesitatingly.

The Ontario Provincial Police are another good example. They conduct investigations into accidents. They make their findings available to both parties, the insurance company as well as the injured claimant. The cost of the Ontario Provincial Police, at least a proportion of it, is recouped in the fines and payments made in the courts, in the hierarchy of the courts.

I think it is eminently just, in the case of the provision of a private service to the fire insurance company, that they should pick up the tab, if I may use the vernacular, they should pick up the cost of it. Now if the Attorney General on the other hand tells me that only a very minor portion of the time of the officials of the fire marshal's office is employed in this way at the initiative of the companies, then all well and good, I will take it all back.

But I have harbored the suspicion over a number of years that those people in that office are activated by the insurance companies, and I would be willing to bet a dime —I would not go further than that—I would be willing to bet a dime that the officials in the fire marshal's office know the claims managers of those insurance companies personally, that there is a rapport between them. Probably what happens is there is a fire in Cornwall or Sarnia and on the blower goes the claims manager of Lost Echo Fire Insurance Company and he says, "Bill, what do you say you send somebody down to have a look at that?" And down goes his expert.

Now that is a handmaiden, this office is a handmaiden of the fire company. All I am saying is that if that is the case, then what steps is the Attorney General taking to make them pick up the cost of it and pay for the special service? If it exists for their convenience, then let them pay for it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am glad to hear the hon. member say he sees nothing wrong with insurance companies reporting fires, because often they do occur under suspicious circumstances. We would be very naive if we did not think where there is a large amount of insurance that they did not occur under sometimes suspicious circumstances.

So the reports do come in from insurance companies, of course. They come also from police forces. They come from the fire force in the municipalities and cities and they come from private persons.

I have a note in my material before me headed, "Fire Investigation Services". I would like to read a bit of it into the record:

> The cause, origin and circumstances of suspicious fires and fires where fatalities occur, as well as unusually large fires and explosions are investigated. During 1966, the office—

That is, the fire marshal's office—

> —conducted 787 fire investigations, of which there were 121 fatal fires, in which 172 persons died.

Now I am sure the hon. member will not think those were unnecessary to investigate.

Mr. Sopha: I do not.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: One hundred and seven were large fires and explosions, 559 fires where there was a suspicion of an offence having been committed, of which 298—nearly 300—were found to be of incendiary origin. As a result, 270 criminal charges were laid. There were 246 convictions registered and 24 acquittals, with 49 cases pending at the end of last year, 1966.

Now on the question as to what the fire insurance companies should contribute, I think the hon. member should be made aware that there is a contribution—and he will perhaps be very happy to hear this, Mr. Chairman, if I can get his attention again—the greater proportion of the funds for the support of the fire marshal's office is provided by a special tax on fire insurance. This tax is computed at the rate of two-thirds of one per cent on the net fire insurance premiums and yields approximately $600,000 per annum. So I am happy to just repeat for the hon. member, we collected $600,000 from the fire insurance companies by a tax on premiums.

Mr. Sopha: Well you are just $25,000 short. How about getting that—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We get $600,000.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, all you need is $25,000 more!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, there is no provision that I have quickly been able to spot in The Fire Marshal's Act about an annual report. I suppose what the Attorney General gave us is a summary of what this officer has done. Is there any provision in the regulations that the fire marshal report, is there any form of report that is required to be made to the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not that I am aware of, nothing of a report tabled in the House or of that nature. He reports to the Minister.

Mr. Singer: Along the line of the suggestions I was making earlier in these estimates, I think this is another official on whom we should automatically have, before the consideration of these estimates, the sort of information that the Attorney General just read to us. If we are going to have these officials and they have specific jobs as outlined in the statute, The Fire Marshal's Act, then I think we should have available to us in ample time, before these estimates are considered, a full and complete report about the activities of this official during the current year, so that we can intelligently comment upon them. This is another instance where apparently we only get the information after certain specific questioning, when it should be forthcoming automatically to the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: Shall this item carry?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Attorney General if there is anything in this department that would have to do with fire-retardant clothing? Now with synthetics being used more and more in the manufacture of clothing and toys, there is the great hazard, especially to the youngster and to the senior citizen. These synthetic materials are so dangerous that they ignite and sort of explode. Does The Attorney General's Department, or the fire marshal's department, have anything to do with the restriction, or the control, of the use of such materials in the manufacture of clothing?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the fire marshal's office does have a laboratory for testing such things as the resistance of material. The doll, for instance of which the hon. member spoke, or the toy, which was distributed around Christmas time, was tested, and the industry was informed of the material in this recent fire in the workmen's compensation hospital, and I am sure—I can be certain in saying—that material will be submitted to the fire marshal's laboratory for testing.

This sort of work is going on all the time, in the testing of material for its qualities as to resistance to fire and so on, and the industry is then advised as to the result.

Mr. Newman: Is the Attorney General considering legislation to forbid the manufacture of children's and senior citizens' clothing from certain types of material that may be a fire hazard?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I had not thought of that, Mr. Chairman. It may come within my purview, but I had not considered that at the moment. I will make a note of it.

Mr. Newman: I bring this to the Attorney General's attention because I understand that certain jurisdictions do have such legislation, that will prevent this type of accident, and it certainly is worth while duplicating it here.

Next, I would like to ask the Attorney General something concerning oil storage tanks. Would this come under the fire marshal's office also? Would the size of the moat around storage tanks come under energy and resources management?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Is the hon. member speaking about propane and oil—

Mr. Newman: Any of these liquids. There is a moat around the tank and too often, I understand, the moat is not large enough actually to contain all of the contents in one of these tanks. There is a great danger to the residents in the vicinity of such storage tank farms of the overflow actually endangering their property and their life.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the storage of oil, gas and gasoline and propane, and all these things which are inflammable, comes within the control of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, is this the proper time to talk about the emergency measures branch?

Mr. Chairman: No, not yet. Shall this item carry?

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I have been approached by the fire inspector in Niagara Falls. He is concerned about small hotels that add to their equipment as time goes on and as they need more electrical appliances. Many of these units become overloaded and become fire traps.

This could happen in any small business which continues to add new equipment and yet does not bring in heavier wiring. They overload the present circuits they have.

Now as I undertsand it, Mr. Chairman, there is the liquor licensing board who also comes around and issues a permit for a man to redevelop his establishment since they find they can get money to build their unit a little better. But apparently their requirements are not quite as stringent or as difficult as the fire marshal's are, and there seems to be a conflict, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Attorney General, and I can understand why. The inspector who comes in to see about the quarters and to see what outlets they need as far as rest rooms are concerned, and what rooms are necessary in a new hotel—they do not go into the wiring problem as stringently as the fire inspector would.

Now I understand on many occasions when they apply for a permit they get it to redevelop and reconstruct, but they do not seem to get together with the fire inspector's department to find out what necessary wiring ought to be installed in that particular hotel or business to make that a much safer unit in which to live.

I was wondering whether any problems of the type that I broach have been brought to your attention?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is mistaken when he indicates that there is no contact and understanding between the liquor licence board and the fire marshal's office.

The regulations which we have prepared and which were revised last year, and were some time in the revision after consultation with the hotel industry and so on, are designed to apply to buildings which are licensed by the liquor licence board. We work closely with The Department of Tourism and Information—and when a change is requested in a building, to meet an additional facility or service, they must comply with the regulations under The Hotel Fire Act and there is

the closest relationship between the liquor licence board and the fire marshal's office.

The fire marshal's office inspects the plans for the building and it must meet the regulations as laid down. I know from my own personal knowledge that in every one of these cases there is inspection and discussion between the two departments—the liquor licensing board and the fire marshal's office—and many of these have in their discussions, come across my desk, so that I have seen some of the correspondence.

I think there is one area in which the fire marshal's office is not perhaps primarily concerned with inspection, and that is what the hon. member mentioned—wiring. The inspection of the building, the fire doors, the outlets, the transoms, the thickness of the walls, the fire escape provisions, all these things, and they are numerous, are set forth in the regulations and the standards are laid down there in meticulous detail. I think I must say of the wiring, that is not a matter that is inspected by the fire marshal, but all those other provisions of the regulations must be met by the hotels.

Mr. Bukator: May I, Mr. Chairman, pursue this argument a little further? You, Mr. Chairman, are acquainted with what Hydro does and does not do. I am directing my remarks to the Chairman, it is not fair for you to cast an opinion, but would it not be good business for the Hydro authority when a permit is applied for by an institution to remodel and reconstruct an older establishment, would it not be good business for the fire marshal's office to sit down with Hydro officials and say that 110 is not enough, 220, or 440, whatever the case might be? Do you agree that that ought to be done? I would like to know from the Chairman sometime when he is back in his place, when this is going to be done and then we would have a little more safety than we have today.

I think that the Attorney General, Mr. Chairman, did say that conditions are much better in the last year or so. There was the problem that I mentioned previous to that—and I will check with our people when I get back—that there was not this coordination. One authority would issue a permit and another would say: Why do you reconstruct because you have not got your wiring up to what it ought to be to make this unit safe. Now if this has been remedied, it is a step in the right direction.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well I made it clear that I am not sure about the wiring side, but I know that in all the other areas, the fire marshal's office inspects and the regulations must be met.

I do know that considerable attention is given in the requirement for heavier wiring where additional services have been extended or the outlets are being expanded. I must confess that I do not think the fire marshal's office is primarily responsible. I believe that it is Hydro but there is a great liaison and contact between the liquor licence board and the fire marshal's office.

This we worked out with the liquor licence board, Tourism and Information and our department a year ago, and brought in these new regulations.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on the same point, I have been handed a memorandum prepared by the liquor licence board dated November 21, 1966, "Christmas trees in licensed establishments."

It goes on for a full foolscap page, telling the proprietor of licensed establishments what kind of Christmas trees they should have, how they should be safe and whether you slant cut them or put them in bowls of water or whatever you do to make Christmas trees safe.

I share the concern of my friend that you have, in this field, an apparent overlapping of jurisdiction. We go into the cinematograph field, which is another department, movie theatres and so on—you have movie inspectors doing the same thing.

Would it not make some abundant good sense that if the fire marshal is in charge of making sure that premises are safe, and he should be, from a fire point of view, that he should have charge of all of this type of inspection?

And if the liquor licence board is concerned, they can get the appropriate certificate from the fire marshal. And if the people in charge of movie theatres are concerned, they can get the appropriate certificate; and similarly in places where public gather, like in licensed premises, like in moving picture theatres or other theatres, assembly halls and arenas and so on.

Surely there should be one centre of authority. It seems to me and the point is heightened by the remarks of my colleague from Niagara Falls, that there is split authority. Where you have split authority, and certainly it has been my experience, it is weakened because it is split.

You get a number of people doing a job and none of them are really doing it very

well because parts of it always seem to be somebody else's responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not really see a serious overlapping here as the hon. member suggests, Mr. Chairman. He agrees, I think, and he says he shares concern about safety, particularly in this particular item of Christmas trees, decorations at Christmas, the current that is used and the type of tree and the danger of flammability.

Now, the liquor licence board has its inspectors out. They are inspecting premises for their purposes anyway and the fact that they saw fit to send out a periodical or a brochure saying, "Please observe these safety features", I think was good. Their inspectors will be notified and they would check to see if they could try to avoid this danger.

I do not consider that a serious case of overlapping. It is an extra touch which was probably very wise and advisable at the time.

On the suggestion that the fire marshal's office should be responsible for inspection of such things as that installation, or setting up of Christmas trees and its lighting, where you have a field inspector out all the time in districts of the province working for the liquor licence board, I think we would be placing a heavy burden on the fire marshal's office.

We have the other inspectors there. Perhaps there is some overlapping, but the fire marshal's office is not particularly concerned with the electrical equipment. Hydro makes its inspection where there is an installation. Municipalities have their local inspectors and Hydro is tied into that, as I understand it.

To qualify and equip the fire marshal's office to do that work, I do not know what it would entail.

I think we have a pretty adequate system of inspection and I am not greatly upset by the fact that there may be some overlapping. The liquor board deserves approbation for sending out this word and saying, "Please take these precautions, observe these regulations." Then the inspector can go around and see that they are being observed. I think that is good.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I am not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, for a moment, that somebody should not do this—if nobody else is doing it, I am glad the liquor board is doing it.

But it would seem to me it is a slightly different type of training that would lead a liquor inspector to determine whether or not the right measure is in a glass; or whether there are enough chairs around; or windows; or all the other things that they look for; or whether the labels are properly on the bottles, that would enable the inspector to determine the safety of electrical fixtures.

And it would seem to me that if you are expecting from the liquor licence board, or from the inspectors appointed under The Cinematograph Act, or whatever it is Mr. Silverstone looks after, then you are expecting a bit much if they are not given proper courses of training in this.

It is better than nothing. But I think that the main responsibility of this type of inspection should lie at least with people who are trained by the fire marshal's office so they know what they are looking for.

Mr. Bukator: That is exactly the point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman. The fire marshal should not have to come in from Toronto to municipalities where they have a municipal fire inspector. They know their business and they are trained for that work.

But in many instances your liquor licence inspectors are not qualified electricians or do not know what is necessary. They may make certain suggestions because they see an inadequate bit of wiring, possibly nailed to a door such as you have seen in some instances, but I suggest, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Attorney General, that what ought to be done, is that the fire marshal should firstly inspect the inspectors of the municipalities that do this type of work.

And this is where the difference of opinion comes in; your liquor licence board inspectors come in and say this is fine, this is all right, you have your permit. But the fire inspector of the municipality is not happy with that decision. And this is where the conflict was, let us say, a year ago. Apparently you have taken steps to clear the situation up.

But the direction should be from the fire marshal's office to the inspector of that municipality, and not by the inspector of the liquor licence board because he is not, in many cases, qualified to do that kind of work. They ought to work hand in hand with each other, rather than at odds which they have done in the past.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I asked a question of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) with respect to the tragic fire which occurred in my riding in the workmen's compensation hospital. We got the expected answer—that it was being investigated—and I presume that the fire marshal is taking part in that investigation and we will hear in due course some verdict about

what happened and what measures will be taken to rectify the situation which was responsible.

But in the report of this fire, we find that the fire chief tells us that the false tile ceiling was largely responsible for the fire's rapid spread and Charles Dawson, the North York platoon chief, said that the tiles carried the fire down the hall and created heat, making it awkward for patients to get out of their ward.

Then he went on to say that most hospitals have stopped using these tiles since the hospital was built in 1957 and I presume that the new construction that is carried on throughout the province today, does not use this particular type of tile.

But platoon chief Frank Bennett said this, that the paper fibre tiles were very light material. They burn much more readily and there is much more smoke when they are used. He also went on to say that except for the tiles, the hospital was strongly fire resistant.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would give us some assurance, this afternoon, that the fire marshal's office is being instructed to have a look at some of the hospitals and similar institutions to this one, that were constructed in this province prior to 1957, or even since that time, in respect to this matter of the paper tiles.

Are they still being used? Where they have been used, is a survey being made to determine whether or not they are dangerous in the locations where they are? Will they be removed where there is danger and what is the fire marshal going to do about the whole situation?

I think this is a place where he ought to be looking very carefully today at what possibly could happen, in light of that tragic event last weekend. I wonder if the Minister would comment on this situation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to that particular tragic happening, I can inform the House that the investigation is going forward and is being conducted by the Metro Toronto arson squad and the engineers from the fire marshal's office. There is no information as to the cause, or general circumstances, available as yet. An inquest jury is being empanelled in order that it may visit the scene as of April 5, and a tentative date is set for the inquest as of May 2.

Information on the hospital plans' approval is conducted by the fire marshal's office and, last year, there were some 126 of the plans checked and approved by the fire marshal's office. This is now standard procedure for Ontario hospitals. I think that I know the paper tiles which were found in this fire, were installed in that building before this system of inspection—

An hon. member: Well, how many other houses are like that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, there will probably be recommendations coming out of this investigation to this end. We are aware of the suggestions put forward by the hon. member and I am not able to say more than that at the moment—that investigation will be carried beyond this particular incident.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, if I may make a comment or two on this matter. I would hope that the fire marshal's office will not wait until after the inquest before taking as vigorous steps as it can, to discover if there are other hospitals, and I would add to that, schools and other public buildings, in which this type of tiling is being used.

If it is being used I think something should be done about it. It came to our attention with tragic impact just how disastrous it can be, to have this type of material in a building, especially a building of this kind, but I would say in any building.

Now, the fire marshal cannot do anything about people's private recreation rooms—at least he cannot readily do anything about them. If any people have such material in their recreation rooms I think they would be well advised to rip it out; but he certainly should do something about hospitals and schools in particular, and also other public buildings. He should try to find out as far as is feasible, any buildings where this material is installed, and I would say should take steps to get it out immediately. It happened once, let us not let it happen again.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would not want to depreciate the importance of checking to see if this type of material has been used, but I think that this particular investigation now may bring forward information that paper tile may not have been the particular cause of the fire or may not have particularly aggravated the situation in that fire. This may be so. I do not think that we should jump immediately to conclusions.

I am not trying to downgrade the importance of being sure there is fire resistant material, particularly in public buildings. But

just to say that we immediately check every building and rip it out; I am not sure I agree that we should jump to that conclusion at once.

This legislative building contains flammable material, but I am not sure that we would agree at this moment that we should rip it all out and replace it with some other metal or stone or brick or something of that sort. But I do agree with the hon. member that in public buildings, particularly where hospital patients or any persons invalid or immobile are housed, the material should be of the utmost resistance we can use in that sort of building. I am sure out of this investigation, as I say, and without delay, there will come an investigation of the types of buildings where other materials are used that are flammable or have some danger of being flammable.

I do not think you can jump immediately to the conclusion that everything that would burn should be taken out. There are some things that would not be necessary. I think all you can do is do a reasonable check, use every precaution to prevent the causes of fire and prevent it from getting out of hand. That is all I would answer at the moment on this.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would say that this is not a matter of jumping to conclusions. I think the Attorney General puts the matter in extreme form when he says that it is not feasible to suggest that everything that might burn should be taken out. I am certainly anything but an expert on these matters, but I am advised that it is almost impossible to have a building that is totally fireproof. There are always some things that will burn, although I think the objective is that where the use of flammable material is inescapable at least it should be extremely slow burning.

However, in the case of the paper tiles it seems to me it is quite obvious and not a matter of jumping to conclusions to say that that is not a slow burning material, it burns quickly. We have the statements of the fire chief of the borough of North York and of the platoon chief who was right on the spot and they said it was this tile that spread the fire. It was not a slow burning item, it was a fairly rapidly burning item and it generated a lot of heat and smoke that made evacuation of the building much more difficult. We have their statements to begin with and I think those gentlemen are pretty competent to judge the situation, having been right there on the spot.

Second, we have the fire marshal's own regulations. As I understand it, in 1958 the fire marshal issued regulations prohibiting the use of this particular type of material in such buildings in future. It is quite obvious he did not issue those regulations just for the sake of throwing his weight around, I am quite sure of that. He issued them because he considered it a hazardous material.

He did what is usual in respect of safety regulations. He made them apply as of the future, because as we know it is costly to re-do all buildings which do not conform to new regulations and as far as possible one avoids doing that.

In this case however, we now have graphic proof of the validity of his regulations and, I would say of the need to make that retroactive, so to speak. In other words, they should apply not only to buildings built after 1958 but to all buildings in the province used for this purpose. Therefore I do not quite agree with the Attorney General that it is necessary to wait until the results of the inquest and such other investigations as may be made before taking at least preliminary steps to deal with this problem. When I say preliminary steps, I would say, for example, that we should at least try to discover where these tiles may be in use.

So, nothwithstanding the answer of the Attorney General, I would still urge that this should be treated on something of an emergency footing. It is apparent it can create a pretty serious hazard, given a certain combination of circumstances.

One other matter that I would like to raise while I am talking about this, Mr. Chairman, arises out of a comment that I noticed in the press, and I am relying entirely on this press comment, by a man who was credited with having done some yeoman, indeed heroic, work in preventing panic or allaying panic among patients. He stated that in this building there are no fire escapes. I am not suggesting the old fashioned exterior fire escape is necessarily the proper answer in a modern new building, but does the Attorney General have any information from the fire marshal's office as to the adequacy of the evacuation facilities?

One difficulty that I have seen in many buildings is that there are internal staircases which are just about 100 per cent fireproof, one could say. Even if you cannot in the building at large eliminate every flammable material, you can have interior staircases which are accessable from the inside which

are just about 100 per cent fireproof. The only trouble is that in many buildings I have gone into, doors that are supposed to act as firebreaks to protect these staircases and to act as brakes in hallways so that a fire will not whoosh the hole right through the hallway, are open half the time.

Now have they discovered the situation that existed in Downsview at the time in question? Why was it this man found himself in the situation where he had to allay panic among patients until they could be rescued by exterior ladders? Why was he in that position? Why was it not possible for him to find a safe means of exit for these people? It would seem to me there was something radically wrong with the building especially one built in the last decade, if there was not a safe means of egress without having to rely on aerial ladders from the fire department.

Therefore I would like to hear what information the Attorney General has on this point, as a matter of fact, not only with respect to Downsview, where one would expect standards if anything to be higher than usual, but with respect to buildings of this kind generally throughout the province.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I have not got the information on this yet. I will certainly be getting it I know, but I have not got it. As for a survey of buildings throughout the province; that I have not got either as to the matter of fire escapes.

Mr. Chairman: Fire marshal's office? Carried.

Mr. Sargent: Let us talk about the emergency measures branch.

Mr. Chairman: The fire college.

Mr. Singer: The fire college, Mr. Chairman!

On the fire college, I would like some sort of report from the Attorney General as to what progress we have made this year.

How many fire departments have we? How many consolidations have there been? What progress are we making to provide better fire protection in the whole of the province of Ontario? How many people went through the fire college? What courses did they take? How long did those courses last? How many of the people promoted in the fire service in the province of Ontario took courses and passed them successfully?

In other words, I would like to know really what we are getting for our $234,000 the Attorney General is asking for.

Mr. Sopha: In other words are you getting anywhere?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a very considerable amount of material on the fire college. Under my note of fire training services, 1966 was the ninth full academic year of operation of the Ontario fire college at Gravenhurst. In attendance during the eight months of operation from February 28 to October 28, was a total of 579 students, of whom 503 were from 127 Ontario municipal fire departments. That is just over 20 per cent of the fire departments in Ontario. There were 16 municipal fire department students attending from Nova Scotia, Quebec, Alberta and British Columbia.

At the college, travelling and living accommodation is paid for the students from Ontario municipal fire departments. A limited number of other students are accepted at their own expense, and in 1966, there were 60 such other students attending—three from insurance companies, 19 from Ontario government departments, three from the federal government, one from the dominion fire commissioner's office, and 34 from other countries, being Georgetown, Guiana; Peoria, Illinois; Singapore; Bangor; Detroit, Michigan; Warren, Michigan; and New York State division of fire safety at Albany.

Courses are limited to 36 students at a time—the limit of the sleeping accommodation—that is as many as can be accommodated at one time, and the courses are limited to officer training and not to recruit training.

Admittance is on the basis of first application, subject to preference to those who are staying for more than one part of a course, and to limiting the number of students from any individual municipality. Written examinations are required in all courses as well as practical tests and, of the 3,819 students attending since the opening of the college on August 25, 1958, some 63 have failed to pass examinations—about 1.65 per cent failure.

Field fire training services continued in 1966—3,581 fire fighters received three-hour courses of instruction. These courses are offered to newly organized and reorganized fire departments and consist of teaching any or all of the basic skills of firemanship to the fire fighters and municipal fire departments, using the fire fighting apparatus and equipment of the departments.

The courses are usually presented in the evenings or on week ends for the convenience of the volunteer fire fighters. During 1966, three regional fire training schools were con-

ducted in the municipalities of Chesterville for the fire fighters of the counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, Amherstburg for the county of Essex, and Timmins for the district of Cochrane with 89 fire fighters attending.

Each group consists of a five-day, 40-hour course of study in the basic skills of firemanship. Lectures are presented in the classroom and practical training is provided in the training ground. The firefighting apparatus and equipment of the office, that is the fire marshal's office, is used in presenting the courses and the class and training ground facilities are made available by the municipality.

The calibre of courses consists of the fire protection technology course, a staff training course, the fire prevention unit, the fire fighting operations unit, the fire department administration unit, the voluntary officers firefighting operations course and the emergency fire service planning officers course.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, it would appear from what the Attorney General said, that some 20 per cent of the forces were represented in this past year's activity. Would he have any statistics that would tell us how many of the forces have had training out of the total number in the eight years that the fire college has been going?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have not got such percentage or information before me but I can get it for the hon. member. It may take a little time, though, to gather that.

Mr. Singer: Well, what I am getting at, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is pretty obvious, is that we have a fire college, we are making it available, but I would like to know how far embracing its effect is. Are the majority of our fire forces in charge of trained people, are they dealing with certain standards when promotions come, are there inspections made by some central body in regard to promotions and standard of training and that sort of thing? I would think from my knowledge of the North York fire department that they pretty well run their own show. I do not know if there is any great government inspection of their courses and opportunities and so on, but by and large they seem to be allowed to run their own show. The large city department run their own show, provide in-training and that sort of thing, and there are courses available for officers. But the Attorney General mentioned there are no courses available for recruits. What happens where you do not have a large force and proper in-training systems are not provided?

The other thing that I worry about, Mr. Chairman. We read periodically of some pretty horrible fires in rural areas where there are only volunteer brigades available. Now volunteer brigades do very good work, but I just wonder whether or not they do satisfactory work because they are not available full time and the number of forces in the province—the Attorney General I do not think gave me this statistic, whether the number of forces has been increased or decreased or the size of those forces augmented. Are they big ones or small ones?

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): But how are you going to control that?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member for Simcoe East wants to get into this I would be very happy to hear him when he gets on his feet, but I would appreciate it if he—

Mr. Letherby: Yes, but how would you have these people—

Mr. Sopha: What is that the member is saying?

Mr. Singer: I know that the hon. member for Simcoe East is a great authority on all these subjects, Mr. Chairman, and if he wants to get involved in a debate I am sure he would make a very substantial contribution if he will do it at the proper time. In the meantime, I wish you would keep him quiet.

Mr. Chairman, by and large this same sort of concern that I have previously expressed about police training I am now expressing about fire training in the province. I do not think we spent enough time investigating this type of training. We have begun to nibble at it. The fire college is eight years old. But who except the local fire departments has information? Can the Attorney General give us some more information along the lines of these general questions that I put to him?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The fire marshal looks at the local fire departments and advises. These courses, as I pointed out, are taken to the areas. Field training and lectures are given there as well as at the fire college.

Now the hon. member might be interested in a new course which is being offered this year. It will be a new three-year course in fire protection presented at the fire college. The purpose of the course is to provide a combination of academic study and practical

experience under a cooperative scheme to improve the skills of officers of municipal fire departments and it includes fire prevention, firefighting operations and fire department management.

The course is composed of a fire prevention unit of 320 hours, a firefighting operations unit of 320 hours and a fire department administration unit of 240 hours, making in total 880 hours of academic study to be taken over a three-year period. In order that students may receive practical experience in related fields, they are required to practice skills studies for a minimum of two months immediately following the completion of each unit.

In 1967 a new field training course on radio-telephone procedure will be introduced to the fire services. I will not enlarge upon that. It says the purpose is to train selected fire service personnel from each of the fire departments in counties where county fire radio networks are in operation, in a six-hour standard radio-telephone procedure course.

I know what the hon. member is suggesting, and I agree with him that we should expand this training and try to make it, in a sense, a requirement for anyone joining the force that he take some training. I think we will reach that, but I cannot say that we have laid down that requirement as yet. I think we will get to it, as we have done, in particular with our provincial police force and as we are encouraging municipalities to do in police training when they take on recruits.

Our service is expanding. It is being accepted by the municipalities and I have the list of municipalities all around the province which are sending personnel to get this training. They, of course, disburse their knowledge when they get back to their units.

I would like to be able to accomplish what the hon. member suggests by legislation or by imposition of some control where we could say you must come and take this course, but so far I do not think we have considered it possible to do this by making it a requirement. Perhaps we can get to this. We are certainly starting to get a great deal of interest in our fire college and this is becoming quite apparent.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, we labour under a bit of difficulty. We labour under the same difficulty we did this year in relation to police training. At least the police commissioner is supposed to table a report here. Now I would hope the Attorney General would give serious consideration, if it is going to be his continuous responsibility, and I suspect it might not be, but if it is going to be his continuing responsibility, to again present these estimates.

I would hope that there will be some report of the fire marshal placed before the Legislature, dealing with local forces, so that we can know exactly what the statistics are—much the same general information that is supposed to be in the report of the Ontario police commission, the one that we did not see.

Because it is unfair to the members of the Opposition, and to the public at large, to bring these estimates before us when we have to search first for the information, in order to wonder about whether the programme of the government is correct or not.

In other words, there should be some meaningful statistics in this field, gathered together and made available to the Legislature, so that we will know what is going on in fire services, in fire training, in improvements, in courses, in promotions, in salaries, and that sort of thing, to enable us to properly debate these matters when they come before us.

Mr. Sopha: You have got to do it as if there was a fire.

Mr. Chairman: The emergency measures branch. Vote 208.

Mr. Sargent: What is the basis, Mr. Chairman, for the allotment of the moneys to EMO? I see under Bruce county here, they received $7,700, and Grey county, a total of $11,641 under EMO last year. What is the basis for allotment here? These are the two smallest amounts in all Ontario. Is it on a population basis, or how is it allotted? Page B-17 of the accounts.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, without looking at the item, I will be glad to do this, but the item is provided to enable the county of Grey to participate in the federal plan as proposed, an outlined scheme, of emergency measures organization. That I think is what that is.

Mr. Sargent: You get 80 per cent cut on moneys do you not; 80 to 20 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We get different percentages for different fields of activity within the emergency measures organization. We contribute a percentage.

Mr. Sargent: No!

Why are these two counties the smallest in Ontario, in my riding?

Mr. Letherby: Maybe they are not worth it!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I must say to the hon. member I will come to look at the item he refers to if he likes, but certain municipalities applied for fire pumpers, some counties and districts went into emergency measure planning of their organization in a much more enthusiastic way than others and some of them carry on much more training activity than others. I do not know, relating these amounts, just why is it the counties of Grey and Bruce—

Mr. Sargent: Grey and Bruce both.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —Grey and Bruce did not get more than the hon. member seems to feel they should; probably they did not work as hard at emergency measures training.

Mr. Sargent: It should be on a standard basis; so let us have an answer to that one!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No it is not on a standard basis, and let us get this clear. The municipality contributes a certain amount. There is a certain percentage alloted to the province and to the federal government. If the municipality does not participate then everybody's share is reduced. It is largely a matter of participation of the local municipality.

Mr. Sargent: You get $1.2 million from the federal government here. You are only spending $300,000 of your money. These municipalities are both participating and we are getting the least amount of money. So I want to know: Is it on a population basis or how do you do it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can tell the hon. member what I have really said before. It is based on the participation of the municipality and they get a grant related to that participation.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

It being six of the clock the House took recess.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 52



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 4, 1967

Estimates, Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Wishart, concluded 1709

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 1753

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 1967

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
(Concluded)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 208, the emergency measures branch.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on vote 208—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member would yield the floor to me for a moment?

Mr. Singer: Oh, my pleasure.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I should like to welcome in the west gallery, a group of young people from Armourdale and from Lakeshore ridings. They are here to observe the proceedings of the House. I think it commendable that they should take part in the study of our legislative procedures, and I would ask you to welcome them, as they observe what goes on tonight. And I thank the hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I want to extend a welcome not only to the young people in the gallery but to the hon. member for Lakeshore whom we see so seldom. I am glad he is here tonight.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Glad to have him back.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Now I see why they are going to lose the next election.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, at the time you vacated the chair at six o'clock, we had just begun the debate under vote 208, dealing with the emergency measures branch.

In the past, and over a period of many years, I have suggested that the most useless way in which the government of Ontario has spent its money is in a vote for the purposes of the emergency measures organization. I have had the opportunity in past sessions, and I am going to do it again this evening before I am through, to move that this vote be reduced to the sum of $1, because I do not believe that this is a wise or intelligent expenditure of public money.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I can call on no better an occasion than the one tonight, to remind you of what happened when there was an electrical short circuit in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and most of the sirens went off. At that time, Mr. Pollard, who is the head of the emergency measures organization in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto said: "I know that most of the people in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto do not know what those sirens mean."

Mr. Chairman, that is only typical of the waste of time and the waste of effort that we have directed to the emergency measures organization. Over the many years that I have been in this House, I have challenged successive Attorney Generals to stand in their place and tell us what value we get out of this expenditure. At one time we had a programme for shelters, which nobody built, but the government spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money in producing plans and advertising and so on. At one time, we were going to evacuate everybody in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto into Bruce county. I do not know who chose Bruce county, but we were going to run everybody up there. Nobody had figured out why they were going to go to Bruce county, what they were going to do when they got there, how they were going to be housed, fed, or clothed. But that was the theory—they were going to run everybody up into Bruce county in the event this great disaster ever occurred.

At one stage, Mr. Chairman, somebody painted thousands of dollars of road signs and they lodged in a police station. Those road signs were going to indicate emergency routes out of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, and direct the two-million-odd people who live in this area as to which way they should go in the event of this dire emergency occurring. No one ever bothered to figure out that even on a summer weekend,

on an ordinary summer weekend, we cannot handle, on the roads leading out of Toronto, the people who want to go up to their cottages, and I would suggest those are not all of the two million people in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. Many of us prefer to stay here on those summer weekends.

But what purpose did all this expenditure of money serve? My hon. friend from Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) on occasion has questioned, as he does, the constitutional right of the province of Ontario to spend money on what is substantially a federal responsibility, and that is the responsibility of providing for the defence of this country. In fact, I think he is absolutely right, and I am sorry that he has not got the time in recent months to take this matter into the courts and challenge it on a constitutional basis, because I am sure that he would succeed. Really, Mr. Chairman, there is no excuse for this expenditure on emergency measures.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Why do you not do it?

Mr. Singer: Do what?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Take up the case.

Mr. Singer: No, and I am glad the Minister of Municipal Affairs asked it. I would have thought that a careful man, a thoughtful man, such as the Minister, would have made his voice heard in Cabinet council, Mr. Chairman. You, with me, know the Minister of Municipal Affairs. You know the thought he brings to his office, and I certainly would have thought—I cannot speak for you, Mr. Chairman—that when he went into the sacred meetings, the quiet meetings, the reserved meetings of the Cabinet council, he would have made his voice heard and he would have stood up and said to his colleagues, to the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), and others, "You are wasting $488,000 of the public money. Think what I could do in Timmins with that extra $488,000. Think how happy I would be if I could spend all that money in Timmins."

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Do not give me any ideas.

Mr. Singer: Well, there you are and I am disappointed, Mr. Chairman, because I have the highest respect for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would have thought that this would have occurred to him, and he would have made himself popular forever in Timmins by reducing the tax rate by whatever amount $488,000 would have done.

An hon. member: Better the way it is up there.

Mr. Singer: However, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, disappointingly, we still have that vote in the Attorney General's estimates. Emergency measures is something like the weather—some people talk about it, admittedly not many, but nobody has really done anything about it. For many years the taxpayers have been pouring thousands of dollars of public money into EMO. Except for the few benefits which could have been provided through other channels, and those other channels are clearly obvious, it has been a waste. EMO has been established, it has built up its own bureaucracy, it is settled in, and no authority, least of all my good friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs, appears to be willing to take a critical look at it and to set sensible objectives.

EMO hits the taxpayers on three levels. On the municipal level most EMO expenditures are paid for by the provincial-federal grants. In certain municipalities the attitude has been that since the council's contribution is comparatively small—so why object—we are going to get a big chunk of money from the province, and we get a bigger chunk of money from the federal government, so why should we really worry? We are not awfully concerned, Mr. Chairman, if we spend public money as long as we do not have to raise the taxes to pay for it. The provincial government's attitude is that the federal authorities asked it to accept some obligation for EMO and it is doing so. Just why it should accept the obligation, and particularly when we hear from a variety of provincial Ministers violent criticisms of federal approaches in any one of the fields that you want to talk about, is something that I just do not understand, Mr. Chairman. Possibly the province did not have a suitable reason handy. Nor has Ottawa, and I have no commendation for Ottawa in this regard.

I think if there is a necessity for defence planning or emergency measures planning it should be solely the responsibility of the federal government, and there should be no provincial participation in it, nor should there be any municipal participation. Ottawa has given no satisfactory reason as to why this goes on. Civil defence under EMO and its early organizations has been in existence for about 20 years. In this time its major accomplishment appears to have been the installation of air raid sirens, and you know, Mr. Chairman, if you have read the Toronto papers, what happened when there was a

short circuit in the electrical system in Metro a few months ago. If the worst should ever come and the sirens sounded, what would happen then? What would happen then? Nobody knows what the sirens mean; nobody knows what they are supposed to do; nobody knows if there is an attack coming, sir, nobody knows where they are supposed to go or what they are supposed to do if there is an attack coming; so why do we continue this farce any longer?

At one time civil defence dreamers had conjured up evacuation—and I touch lightly on that—for the public to escape the target area. Some dreamer over on the government benches was going to move the whole two million population from Metropolitan Toronto into Bruce county. I am sorry my hon. colleague from Bruce County (Mr. Whicher) is not here tonight; he could perhaps explain at greater length how Bruce county could accommodate all the refugees from Metro. But it never quite captured my imagination, the thought of moving two million people to Bruce county say in the middle of January when the temperature was ranging around zero and how they were going to be accommodated.

Mr. Nixon: The Cabinet.

Mr. Singer: Oh the Cabinet; yes, the Cabinet, Mr. Chairman. I forgot about that. Somebody has built in Camp Borden a master shelter underground, spent several million dollars to make sure that the Cabinet is going to be well taken care of.

Mr. Nixon: That is why the Minister of Municipal Affairs wants the money spent.

Mr. Singer: Yes. I think they have 12 of those limousines standing by on 24-hour watch in case those sirens ever go off so that the Cabinet, two-by-two, can march into the limousines and be shuttled off up to Camp Borden and hide underground there until the rest of the community is killed. But they will carry on. Mr. Chairman, there could really be nothing more ludicrous in this whole approach to the handling of public money.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): They are the most expendable of the bunch.

Mr. Singer: I could not agree more. The present so-called thinking, Mr. Chairman, if there is any thinking in it—and perhaps before this debate is over the Attorney General will explain what the thinking is—is that voluntary dispersal apparently can take place. Apparently this means that if we are given enough warning of an impending war, and what enough warning is nobody is quite sure of, some people may wish and be able to leave the supposed target area. For this the country requires a three-level, full-time governmental organization. For years the plan for the local level in case of war has been most vague and uncertain. There is space available apparently in Camp Borden and apparently in Bruce county, but who knows where else, to handle certain people who manage to get out of the Metropolitan Toronto area.

The ridiculous situation in which EMO finds itself after all these years of no progress is not entirely the fault of the brains in Ottawa. They share a substantial portion of the blame. But to a very important extent it is the fault of the so-called brains that inhabit the Treasury benches. Year after year after year they bring this estimate back; they give us no satisfactory explanation as to why they are going to spend $500,000 in the fiscal year 1967-68 for these purposes that completely escape any logical explanation. But there it is, and the docile Tory majority, I am sure, not withstanding the very logical motion that I am about to move, is going to insist that this expenditure be made. Mr. Chairman, it would only be gilding the lily to speak any longer about a subject that must be as obvious as this to most of the members of the House. I therefore move that:

> The figure $488,000 for the emergency measures branch in vote 208 be reduced to the sum of $1.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I wish the hon. member for Downsview could direct his voice and have it heard with effect by those who think in the same political sphere that he does at the federal or Ottawa level. He knows as surely as anybody that the emergency measures organization is a federal project, a federal programme, and the province is asked to contribute in a very small way comparatively. It is a federal-provincial-municipal plan of an emergency measures organization designed and directed from Ottawa, and we are asked to contribute on the average 15 per cent or 20 per cent with the municipality contributing 10 per cent or 15 per cent and Ottawa, the federal government, saying, "This is a worthwhile project; will you please cooperate with us?" They say this to the provinces, and they say this to our municipalities, and I think if our national government feels that this is worthwhile and proper, and successive national governments

have said so, then the least we can do is co-operate to that extent.

I might possibly share some of the views of the member that some of the things that we do may seem perhaps not worth all the energy and all the money we expend upon them, but let me clear up one point which was not touched upon at all by the member. He spent much of his time talking about dispersal of population from metropolitan centres. That concept, that idea, went out the window three years ago. We have an organization in the emergency measures organization which is designed to provide an emergency government for municipalities in the event of emergencies, and the training, the facilities that are provided—

Mr. Singer: We may not have any people left at that time.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Who says we will not have any people left?

Mr. Singer: We will all be up at Camp Borden—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not of such a prophetic quality as the member for Downsview. I can say that his confreres at Ottawa, if I may call them that, do not seem to concede that either. There may be emergencies in which we will need to have some sort of government in our municipalities to carry on—fire, police, health, food, welfare, shelter, and things of that nature, and possibly in connection with that, some dispersal, but the idea of dispersing populations went out three years ago.

Mr. Singer: Shelters went out.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Shelters went out. But in the world we live in today no one can surely say that an emergency of a very large nature, of a national type, could not arise. In any case our national government says, "This is a policy which we think worthwhile; this is a policy with which we would like you to cooperate in carrying out." We do so, and our municipalities, to their credit be it said, have developed very thorough-going and very substantial organizations. A lot of dedicated people give time to training in communications and health services and that sort of thing. Our percentage of the cost is small. I can only say that in the light of those facts and circumstances, I am not in a position to say to the national government, "We as a province will not cooperate." That is not the attitude of our government, and it is not the attitude of any other government of any province in Canada. So we are not alone.

Mr. Singer: Be brave, be the trailblazer.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have governments of all stripes, at least four different stripes, in the provinces of this country and none of them has taken this attitude. So I would leave it to my hon. friend, the member for Downsview, to be the trailblazer and I would like him to make his voice felt in Ottawa. They are the people who must listen to him because they dictate the policy, they suggest this is what we should do and I think as long as they do that we shall try to follow.

There is one feature of this programme which gives me some concern—I have been a little bit critical of the federal people. One of the things which I thought was very good in the programme was the provision of funds to assist municipalities in their firefighting, and fire is one of the emergencies which may arise at any time. They did supply funds for the purchase of fire pumpers and the training of fire forces to use them. Now, so far as we are aware at the present, the policy has been changed and they say they will not contribute to that feature of the emergency measures organization. That, to my mind, was one of the most worthwhile things that they were doing. We have tried to persuade the hon. Mr. Drury to take a further look at this and restore that feature of the emergency measures organization.

In any event, I think we have to follow the request which is made to us to cooperate in emergency measures, so I certainly would oppose the motion proposed by the hon. member for Downsview. I think we have no choice if we are to meet our responsibilities in this programme, which is a national programme, but to accept it and follow on.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, in support of the Attorney General's remarks in connection with this matter, I might—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The Minister had my eye first.

Mr. Sargent: I think I had the floor first.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister caught my eye first.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I will bow to the hon. member certainly. I did not see him standing there, he is a little shorter than I am.

Mr. Sargent: The fact the Minister suggests we toss the ball to the hon. member for Downsview in going back to Ottawa as the villain in the piece here, and the fact that the province is a junior partner does not mean that we should not discuss this. I do suggest to you that two wrongs do not make a right. Insofar as this is concerned, this is not mandatory. The federal government makes these moneys available to us—$1,250,000 each year—and our contribution is roughly $308,000. To show you the ridiculousness of this whole situation, the major domo in this particular sphere, EMO, is the Attorney General; he is the man to whom we look insofar as the administration of this expenditure of $2 million is concerned. It would be important to ask him one single point, to know whether he knows what he is talking about or whether his department knows what it is talking about so far as the overall major plan in the United States of America and Canada.

We have, in the United States, we are told, 25 target areas in a major attack, and the administrators and the politicians in the United States are now fighting bitterly because there are only 25 areas in the United States which can be protected, so they are going to give away 40 million lives. And the Attorney General should know whether or not we are one of the areas that is protected. I would suggest to him that he should know this at this point. We have $2 million here in the kitty, and we are being asked to vote intelligently, and he does not know the answer as to whether we are included in the protected areas or not.

But we have a game going on here; we have $1.2 million coming from the federal government and he says, "Well, we will take our bit and we will distribute it as being the big boys passing this money out." But no one is running this show and as the member for Downsview pointed out, it is just a big joke. The boys across the province, in every area, know this is just up for grabs; they take what is available to them but nothing is happening. We had the administrator in Owen Sound quit the job because he felt guilty taking the money. This is a fact.

An hon. member: What is your brother doing now?

Mr. Sargent: So the thing is, we are responsible people administering public funds. We are talking about $2 million and no one knows what is going on. The member for Downsview has made a very important motion and not one of you can get up and speak intelligently about it because no one knows anything about it. It is just another joke that the Tory government has foisted upon the people.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted now, in support of the Attorney General's statement in connection with the item in this budget, I would like to bring to the attention of yourself and the House that emergency measures is just not only an organization concerning itself with a war emergency, it has developed into much more than that. Its purpose, and its prime purpose in this province, in cooperation with the municipalities, is to establish and to maintain a continuing operation for the protection of our people through providing essential services that may be required in case of a war emergency or any other emergency which affects the public.

The hon. member for Grey North was questioning earlier today the small amount that was allocated or paid to the municipalities of Grey county. Actually, there are two amounts—no, pardon me, not in the case of Grey county, in the case of Bruce, there were two amounts, but Grey county got $11,641. You might be interested in knowing that Timmins was not quite as greedy—that is not the right terminology, I did not want to use that word—but my friend the hon. member for Sudbury will be pleased to know that Sudbury received more funds than the Porcupine or Timmins areas did.

Mr. Sopha: The first time in human history.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It may be, but the public accounts force me to make that statement. This is one time anyway when the member for Sudbury will not accuse me of being quite as greedy.

However, I would like to mention to you that the emergency measures organization in the area in which I live is a very important organization, and this spring, at the present time, Mr. Chairman, there is a very strong possibility of a serious flood affecting some people living in that general area. For some time the emergency measures organization has been aware of the possibility that this might happen. I know that the organization here at head office is also aware of this situation, and I do know that plans are on their way so that if this emergency does arise, the EMO is prepared to deal with it. It may mean moving something like 500 to 700 people, making arrangements to house them

somewhere else. All the arrangements necessary are all there, ready to be acted on. Now that is a—

Mr. Singer: Oh, go on, there are no plans like that.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Singer: There are no plans like that.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Singer: What plans are there in the metropolitan area for moving any group of people?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not know anything about the plans in Metropolitan Toronto; I am telling you what I know.

Mr. Singer: The Minister should not make broad statements like that.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: As far as the member is concerned, one swallow makes a spring; just because somebody had a short-circuit in the sirens five years ago he blows his top.

Mr. Singer: That was not five years ago, it was three months ago.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: All right, suppose it was three months ago. I am telling you about some of the work that the emergency measures organization does undertake in parts of this province. So I say for that reason these funds are well spent and this budget should remain in the books as it is now. Leave these organizations to continue their work of preparing for emergencies and do not think that EMO is an organization concerning itself only with war emergency. I suggest to you that it is important that these funds be made available to continue these organizations, because when you examine them and know of the work that is being done in the local communities, you will find that this is a very important and a very satisfactory service.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would certainly agree with the Minister of Municipal Affairs that we should not regard this as an organization dealing with wartime emergencies. That is the way it started but that is a total joke. In a nuclear war we might as well forget about it anyway. The hon. member for Grey North said that United States plans envisage the writing off of 40 million people. That is the lowest estimate I have ever heard.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: I thought it was something like 140 million they envisaged would be written off. As far as nuclear war is concerned, if that ever happens, then all the emergency measures organizations in the world will mean nothing. So we are then left with a new conception, with not the original conception. As far as I can make out, the basic thinking of the organization now is that we should have an emergency measures organization to deal with emergencies that arise from time to time in the natural course of events, acts of God or whatever one may wish to call them.

I could be sold on that conception if I thought that the organization at any level really had any concrete idea of how it was going to meet such emergencies. The only argument, really, that the Attorney General put up to us was that the federal government has decreed that there will be an emergency measures organization. It has also put up money, which of course makes it easier to follow its decrees. It is surprising to me that the Attorney General should take such a supine attitude towards the federal government, that he will do this whether or not it makes any sense because Ottawa has decreed it.

They have decreed it. Have they given us any good reasons for continuing this expenditure? Is there any reason why we should concur in the waste of federal funds and waste provincial funds along with them?

Mr. Singer: And municipal funds.

Mr. Bryden: And some municipal funds, as well as the time of quite a few people. I have never heard anybody tell me what this organization is geared to do. I can conceive of civilian emergencies where such an organization could conceivably play a role. The more I look at it, however, I come to the conclusion that one deals with civilian emergencies, acts of God, something like hurricane Hazel, by mobilizing such resources as are already in the community.

Mr. Sargent: Power blackouts and so on.

Mr. Bryden: We have police forces, fire forces and so on, and we mobilize those. I have yet to be convinced that some sort of skeleton organization that exists all the time has anything, really, to contribute. All it will do is phone up the fire department and the police department, and frankly I can do that too.

I used to look like a skeleton, but I do not look as much like one now. The older I get,

the less I look like one. But I can phone up the police department and the fire department, just like anybody else.

I have looked and looked and looked for any rationale of this emergency measures organization, either at the federal level or here. The argument that the Attorney General has put forward, that we should do it because Ottawa wants it, is a very unconvincing argument to me. You know the Ottawa bureaucracy has got so bad that there are all sorts of things that have been going on there for decades and nobody even knows they exist. They just carry on because the organization is so big that nobody ever notices them and EMO has almost got into that position. I am sure the Cabinet at Ottawa has not thought of any rationale for this organization in many, many years. So the fact that they are still supporting it because they decided roughly 20 years ago that something should be done about nuclear attack, the fact they are still carrying on with this organization, means nothing in my book.

I looked with some interest at an article by the director of the emergency measures branch in this government, in The Attorney General's Department, which appeared in the civil service paper, *Topic*, about a year ago. I looked there to find out what the rationale was, and this is the sort of thing the director said the branch is working on. For example, he said of The Department of Highways—he cited this as an example, worthy of publication in an article—

> The Department of Highways has reviewed all its great resources of manpower, vehicles and material and has worked out how it would keep the highways functioning in an emergency.

Now do we have to have an emergency measures organization for The Department of Highways to figure out how it would keep the highways functioning in an emergency? I thought it was the responsibility of The Department of Highways to keep the highways functioning in any kind of emergency, no matter what it may be.

Then another great achievement of EMO:

> The Department of Health has recently acquired from the federal government millions of dollars worth of emergency medical stores and equipment including such items as 200 bed hospitals, which have to be planned for and distributed in the most effective manner around the province.

Now can The Department of Health, if such facilities are available, not accumulate them without having the emergency measures organization?

The Department of Lands and Forests, the article says:

> is cooperating with the emergency measures branch, especially in the north, in completing the emergency communications radio network which would operate as a backup throughout Ontario in the event of a failure of the commercial system or to supplement as circumstances dictate.

Now heavens, Mr. Chairman, surely they are doing that anyway.

There is not anything that has been listed in the article written by the director about a year ago which could not be done quite apart from this branch. The only thing that I can see that the branch is doing is to provide some sort of a vehicle through which the Attorney General can worm his way into all the other departments and take over half of the departments of government. I do not know if he has that ambition, but otherwise, sir, I cannot really see anything listed in an article written by the director himself that would not be done if the branch, the whole setup, did not exist at all.

So therefore, why should we carry on? I said some years ago that this was an organization in which retired generals could play at being soldiers. Well some of the retired generals have disappeared, so I would revise that and say: retired generals and would-be generals could play at being soldiers.

Mr. Sargent: And ex-politicians!

Mr. Bryden: And the hon. member says ex-politicians. Well, as an imminent ex-politician, I can tell him that I plan to have absolutely nothing to do with the organization at all. I hope to do something useful and I frankly cannot see that this organization has any useful role.

There is nothing that has ever been suggested that it might do, that is not already being provided for in other ways. I do not accept the argument that we have to do it just because Ottawa decided to do this 20 years ago and has forgotten to abandon it ever since. I think that we should save ourselves a matter of half a million dollars and in doing so save Ottawa substantially more money.

The only objection I have to the hon. member's motion—the member for Downsview's motion—is that it cuts the vote to one dollar. The trouble with the one dollar vote is that it still makes it possible to reopen the

thing and spend the money by way of Treasury board orders.

So we in this group will vote for the motion to reduce the amount to one dollar. Then in the event that that carries, as we think it should, we will vote against the motion as amended to wipe out the one dollar as well. We do not think the organization has any role to play at all. We do not think anybody has yet, in the many years that I have listened to rationalizations of this organization, given any reason why even one dollar should be spent on it.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I will very enthusiastically vote for this motion. Until a few minutes ago we almost had them outnumbered, until a few stragglers left their downtown pads and wandered up here to bring an increment. Of course in any event you would have made use of that new found rule in the history of this Legislature, the rule of recent years, you will no doubt ring the division bells.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: As soon as the young fellow from Kent West who sounds like a Georgia toad resumes his silence, I will continue.

Now Mr. Chairman there is no doubt about it that we live in a world that is haunted with the spectre of a nuclear war, and as you and I well know perhaps at no time in human history has mankind had the devices at hand to exterminate himself from the face of the planet. That is one of the horrors and anxieties with which we have to live.

However, having said that, I must say that in the eight years that I have sat in this Legislature I have never heard an Attorney General at any time ever give a definitive statement of the aims and purposes of this organization, much less the technique with which they will be carried out. My friend from Downsview is perfectly correct when he itemizes the number of matters, aspects, that in a very casual nature from time to time over the years have come to our attention. There used to be a good deal more said about the evacuation of the Cabinet to the reaches of Camp Borden, and until a few years ago that was an annual exercise when they would get in their cars and go up there to have a Cabinet meeting and test the surroundings—and the amenities presumably—instead of preparing to sweat it out with the rest of us less fortunate individuals within the precincts of this place.

But other than that sporadic and very unpredictable use of the sirens and exercises in various parts of the province as I say, we never had any definitive statement from the leader of this department at any time about the technology that will be employed to take care of the survivors of our populace in the event of that nuclear holocaust.

Now that is one side. If on the other hand it is intended by the Attorney General or his successor to transform this through some form of alchemy or metamorphosis into an instrument for the preservation of the public good, and in the words of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, as a device to advance the public safety, then I think it is about time that somebody in the government was prepared to say so.

In other words, if this is to become a branch of government that directs its efforts toward the mitigation of the ravages of those natural phenomena—which are often blamed on the Almighty, and very improperly I would think—that confront us from time to time, as in the instance of hurricane Hazel of a few years ago.

Now, sir, if that is the purpose of this department, rather than directing its energies toward the anticipation of a nuclear war sometime in the future, then I think the time has come when we ought to face that problem and decide once and for all, as a Legislature of reasonable people, how we are going to effect that purpose.

Now that is one side of it, and in the absence of any clear cut definition of that type, then I must support this resolution of my hon. friend.

It needs to be noted in the record—the course should be clear—that the Attorney General himself, the man who pilots these estimates through the House, never said anything along those lines at all. Those thoughts did not occur to him when he rose in his place, to answer my friend from Downsview.

On the contrary, his colleague and seat mate, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, apparently suddenly got a blinding light of inspiration. That was his contribution and the Minister of Municipal Affairs remembered that in his own constituency—and a great time for memory it is, is it not, this year, at this time of the year—he remembered having heard that in his constituency, some group, he did not say where, whether they are in Ramore, or whether they are at Hoyle, or Dane, or South Porcupine, or Porquis Junction, or Ansonville, they are going to prepare for the renewal of that event that drove Noah to his ark and they are not going to

have all the beasts of the field and birds of the air, but they are going to have a mere 700 of the populace.

Well I do not think it is too much of a joke to say that when the Minister of Municipal Affairs started to relate this dire anticipation of forthcoming floods, probably the director of EMO over behind the Speaker's Throne, began to write that down, and say "I must look into that", and see what needs to be done in that regard.

Well, that is to be noted. It was not the Attorney General, you see, it was his pal, his seat mate who thought of that, thought this is a wonderful organization to spend $500,000 of our money to prepare for flood. All right.

Now the other point I want to make is the terrible inconsistency in the government policy that is to be found here. We all recall too well the anguished wringing of the hands and the tears that fell from the eyes of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) last November when he made his annual trek to Ottawa and Mr. Sharp closed the purse in front of his face, almost clipped him in the nose as the purse went shut, and said, "No more do you feed at the federal trough," if that is not too vulgar an allusion, I hope it is not. "No longer do you and the Provincial Treasurer come and dip into the till here and take away suitcases full of money back to Queen's Park. Go and raise your own revenue."

We all recall, of course, the Prime Minister at that time, having got out of the way the matter of the unexpected resignation of the former Minister of Lands and Forests, which occurred at the same time to upset his trip to Ottawa, having dealt with that, then he said, "All right, it is a time for economy, we are going to have great economies in the government of Ontario. We are not getting any more money from Ottawa, therefore we are going to have to pare expenditures."

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Cut the frills out.

Mr. Sopha: Cut the frills out, I say thanks to my friend from Grey South, that was the very phrase he used. We are going to cut out the frills. One envisaged that when he got back to Queen's Park of course he was going to cut with a very sharp knife. However, in the one logical avenue, where he could have saved the people of Ontario $500,000, he did not deign to deal with this in a very forthright fashion, by saying to the people at Ottawa, "We in the government of Ontario, being responsible to the people, and having to face them at some time, we say to you, that emergency measures is a matter under the constitution which is of the exclusive jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada." And I would be prepared to argue any hour of the day or night with any constitutional lawyer that emergency measures, so far as it pertains to the acts of the Queen's enemies and what they may do to create holocaust and dislocation in our country, then it falls under the heading of section 91 of The BNA Act, which I believe say, "National Defence".

It is called "National Defence" and this government—the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), who is not in his seat—could with great honesty and forthrightness call up Mr. Sharp, or write him a letter and say, as of January 1 next year, we notify you that we are not prepared to pay five cents of provincial money towards emergency measures and then he could have got the very gracious attitude of cooperation of the Attorney General.

He could say to Mr. Sharp: "Tell Mr. Hellyer that if he wants to establish an organization in Ontario to protect the people in the event of disaster, we will be only too glad to cooperate on the administrative side, provided that we do not have to spend a nickel of provincial money; the whole cost is paid by the federal government."

Now let me say by way of addenda that one of the reasons for the strains and stresses of this Confederation, as we sum it up in 1967, is that there are too many of these fluid grey areas where the provincial government is in the field of jurisdiction of the federal government, and vice versa. And of course that is more pronounced in our sister province, in Quebec, than it is in Ontario, where we are much more centralist minded than the Quebecois are. But someday, hopefully, someday, Mr. Chairman, we are going to sit down in this country and lay out the lines of demarcation of areas of legislative responsibility and thereafter we will make an agreement that the one will not transgress into the area of the other, except in areas of clear cut agreed upon in a prior way, in areas where it is agreed to cooperate, the one with the other.

I say here, sir, and take responsibility for saying it, in support of my friend, the member for Grey North, that we cannot justify to the people of Ontario the spending of $500,000 in the haphazard fashion such as we spend it. That $500,000 is about the same thing as taking a cup of water and throwing it on the Sahara Desert; the analogy is just about perfect, because we cannot see within our body social, within the framework

of society in this geographic location in this province, we cannot see where the results of that $500,000 are.

It is sad to relate, in order to be specific, that one reads the papers and the only reference one sees to EMO is such a reference that a meeting was held and the meeting had to be adjourned for want of a quorum, there were not enough of the participating municipalities present in order to get the meeting under way. And that is an instance of what has happened.

There certainly is no system of public information, there certainly is no body of literature, there certainly is no plan for evacuation or care of our people. And again to be illustrative, one is struck by the fact that when one goes into the United States where they are far more conscious of the possibilities than we are, one sees such evidences of what could happen as in hotels when one encounters the large canisters in the hallway which are filled with clean water, clean and potable water, to be used in the event of the emergency created by a nuclear attack. One does not see that here.

If you told a visitor from Mars coming into Ontario that we were prepared or had made some preparations for nuclear attack, he would really be skeptical about any evidence of them. It does not exist.

The Attorney General of this province does not carry out the responsibilities of his office this night when he gets up and the only justification he has for 22 responsible people representing almost 40 per cent of the people of this province and another eight who take us up over the 50 per cent mark, the only justification he has can be summed up—and I think not unfairly—in saying they are good guys down in Ottawa, they want us to cooperate, we are good guys down here and we are of a cooperative mood.

We are glad to go along with them, them paying two-thirds of the cost and us paying a third, and because it is one big happy family we are going to continue to cooperate and go along in this area. But his speech is vacant, it is vacant of anything constructive in which he tells us what he is doing, how he is spending this $1,750,000 in this day and age to provide anything useful, anything meaningful to a people seven million strong who live in an era that, unfortunately, part of the climate must be that anxious spectre that some day, some day, some fool is going to press a button and there will descend upon us such a force of *vi et armis*, as we say in the law, such as humankind has never before in human history seen.

That could happen. But before the vote is taken, we have to be denuded here on these benches of any words from the other side that could justify us in conscience to change the views that we have expressed here in opposition to the expenditure of that money. Therefore, responsibly, as the member for Sudbury, I will cast my vote against the spending of this money.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: A word in reply to the hon. member for Sudbury: I said to his colleague, the hon. member for Downsview, go to Ottawa and tell them.

Mr. Bryden: Why does the Attorney General not go to Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, they have much better rapport with Ottawa.

Mr. Bryden: Well, let us just tell them right from the legislative assembly.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I see their pictures in the paper, the leaders of both parties, I read about the cozy attitude they have—

Mr. Bryden: They are a bad lot, we can agree on this.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Surely the voice of this group of 22 or 23 over here should have great force at Ottawa and I think that is where they should make their voice felt.

I would say to the hon. member for Sudbury, as well as going to Ottawa, go back to Sudbury, tell Sudbury they got $34,000 last year in grants for emergency measures, tell the city of Sudbury to get out of emergency measures, if that is his attitude.

Let me tell the hon. member that the municipalities which form the emergency measures organization in this province come in on a voluntary basis, they are not forced in, they come in on a voluntary basis. The hon. member for Grey North should go back to his municipalities, tell them to refuse the $8,000 or the $11,000 they received for fire pumpers and so forth. They came in voluntarily; go back and tell the municipalities.

Let me say this: if the municipalities of this province did not accept the responsibility to take part in the emergency measures organization then the province would have nothing to do, there would be nothing to do. So if your local municipalities from whence you come adopt your view, you can slay EMO if you wish by telling them not to take any part. So I say the hon. member for Sudbury, should go back and tell his municipality that

EMO is useless, worthless, if that is what he believes. I wonder if the hon. member has ever been to the Sudbury council and told them not to participate, I doubt if he has.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Attorney General accept a question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have the floor. I will take the question later.

So I say, go not only to Ottawa, go to your municipalities, they are the people who carry on this organization, the municipalities of this province and they do not have to come in, they come in on a voluntary basis.

Because so much has been made of the plan for the preparation for the government of this province at Camp Borden, I am amused to hear this bruited abroad but I would like to say to the hon. members that I have never seen Camp Borden. For the three and a half years I have been here, at least I would like you to know I have not been spending my time going to Camp Borden to see preparations there.

Mr. Singer: How much money was wasted up there? How much money did the province spend—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I know the hon. member likes to make a great display of this, but I would like him to know that that is not what we are spending our time on in emergency measures.

Mr. Singer: How much money did you waste up there?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I could recite a number—

Mr. Singer: The Attorney General will not even go there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have not had time to go, I am too busy.

Mr. Sopha: He will not associate with the rest of you.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I could recite a number of instances, quite a number of instances, where the emergency measures organization has proven its worth, proven very useful and very active, but I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I have said enough. I certainly would oppose this motion.

Now if the hon. member for Grey North has a question, I think I might be glad to answer it.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney General has been in government a long time and he must know that the cities and the counties and the towns across Ontario have very few unconditional grants available to them now, we have a system of bureaucracy and this is one sharing of federal money on an 80/20 basis that no municipal council would dare turn down because it is available to them on a plate and it is the only chance they get for unconditional grants.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: But it is not an unconditional grant; it is a conditional grant.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is not unconditional.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister cannot recite one case where it was turned down when it was made available to them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, this is not an unconditional grant, the municipality has to contribute in dollars to get its share.

Mr. Sargent: On the ratio scale of 80 to 20.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: And for specific projects.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Attorney General is travelling on very thin ice indeed when he approaches the Opposition and asks us to go to Ottawa and present the government with reasons why this programme should not be continued. In the debate that has taken place here in the last few minutes, and an excellent one it has been, there has not been any substantial reason given by the government nor its supporters for the continuation of this particular vote, close to $500,000. The best that can be put to us by the responsible Minister is for us in the Opposition to go to our friends in Ottawa and have the programme cancelled.

This is just an indication of the depth of perception of the present government, when on the one hand the Minister of Municipal Affairs says there are extensive plans to move concerned citizens in the northern part of the province, and the Attorney General himself says there are no such plans to evacuate citizens from one area of the province to another. He has said that he could recite various instances where the funds voted in previous years had been put to good use. Well now, I would agree with him that for the financing of local fire efforts, this is

a useful expenditure of public funds which surely should be channelled through the appropriate part of this particular government and is assistance that you should certainly be strongly in support of. But for the vote of $488,000 there has been no argument put in opposition to the amendment that has been placed by the hon. member for Downsview. Surely the supporters of the government themselves, in listening to the arguments pro and con, will be hard put to support the Attorney General in the weak position that he has put out for the government tonight.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this go by, after the Attorney General's second effort, without comparing his remarks to the vapid statement that he released and that ran some 18 pages on the Prudential Finance fiasco. In that statement, he spent 18 pages trying to blame people other than himself for lack of leadership. Tonight he appeals to us in the official Opposition to go to members in Ottawa and direct them in a certain direction insofar as federal government policy is concerned. And then he says, "If that does not work, why don't you go to the municipal councils?"

Mr. Chairman, surely the question is as simple as this: If we have an Attorney General who is supposed to be a leader in the field of justice, who comes before this House and asks for $488,000—and he is leading in this regard—and his best excuse is, "It is not my fault, not me, not the poor Attorney General; it is Ottawa's fault or it is the fault of those terrible municipal councils," Mr. Chairman, where, oh where, is the leadership that the province should expect from the Cabinet Ministry? It is not there. There is no justification for this, and I would hope that thinking members of this House would once and for all see how foolish this vote is, would see how important it is that there be wise expenditure of public money and would support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further debate?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I must have one further word, Mr. Chairman. I know that the members are fond of getting up and saying the only argument the Attorney General puts forward is that they go to Ottawa. They are not so obtuse, I think, as to miss the main point of my argument—that the programme is an Ottawa programme, a federal programme. That is the reason we support it, because we are asked to do so. That was the argument I put forward, that this is a federal programme which all provinces support. And then I added—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: My main argument was that this is a federal programme which all provinces support. And then I added, simply as a coincidental perhaps, or almost an afterthought, if you can convince Ottawa that this is not valuable your voice should carry some weight. But that was not my argument, that was not my main argument. This is a federal programme, we are asked to cooperate, "Do you support it or do you not?" Your motion is "do not", and I say let us do, and I will oppose the motion.

Mr. Sopha: The Attorney General has not advanced an argument.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Singer has moved that the figure $488,000 for the emergency measures branch in vote 208 be reduced to $1.

All those in favour of Mr. Singer's motion, will please rise.

All those opposed to the motion, will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 21, the "nays" 43.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost and the item, emergency measures branch, carried.

Supervising coroner and general inspector of anatomy. The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: In this item, there is a man named Cotnam.

An hon. member: He does not live in Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: He gets about $17,000, and I would like to ask, is he a medical doctor?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, he is.

Mr. Sargent: Is he a full-time medical doctor?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He is a full-time—

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry, is it a full-time job?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the member will permit me, I will answer his question. He is a full-time coroner, supervising coroner for Ontario, and the inspector of anatomy for the province of Ontario and he gives full time to that job. That is his position and that is his

responsibility. He gives his full time to it. He is a medical doctor.

Mr. Sargent: Well, what does he do?

An hon. member: He is the supervising coroner.

Mr. Sargent: Are all the coroners in the province under his direction?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is right.

Mr. Sargent: And what is his function?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He supervises the whole area within the province of investigations by coroners of matters which need to be investigated and the direction of coroners' inquests throughout the province. That is his particular function, that is his work and he sometimes takes some of the more important inquests himself. He has taken quite a number, where he has felt as the chief coroner of the province he should himself preside. He also attends the inquests held by other coroners, he advises and assists coroners in the carrying out of inquest procedures and he reports to my office continuously and sees to it that mattters which require investigation to determine whether there has been misfeasance, malfeasance or criminal intent or criminal negligence, that these matters are properly investigated on behalf of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: There is a chap named Shulman; is he under the authority of the supervisor of coroners?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He is the chief coroner for Metropolitan Toronto and all coroners in Ontario come under the chief coroner, Dr. H. B. Cotnam, the chief supervising coroner of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: Does Dr. Shulman know that?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, not too many weeks ago there was a substantial discussion raging in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto as to whether or not there should be a new morgue. The debate ranged around whether a morgue was more important than a zoo, or a zoo was more important than new housing for old people, and there was a great deal of difficulty in determining which came first. The substantial decision was that the morgue—notwithstanding the opinion of grand juries and various coroners about its inadequacy—that the morgue is going to stay because nobody could find in the municipal budget enough money to build a new morgue.

Now the Attorney General believes that this is an important office, and I would agree with him, but if it is an important office, would you not think, Mr. Chairman, that the Attorney General would make funds available to the municipality to carry out their job properly? The fact remains that in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, the morgue is old, it is dirty, it is worn out and it is useless. And we run into the same problem that we have run into about the court house in the city of London. Even though London is the new capital of Ontario, we still do not have a new court house, because the municipalities are not happy with paying for the cost relating to the administration of justice.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): That is not quite true.

Mr. Singer: Well, my friend the member for London South stuck his neck out before about the court house. I would have thought he would have kept quiet now and listen for a while.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, surely the time has come when the province should assume its full responsibility for looking after the cost of the administration of justice. There is a vote here, an important vote, that ties in in a very necessary manner with the proper administration of justice, which is the responsibility of this government. Surely the provision of the suitable tools to do the job should be part of that responsibility and surely the province should pay for the provision of proper facilities to allow the coroner to operate in this, the largest municipality in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the hon. member in his view that the province should take care of this area—the investigation of death in the field where it touches the administration of justice, and in coroners' inquests we do that. But the morgue as such, the facility for the storing and keeping of bodies as a morgue is a municipal responsibility and every municipality in this province—and Metro is no exception, in my view—has its own morgue.

We are proceeding with plans for the establishment of a centre of pathology which will serve the whole province for the study of pathological cases, and where it touches particularly on the administration of justice, the investigation of deaths where the criminal field is involved. This we shall do and we propose to build it in Metro Toronto. But

if we are just talking of a morgue as such, the province has no responsibility to build a morgue for the city of Toronto any more than it should build—

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney General is talking so loud that I cannot hear what is being said at the Ministerial conference that is going on behind him. I wonder if you would straighten one or the other out.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I thank the hon. member for Woodbine, Mr. Chairman, for his assistance.

An hon. member: You should build the morgue for the city of Toronto, they need it.

Mr. Singer: I think you should.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Insofar as a morgue is concerned, we should not build a morgue for the city of Toronto any more than we should build one for the city of Chatham or the city of Sudbury.

Mr. Singer: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The building of a morgue does not come under the administration of justice, but we shall do our duty in respect to the field of inquests, the investigation of crime, the pathological investigation of that kind of death, and so on. This we are doing, and we are expanding our plans to take care of it. I think our own facilities are inadequate at present and we are seeking to expand them.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes a distinction without a difference. How does he draw the line?

If pathological examinations are important, where does he suggest they be done? Out in the street? Surely there have to be buildings available where this kind of examination goes on, and if the office of the supervising coroner and the individual coroners in the individual areas means anything, and if they are going to be able to carry on their job, they must have a place from which they are going to work. Surely that makes sense. Where is the distinction? Where do you draw the line, and when do you stop?

If you are going to talk about there being a distinction, make it a genuine distinction; the line you draw makes no sense at all.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed in the Attorney General when he retreats to the old status quo and says there are municipal responsibilities and we are reluctant to interfere with them. Look at the municipal tax rates that are about to be levied in Sault Ste. Marie, as well as in every other municipality in the province, and watch the people's reaction.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well Mr. Chairman, I am always very saddened when I disappoint my friend from Downsview, but surely he is aware that there is a distinction. Only a fraction of deaths need to be investigated, from the point of view of criminal justice. Those cases where autopsies are necessary, yes; where there is a suspicion of something criminal having been done, criminal negligence, as I said, malfeasance or deliberate intent, or misfeasance, those cases need perhaps to be investigated. The bodies may need to be studied by way of pathological study or an autopsy.

But a great many bodies are stored in morgues simply as a matter of convenience until the conditions for burial are available. This is so in every municipality. Then in addition to this, most hospitals, almost every hospital, has facilities for doing autopsy studies, or pathological studies, from the point of view of disease, from the point of view of the effect of an operation, the point of view of studying what medicine can learn from a certain death. These are not related to the administration of justice.

We propose to establish a centre of pathology, which will serve this whole province, including Metro, in the field where pathology and autopsy is related to coroners' inquests and thereby to the administration of justice.

Mr. Chairman: Item carried.

On centre of forensic sciences?

Vote 208 agreed to.

On vote 209:

Mr. Chairman: On vote 209, Ontario law reform commission:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on the Ontario law reform commission, I know that the Attorney General has assigned a great number of topics to the Ontario law reform commission and I am very disappointed in the speed with which that important body is bringing forward recommendations.

The Attorney General a short time ago presented to the House the report of the Ontario law reform commission with relation to the law of condominium. That report was prepared by a professor at the university and I would assume—and if I am wrong the Attor-

ney General I know will correct me—that he prepared the draft Act. When the draft Act was attached as an appendix to the report of the law reform commission, which merely was a repetition of the report of the university professor, I just wonder what was the function of the Ontario law reform commission in regard to this whole matter, or what in fact was the function of anyone in regard to this whole matter, because the Act as given first reading, insofar as the law of condominium was concerned, was almost, I think with half a dozen minor changes, an exact repetition of what had been presented originally by the consulting professor.

Mr. Chairman, we have in Ontario a great need for meaningful reform in our laws. We seem to have assigned to the Ontario law reform commission—the Attorney General touched on it this afternoon—the question of reform in land registration. The list of topics now is almost endless, and the few meaningful decisions or recommendations that they have brought forward deal with such fascinating matters as the law against perpetuities, and medical evidence, which was frustrated because the court of appeal decided it was done in an improper way. But things like family law, the Catzman bill—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Personal Property Security Act.

Mr. Singer: Yes, we have not seen that again. It is not before the House now. Where is it? Mr. Chairman, there has not really been, in the three years that the law reform commission has been set up, any real reform introduced as the result of its efforts, and I am very disappointed. I had hoped when the bill was introduced by the present Attorney General's predecessor, that there was going to be something done in these very important fields. But unfortunately, no, it has not been done at all.

The first mistake that was made in this field, Mr. Chairman, was when they gave the dual job to Mr. McRuer, on his retirement from the bench of the Supreme Court of Ontario. He is the commissioner inquiring into civil rights in the province of Ontario—and there is another job, Mr. Chairman, that I think needs to be explained. What really has Mr. McRuer been doing in the three years he sat in that job, and in addition in the job on the law reform commission? Are civil rights going to continue to mark time for an indefinite period? Are we going to have any report in relation to that matter, or are Mr. McRuer's duties on the law reform commission going to keep him so involved that he is unable to report in relation to his previous job?

Mr. Chairman, we are spending a great deal of money on the law reform commission, as well we should. But surely to goodness we can expect that with a law reform commission in this province, there should be something of more importance to show than a revised law relating to perpetuities. This is the only performance of note achieved by the law reform commission. The other one that had some merit to it was the reform in the introduction of medical evidence, which has ben voided by the recent decision of the court of appeal of the province of Ontario. Over and beyond that, nothing has been translated into legislation. When are we going to get a proper functioning of the Ontario law reform commission?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, first of all if Mr. McRuer needs a defence, I would offer it. He was the original chairman. He, I think, did tremendous work in organizing the commission and no one will suggest for a moment that he was idle or that he did not, himself, work very industriously and have the members of that law reform commission work with him. He was relieved a year ago of the chairmanship of that commission, so that he might carry on and give more attention to the civil rights commission, of which he is the sole commissioner. That does not come within The Department of the Attorney General.

We did introduce—my hon. friend is fond of saying—The Perpetuities Act. He may say that because not too many people understand that, it was not important. But it was important; it is important in the field of estates and trust law, title law. I think he will admit that at least, and that was passed, and it was quite a study. It is a very difficult thing to understand, but it was done.

We introduced last year, and gave first reading to, The Personal Property Security Act. That is the Catzman study, the Catzman bill, as it is known. That was the first of the Catzman presentations studied by the law reform commission. A report and the bill attached were produced and I introduced the bill in this House last year. The sole purpose of that introduction was to place the bill before persons who would be interested and I am sure the member for Downsview will admit that a great many people, not just lawyers, but the people who are affected by

the whole field of personal property and personal property security, were interested in that bill.

Mr. Singer: Yes, that is not before the House now. Where is it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Just let me tell you. It has received a great deal of study. We got a tremendous amount of correspondence and briefs, pro and con, suggesting amendments and alternation, additions, and so on, moderation and so on, with respect to that bill and the Catzman committee itself, headed by Mr. Catzman, took a great interest in the bill which the law reform commission produced, which was a modification of the original Catzman study. Those people who presented briefs were heard. Mr. Catzman had several discussions with the law reform commission. This was a detailed and a concentrated study.

That piece of legislation, which is so important and which touches so definitely and so closely our whole business of dealing with personal property, is now being finalized by the law reform commission, and I am not at all disturbed or concerned that it has taken us a year and a half, or say two years if you will, to reach what I think will be the acme of perfection in this field of legislation. I am not upset about that. I would much prefer that we reach, through discussion, through study, through argument and conference, something which we can say is as close to perfection as we can come. I would rather present it after two years than toss it in in the first year and say, "There it is," and then have a lot of trouble and perhaps cases in the courts, and so on, trying to solve and interpret some of the difficulties that such an Act would produce. So we are going on with that.

Mr. Singer: Will this be different from the medical evidence matter?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Now just a minute. The medical evidence report was produced and recommendations were made and we produced legislation, and let it be made clear that the legislation we placed on the statute books has not been impugned.

Mr. Singer: Oh, Mr. Chairman, he is just splitting hairs now. The fact is that that legislation is meaningless because the rules of practice that were designed to go along with it were ruled *ultra vires* the powers of the rules committee. The whole report, the whole scheme of making medical evidence available in litigation has gone by the board because either the Minister used an improper means or his statutes were improperly drafted.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am glad the hon. member at least has admitted that it was a rule made by the rules committee that was taken exception to by the court.

Mr. Singer: I do not have to admit it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But our legislation stands and has not been changed in any way. Now with respect to The Mechanics Lien Act we brought in the report and introduced a bill in the last session. That was designed to give an opportunity for study of the very drastic change which was made in a very confused area in the situation with respect to mechanics' liens. That has gone back and many representations have been made with respect to the law on mechanics' liens, and I think my hon. friend from Downsview will admit that if there was ever an area of law which touches a lot of people—home owners, builders, merchants, suppliers, labourers—it is the mechanics' lien situation. That went back—

Mr. Singer: Could we not concentrate on one until we do it properly?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well I do not think that is necessary. They are doing good work and you will see the fruits of their labour as it is coming forward. The Mechanics' Lien Act has been taken back, has been studied and restudied and the representations have been heard from the suppliers, from the builders, from the construction people, from the labourers. These briefs have been submitted and we will come forward one of these days very soon with a bill which I think will clear up what I am sure everyone will admit is a most important area of law which needed reform.

Condominium I have introduced and I would hope that within a very few days we will be able to give that bill second reading and it should solve some of the problems which we face in housing. Now there is condominium, perpetuities, which I know the hon. member for Downsview is fond of downgrading a little bit—

Mr. Singer: It is the only one you have gotten through.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Medical evidence—

Mr. Singer: Medical evidence is useless.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Personal property security—

Mr. Singer: Personal property is not here. Mechanics' liens are not here.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: These things are imminent at least and I am sure that if the hon. member were charged with the business of determining and setting forth the personal property security law he would probably need at least two or three years even with the best help he could get, and I do not make any apology at all for employing eminent counsel and research personnel in the way of professors and university groups to do these studies.

We have been urged to do this and I think it is a good thing to employ research facilities in law and certain of these acts were designed and brought forward by persons who are very outstanding in their field. I make no apology for that, I think that is the way to go about it.

If the hon. member for Downsview will just be a little more patient—I think he is being a little impatient—he will see the fruits of this work of the Ontario law reform commission. I think one of the best things we ever did in this province was to establish that commission.

Mr. J. Renwick: (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, under the law reform commission—we just cannot accept the Attorney General's position on the personal property security law.

The personal property security law Catzman committee was established in 1959. In 1963, after they had worked for three or four years adapting what is recognized as the United States method of accomplishing the same purpose from the commercial code in the United States, there was an international conference held under the auspices of the law society of Upper Canada at Osgoode Hall for three days to discuss the personal property security law.

After that time the law reform commission was established and the matter referred to the law reform commission and what we are in fact waiting for is for the law reform commission to acquaint itself about how the system operates. There was no reason whatsoever why the personal property security bill, as prepared by the Catzman committee, could not have been brought before this House and passed and been in force in the province of Ontario at any time within the last three or four years. This points up exactly the point that the member for Downsview is making, that what in fact is happening in the law reform commission is that we are not engaged in hiring experts to assist the law reform commission in these matters, we are now paying the price for the failure of legal scholarship in the province.

What the law reform commission is doing is hiring a number of people to do basic research in fields of law in the province of Ontario which have been neglected for a quarter of a century, and there are, in many of these areas, men who are not expert in the province of Ontario.

The price which we are paying year in and year out in the delay in the reform of law is because we have to wait upon the law reform commission to commission studies from various places within the province and they in turn do not have the background of legal scholarship which permits them to present the matters in a rapid and expeditious way. We cannot afford to tolerate this kind of legal scholarship situation in the province of Ontario any longer because if you take the law reform report on the rule against perpetuities the fact of the matter is that in substance, with minor variations, but in almost total substance, it incorporated the results of a study which was done in the United Kingdom. Almost without exception it adopted the results of that study which was based upon legal scholarship.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Which was that?

Mr. Renwick: On the rule against perpetuities. Now so far as I can tell from reading the law on condominium, what it really meant was that a great deal of time and effort was put into studying what had been done in other jurisdictions, and in substance there is very little difference in the proposed law of condominium than there was in the law which was introduced in one or two other provinces in Canada and elsewhere in the world.

Now it is not a matter of the law reform commission doing any original research on basic fundamental problems. What it is doing is trying to update the law of Ontario by adapting—adapting, and nothing else, let us not give it too elaborate a façade—it is adapting studies which have been done in basic research in other places, to the law of the province of Ontario.

I am prepared to wait, and I am sure the member for Downsview is prepared to wait, in any area in which indigenous legal research is going to be done in the province of Ontario by scholars in the province of Ontario related

to peculiarly Ontario matters. But we cannot wait, and we cannot afford to wait, for eight or nine years as in the case of the personal property security law, for a large number of people in the law reform commission and elsewhere in the province of Ontario in the universities, or wherever the studies have taken place, to bring themselves up to date in matters of law which are well known and well established and functioning efficiently in a jurisdiction such as New York State across the lake.

We cannot afford that kind of luxury any longer. It would be quite different if there had been a continuing system of reform of the law in force for the period that the Tory government has been in office. Then we would not have this backlog of accumulative work which has now submerged the law reform commission to the point where we only extract from it on odd occasions a report on a particular topic which happens to be given priority, not by the law reform commission, but by this government. Because it is this government which told the law reform commission that at this session of the Legislature we had to have the law on condominium, because for some reason or other it seems that the housing shortage in the province of Ontario does not require any legal changes at all except a new law related to this condominium.

So it is the government which dictates to the law reform commission what the law reform commission will give priority to. Now the Attorney General has got to take upon himself the problem of ordering the work of the law reform commission. If there is too much of a burden of work then he is going to have to establish his own *ad hoc* committees for particular topics and get on with them.

We had the farce of the debate this afternoon on the question of land titles and how to get the property out of the registry office system into land titles and the Attorney General's answer was that the law reform commission is studying the whole question of titles.

The problem is such that the Attorney General is going to have to establish an *ad hoc* committee of his own—an Attorney General's committee made up of surveyors and those experienced in conveyancing in the province, and those who know how to conduct surveys with the most up to date methods, and to study it in various parts of the province and bring in the report of their recommendations to the Attorney General. Then if he feels at that point that he should give it to the law reform commission and if the burden of their work permits them to take it on, ask them to do it.

But what the Attorney General does in each instance is, he blows up the problem of the law in that particular area to the point where it would appear that only the most sophisticated people could possibly understand it. Yet there are basic matters which people are dealing with in day-to-day life, and he then says we must wait because it must be just so perfect and we must understand all the background that has gone into all the historical development of this branch of the law.

This is just not so. In the case of personal property security law, we are talking about the kind of security which a person should have with a sense of assurance when he advances money or takes security on personal property. There is nothing mysterious about it. Traders have been doing it and commercial people have been doing it for many, many years. The idea is simply now to give an up-to-date and effective method of dealing with that particular aspect of the law. The same with the registration of titles—it is not a question which is involved in a lot of esoteric law, it is a question of being able to go to a place and find out who owns a plot of ground in the province of Ontario. That is not something with which the most sophisticated legal scholars necessarily are the only ones who can deal. These are problems of severely practical importance in the day-to-day life of the province of Ontario.

If you want to move into more difficult fields—and I am quite prepared to agree that there are some difficult fields of relationships between persons, rather than relationships with inanimate objects or with land in the province of Ontario—and you want to say that the law of families and family law in the province requires research and study and the benefit of the opinons of others in related disciplines connected with interpersonal relationships, we would be quite prepared to accept that, but we are certainly not going to accept it on the basis that we have to wait any longer for the personal property security law. The Attorney General says that they have had further studies. It is now back in the law reform commission, and there is no indication that it is going to come in this session, which will mean that it will be another session. Before long it will be another two or three years, and it will be over 10 years since the Catzman commission sat down to attempt to adapt to the province of Ontario a system which was working 90 miles

away and had been working for a number of years.

In that perspective, I think that the Attorney General, in consultation with the law reform commission, has got to rationalize what that commission is doing, establish the priority, remove certain topics from it, assign them to special *ad hoc* committees of his own, and try to get the work coming forward in an orderly way. Whatever the Attorney General says he cannot gainsay the fact that the only items which have come forward so far are not matters which required any great legal scholarship or any great length of time in order to bring them before the assembly. They were, in substance, nothing other than adaptations from studies which had been done in other jurisdictions where most of the problems had, in fact, been ironed out.

I think the Attorney General cannot—we cannot—get ourselves in the position where the law reform commission is being run down. I think the problem is that the law reform commission was established so late in the lifetime of this government and was then handed so many of these topics that it is suffering from serious indigestion. It is now up to the Attorney General and the government that established it to relieve that problem, allow them to do the work which they can effectively get done in the areas which require legal research and scholarship in substantial depth, and take the matters which can be dealt with conveniently and effectively in areas which affect people—such as land registry and the personal property security law, and I am certain there are other fields – and get them before this assembly and get the law brought up to date just the way after many, many years we are finally and gradually getting some aspects of the commercial law, company law and financial law of the province up to date.

But in most cases, again, the problem has been because there has been this terrible time lag with the Tory government in office. It has produced at this time, important legislation coming forward or being delayed in processing through this House, because we feel that of necessity everything must go through the law reform commission. This is a matter which requires urgent study by the Attorney General and I would hope that he would take some time to give that study to it.

Mr. Sopha: We must not lose sight of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that we are engaged in the Act here of voting public money. It is important that there should be on the record an expression of the views of members of the Opposition as to how they feel and the arguments they are prepared to marshal in respect of the voting of Her Majesty's money to the executive council to be spent.

The first observation that I want to make is that ever since the commencement of the presentation of the estimates of the Attorney General, his officials from each department, I have observed, have been sitting behind the Speaker's throne there. It is to be noted, and my eyes have told me, that as each specific branch in his department was called the responsible official moved up to the desk normally occupied by legislative counsel. Now I observe tonight that when we are called upon to vote $213,000, we are not this year, as we were not last year, favoured with the courtesy of having someone from the law reform commission come to hear what we might say about their work in the public service, and their use of the precious money. There are some of us who still regard the Crown's money as precious—their use of the precious money in furthering the tasks with which they have been assigned by the responsible head of this department.

Now I would be the last to say that is contempt for the Legislature on their part, but one is entitled to infer that they have not much regard for what legislators might say about the work, except to add this proviso that the chairman of the law reform commission—if Mr. Leal is the chairman, I think he is the chairman of the law reform commission—last summer at the Canadian bar association meeting to which I keep referring, the one where the former Provincial Secretary, now Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko), and I attended and one official—

Mr. Bryden: Well, we paid $14,000 for a banquet at it.

Mr. Sopha: No, you did not pay $14,000, do not get me into that channel. The province of Manitoba paid the sum of money.

There was one official from The Attorney General's Department there; I only saw one there, he was Mr. Ronald Thomas, counsel to the Attorney General; that is the only one I saw there.

But the chairman of the Ontario law reform commission favoured his audience by reading an excerpt from the *Hansard* of this House about last year's debates; without identifying the speaker, he read to the audience some remarks that were made by a member of the House. Now, that is the closest contact

that I can establish between this Legislature and the law reform commission.

Let it be said that I am one who is prepared to say that I am more than a little dismayed that they would not come to hear the important contribution of the member for Riverdale and that of my friend, the member for Downsview, which preceded it. I shall seek within the purview of my limited abilities to add something to that by way of a fresh contribution.

The most important statement, or the one that struck me in the contribution by my friend the member for Riverdale, was when he said that we are living in the legacy of the failure of generation after generation of lawyers in this province to take an interest in the reform of the law. We have come to a point in time where society, acting in concert, collectively, society through the instrument of the Attorney General, has said in effect because we have not had the original research into the great corpus of the law and we have left, negligently perhaps, we have left undone that matter of tidying up of the law in order to make it a rational and comprehensible body of jurisprudence, then we have to purchase this; and this is a purchase that we make tonight.

I do not know how many years it now is that we made the purchase, but last year we purchased to the extent of $155,000 and this year we are going to purchase that service to the extent of $213,000. One observes, if the Macaulay school of mathematics approaches accuracy, that is an increase in one year of $58,000.

Now I have my reservations about this method of doing things, because I hesitate greatly before I can accept the proposition that the reform of the law is necessarily a matter that is handed to a body of people called the law reform commission. I find it difficult to digest and accept that notion that here is the thing that we can sort of contract out to a group of people, however eminent they may be, and say to them: "Here is a rubric of social concern which we give over unto you and we hope that you will do something with it that will put it into an attractive state and you will give it back to us."

I find that proposition as a logical exercise to be very difficult to accept, for I know in my heart that the matter of law reform must be one of deep concern to the Legislature. Every member of this Legislature has an obligation to be concerned about the improvement of that body of social engineering which we call law. The legislator, to be true to his creed, must from the moment of his election give some serious thought to the matter of the taking in hand of the statutory law of the province and making some constructive suggestion about its improvement; and through that means of social engineering, the amelioration of the laws of the body politic that he seeks to represent.

Then I find difficulty in accepting the law reform commission in that light. I wonder: Is it logically demonstrable, beyond peradventure, beyond any comprehensible rational arguments that can be mustered; is it demonstrable that law reform is the purview, the preserve, the Alsace, so to speak, of the lawyer alone? Is the lawyer alone the only person who is concerned vitally with the matters of jurisprudence relating to the body of the law in our system? Yet I do not know of anyone on that committee, that commission, that is not a lawyer, I do not know.

The Attorney General may hastily get to his feet and tell me that there are people on it, but it seems to me I was told just before this debate began that it consists of the former chief justice of the high court, Mr. Leal, who is a former dean of the Osgoode Hall law school; Mr. Gibson Grey, a distinguished lawyer of this city; a lawyer by the name of Poole of London—you know it is remarkable, you cannot go anywhere in this province that somebody from London has not got a government job.

Mr. Singer: The new capital.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, it must be.

Well there is the lawyer from London; and then I am told there is Mr. R. A. Bell.

Is that Mr. R. A. Bell who is the federal member of the House of Commons?

Well let me say here and now that the Attorney General has a greater responsibility to his provincial members than he has to some Tory member sitting in the House of Commons. I would be one who would support the candidacy of the member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence); I would feel more confident with that alert and vigorous intelligence that is exhibited in that member than sequestering one of Diefenbaker's henchmen out of the House of Commons.

Goodness gracious, Diefenbaker needs all he can get there full time!

An hon. member: Is he not a Camp man?

Mr. Sopha: Is he a Camp man? Well that is significant; that group of course is led by the Minister of Economics and Development, he is the chief Camp supporter here. However, we will save that for another day.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Do you think Pearson needs any help?

Mr. Sopha: Well that is what we are asked to accept anyway, that this is solely a matter for the lawyers.

Now to come down to what they have accomplished. In two years we have spent $368,000, or are to spend or have spent. The member for Downsview and the member for Riverdale are entitled to say, as the people of the province are entitled to say, what have we got for it? What have we got, what can we point to?

I think somebody must have tongue in cheek, it must have been meant as a practical joke; looking back in retrospect I can give it no other explanation, it must have been some form of practical joke that the very first item that was tendered to this Legislature was the reform of the law of perpetuities. Now that surely, looking back, somebody had a sense of humour. Then we have had presented the law of personal property; it has not been passed.

Mr. Singer: It was presented and then taken back.

Mr. Sopha: Yes; presented, my friend said, and then taken back. Has the law of mechanics' lien been revised?

Mr. Singer: No.

Mr. Sopha: No. Well, what really—

Mr. Singer: Medical evidence was revised, but badly.

Mr. Sopha: Then it must be three or four weeks ago I deemed to ask the Attorney General a question before the orders of the day, positing to him quite frankly and succinctly what legislation may we expect this year as a result of the fruits of the effort of the law reform commission; and his answer is in *Hansard* there; he said that something is coming, that it is going to be presented to the House, but we have not seen it. We sit here every day waiting for the Gordian knot to be cut, for the axe to fall; the hangman's axe, which is going to fall. Daily there are rumours rife about the precincts of the House that we do not know whether this Parliament will exist from one midnight to another, that the Prime Minister of the province might walk in any day and say: "Begone, we will go to the jury of the people".

Mr. Sargent: We will know tomorrow night.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, tomorrow night he is on the television.

Well, in short, we are entitled to say to this Minister of the Crown, if he is going to justify his department to the people in the ensuing election campaign what is he going to point to as a demonstrable concrete result of the paying of this vast amount of money to that commission? The answer is nothing.

I want to say another word about this matter; I want to put this on the record, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps you will permit me, in an election year, to do this. This is an election year and I would like to ask—I have to go to my constituency and ask them for their endorsement.

Now at one time during the session, and I think perhaps now, looking; there are six government bills in the order paper; and there are seven—I outnumber them by one. I have seven bills standing in my name; and at one time earlier in the session I had a couple more, I had three or four more than the total caucus of government legislation. Now almost without exclusion my bills might be called, I say modestly, law reform bills. They are put forward with an honest desire to improve the statutes of this province and through that improvement to better the conditions of certain groups of people of our electorate whom I believe suffer under disabilities.

Now I do not need to repeat my arguments to the Attorney General about The Wages Act, but I was hopeful that the wage assignment which, with the national hockey league —get this, Mr. Chairman—the wage assignment with the national hockey league are the two last vestiges of the feudal system in our society. They are the two last of the colonial system introduced by William the Conqueror in Britain, in the 11th century after the death of Christ. I do not know what we can do about the national hockey league, we will deal with them some time with the assistance of the member for Lakeshore. But wage assignments, which makes the wage earner the bond servant of his creditor, we can abolish the wage assignment in Ontario.

Now the Attorney General is perfectly aware that I have an Act to amend The Insurance Act which would permit the service of the writ of summons on the insurer; An Act to repeal The Gaming Act; and so on. The Dower Act.

Now on The Dower Act; the Attorney General might credit me with a little bit of courage in regard to The Dower Act.

One would have thought that we would have followed the lead of several other provinces of this country years ago and abolish the right of dower because our women folk—whom we are all most anxious to protect and to see that they do not suffer from economic adversity – our women folk, it might be argued, are adequately protected under the laws as they exist and perhaps there might be some other adjustments made that we can get rid of that archaic notion of dower.

That is why that is on there and I merely ask that Ontario follow the lead of such provinces, as some of the western provinces, I think Alberta and Saskatchewan and British Columbia, have all abolished dower. It has been gone for many years.

In short, the law of real property in general needs—now let me make that graphic in this way—the Prime Minister of the province can set up, can pass a statute, as he did, and set up a committee. We have not heard from that committee since, and that committee under that statute can go over to Britain and see if Sir John Graves Simcoe is still resting in his grave, or whether he has got up like a ghost and burst the bonds of his sarcophagus and has fled to Scotland, or Ireland, or someplace.

There is actually a statute in the province that sets up such a committee. But it would never occur to the Prime Minister of the province, much less his Attorney General, that they might send a committee over to Britain to discover that as long ago as 1934, I say to my friend from Windsor-Walkerville, they reformed their law of real property. They did away with all those archaic notions, such as are replete in the Roland Shully case, and all that other gobbledy-gook.

Mr. Chairman: Is the member still on law reform?

Mr. Sopha: I am talking about law reform.

Mr. Chairman: I just wanted to make sure.

Mr. Sopha: Then you do not need a law reform commission, Mr. Chairman, spending $213,000 to discover that the British with that ingenuity and that empiricism which has been their hallmark, 33 years ago reformed their law of real property. But we still labour under the law of real property in this province that existed in Britain to a large extent when Wolfe—I say to my friend from Ottawa East —when Wolfe first took the team up on the Plains of Abraham.

Mr. Bryden: How about saying something to those fellows over there?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. We still have the same law of real property. We do not need a law reform commission to tell us that and spend $213,000. Now I said that at an earlier time in this House, and it offends some people downtown, would the Attorney General believe me that it offends some people downtown to say these things. I have got some correspondence lately that I will take around and show him, I will not put on the record who it is from. I have informed his Deputy who it is from and the nature of the correspondence.

But it offends them to say that the body of the legal profession—there are 2,400 lawyers downtown in the city of Toronto—and for that matter anywhere else in the province, do not demonstrate much verve for the reform of the law. They are engaged in the every work-a-day world earning a living and apparently they could not care less about the reform of the law.

I went to one of the legislative counsel, and I will not say which one it was, and I said: "In all the years that you have been here as legislative counsel, has it ever struck you that the legal profession is much interested in the reform of the law? Have they ever approached you to indicate their interest, as a philosophic matter, as a matter simply of general interest to them?" He said, no.

He said the only intimation of interest in reform of the law that you get from the legal profession is when it begins to pinch them, when some personal matter irritates them, something that they run up against in their practice and they feel that putting a little pressure on government might make things a bit easier. Well of course as I said before, that was the whole burden of the hon. John Turner's remarkable speech that he made at Osgoode Hall. Mr. Turner, an able young Montreal lawyer, went down and talked to them there and he said that is the trouble with our profession, that nobody will get out of the strait-jacket of his daily duties in the law and exhibit much interest from an academic point of view, of lending his talents and his interest, his energy and his enthusiasm, to taking hold of the body of jurisprudence and bringing it up to date.

Well in short, the body of the law, it has been said, and I forget who it was that said it, the body of the law, the thousand statutes —I think there are now 1,000 statutes on the books of the province of Ontario, if not, very close—those 1,000 statutes, it can be fairly said, are a reflection, Mr. Chairman, of the industrial revolution. They are a reflection of

the philosophy that prevailed and summed up by Adam Smith: "Laissez-faire, laissez-passe." They are not in accord with the collective society in which we now live.

This society, in 1967, is vastly different from that society in which those statutes were passed and where it was thought that the individual by the exercise of his own initiative, his freedom of enterprise, and a minimum of restrictions by the state, would be able to fend for himself and would advance his self-interest to the ultimate. That is gone. We now live in a collective society where the society thinks of itself as acting together through the instrumentality of government to effect the broad social purposes of the greatest good for the greatest number.

Now that really is the basis of law reform. In my view it is to bring the statutes of the province into line with the prevailing philosophy of the age; which after all is two-fold, is it not? One to provide a maximum of equality of opportunity, that is the one side; the other is to remove, as much as possible, the economic dislocation that can occur to the individual through the functioning of the economic system, which is no fault of his own.

Having said that, then I state the two-fold purpose of government, when we reach the seventh decade of the twentieth century. Now you will permit me this, sir, in an election year.

I have referred to my bills on the order paper, you will permit me in an election year to refer to other items—October 29, 1964, for example. I think my friend from St. George criticized me a little for this, October 29 I appeared before the Attorney General's committee on securities legislation with a brief about mutual funds—yes, you heard me right, mutual funds. Now other than printing my name in the back of their book to say that Elmer W. Sopha, MPP, was there, that very distinguished committee composed of the now president of the Toronto stock exchange; W. B. Common, QC; H. C. F. Mockridge, of INCO; Martin Freedman—he is the one on bail, who wrote the book on bail; R. A. Davies, QC, was on that committee; and other distinguished people. But there is no mention in the report that I made any complaint about the front end load, about the management fee, and other matters concerning mutual funds that had been turned up by the Wharton school of economics of the University of Pennsylvania in a study prepared by that school for the securities and exchange commission—no mention of this. So it is considerable satisfaction in March of 1967 when the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs gets up here with his face hanging out one day and announces that a committee will be appointed to look into the very matters concerning mutual funds that on October 29, 1964, I advocated to that Kimber committee should be looked into and some revision made.

Then I forget the date that it was, but back in 1965 I presented a brief before the McRuer commission, the Royal commission inquiry into civil rights. In that brief I dealt with the need of an administrative procedure code and I can go back in *Hansard* and point to a speech that I made, and indeed I wrote an article for the Toronto *Daily Star*. I must confess that the Toronto *Daily Star*—a great Liberal newspaper—in a great spirit of munificence they paid me for it; it is great to be a paid author. It gives a wonderful satisfaction to take to bed with one; one is a paid author; the Toronto *Daily Star*—may the Lord bless and prosper them—they paid me. The need of an administrative procedure code—I am not going to go into that.

Also in this brief, I complained as I have complained here, about the inability of trade unions to remove matters dealt with at arbitration under the collective bargaining agreement into the courts. They can only take them in by the prerogative writ now, and I advocated that there be some sort of appeal from decisions of arbitrators under the collective bargaining agreements.

I am carefully saying that I am not referring to appeals from the Ontario labour relations board. I do not believe there should be appeals from that board. I am talking about the decisions of arbitrators under collective bargaining agreements.

I expressed to Mr. McRuer my continual amazement that if you had 24 witnesses to an accident where $80 damage was done to a fender; say you had 24 witnesses, 12 on each side, you could occupy a judge of the division court or the county court for three days until he heard all those witnesses to determine who pays that $80. But if 18,000 men at INCO have a complaint about the interpretation of a cause and neglect of bargaining agreement and something like $6 million be at stake, as in the case I had, then you cannot get it into the court of appeal, you cannot get it in.

Now that is a strange system of law where you occupy a county judge over $80 to a fender and you cannot get a county judge to hear an appeal from a decision in a matter of law in a court of appeal where the fate of

thousands of workmen may be involved. I hope whenever we have Mr. McRuer's report that he will deal with those things.

I dealt with other things than that. I put those things on record because I am unwilling to say and the law reform commission is not here tonight and I hope somebody will tell them that I said it, that I am unwilling to accede to them the sole and exclusive right to be responsible for the reform of the law. If in the fullness of time—now I am looking like Leslie Frost with the hands up, and using his phrases—in the fullness of time, as he used to say, when we go to the jury of the people, to borrow another one of his, they are pleased to return me to this House then I will continue to be interested in these matters of the reform of our law. And in this spirit, I am going to end with these quotations because I think they should be on the record from a remarkable speech made by the former justice of the high court, J. C. McRuer, LL.D., at Montreal, on August 8, 1966. Let us hear what he had to say in this theme about law reform; I will gladly endorse his remarks about them holus-bolus. You see I have no time to read the transcript of *Hansard* any more and I have to spell these things into them. We have no time, we are too busy, the member for Downsview and I; and the leader of the Opposition is three times as busy as we are. Now hearken, will you hearken, I invite you to listen to what he says:

> Law and justice in this century are by no means synonymous terms. Unjust laws we have in abundance; some legacy of other days when standards of justice were different than they are today, others forced on us by impatient legislators who are more concerned with rules than justice.
>
> But when I say this, I am prepared to say that in my country, and I think the same is true in yours, there is much more justice in our laws than there was at the beginning of this century and that freedom, which depends on law, rests on a firmer basis than it did when I first started to practice law. In those days there was little consideration for social justice, little restraint was put on the oppressors of the weak by the strong, and the widow and the orphan were given scant safety. Labour was a commodity to be exploited on the labour market of the nation. At that time neither in Canada nor in England did a man convicted of serious crime have any rights of appeal in the courts.
>
> During the last 50 years undoubtedly there has been a growing discontent with certain laws and customs, and never before have people on this continent and other continents been more alert to injustice than they are today. It may well be that what is interpreted as disrespect for the law in fact may only be the manfestation of a burning desire for justice.

And two more; I quote again:

> What is it that we call disrespect for law? Is it a disrespect for law or a disrespect for laws? Is it a disrespect for law or a frustrated craving for justice? Is it disrespect or disillusionment that has developed into a sort of rebellion?

That is the end of the quote, and it is very noteworthy that the former chief justice of the high court, J. C. McRuer, was speaking very close in the contiguity of time to the jailing of the union leaders at Peterborough. It may well be—the chief justice has never told me, Mr. McRuer has never told me—that he had in mind that incident that had occurred and of course which gave all of us, or many of us, a great deal of concern.

Then finally:

> I challenge the premise that the ordinary man on the street has less respect for justice today than he had 50 years ago. Our forefathers too often believed in vigorously defending laws, and a social order that had one quality of justice for the powerful and another quality of justice for the weak. I am not at all sure that there are not those who are ready to accept this doctrine today.

That is the end of the quotation. Is that not mere cynicism in this enlightened age, that he believes there may be some in our society who believe that there is a law, a quality of justice, for the powerful and another quality of justice for the weak?

Of course, that is Joe Sedgwick, I say unhesitatingly. If you are a client of Joe Sedgwick that means you are entitled to bail overnight, you are entitled to bail pending appeal and you march home facing a prison sentence, you go home and sleep in your comfortable bed.

But if you are Joe Schmuck—I do not know how that is spelled—if you are Joe Smith, if you are just John Doe, and you have not much lineage, you are from the lower orders of society, then the judge says mechanically when he says: "I find you guilty"; I say to my friend, the member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton); he says: "You will be remanded into custody and we will have a pre-sentence report".

Now maybe that is what the chief justice had in mind, that sort of thing. But I have the comfort of thinking, on Joe Sedgwick, that the day has passed when he will get away with that stuff down in the courts.

This was a very powerful document in my view. This was a very significant contribution by a man, not only very learned in jurisprudence, but a very alert septuagenarian who may look back on the lengthy life that he has had in the service of the people of this province. It really is a clarion call and challenge to the profession.

I watched him over the years, and on every opportunity that man, when he spoke to lawyers at some given occasion, would always return to the same refrain. He would say: "You lawyers owe it to yourselves and to the people you seek to serve not to be exclusively concerned with the pursuit of the dollar but to be engaged to the limit of your capacity in research and academic interest, and be stimulated by a living desire within you to understand that which you are doing and to understand your place in the society for the social engineers that you are."

I say to my friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, it does not mean much to be called a lawyer. But when thought of in the light of social engineering, then it takes on a very pregnant meaning.

That is precisely what they are. The lawyer is the social engineer, and perhaps the easiest illustration that can be used to demonstrate this is when a woman comes in and sits herself down on the other side of the desk and says to the lawyer: "I'm going to leave my husband. Can I leave him? What rights have I got? Does he have to support me and the children? Can I have a portion of his pay? How much of the house do I own? Can I take the car? Is it all right if I take the furniture? Do I have to give him back the wedding ring?" And a thousand other questions.

Then the lawyer is the social engineer. He is right in the middle of the family milieu in which he has to employ his talents to his fullest capacity in order to ensure that the advice he gives at that point will have the best effect.

That is what the chief justice is talking about. I do not know where that law reform commission is, tonight. Maybe they are in the tomes of the law, maybe they are somewhere in the library and they are looking up, and dusting off the old volumes. Maybe, for all I know, they are out drinking draught beer and eating Polish sausage, and all power to them if they are. Maybe they are in Florida —no, I doubt it. I saw them yesterday. They were all having lunch together in the parliamentary dining room.

But wherever they are, we are entitled to say tonight that in two years it is $368,000— I do not know how much, maybe it is a million altogether that they have spent, I am just guessing it might approach a million— we are entitled to say: "Here is some expression of our views about the matter of law reform, here is the way we see it." The member for Downsview, as well as the member for Riverdale and myself will have to stand or fall, you see. We will have to get re-elected. The law reform commission will not have to get re-elected, but they will be paid anyway. But the only way we can get the pay cheque next year is if we get more votes than the next guy in the contest. However, those are our views and we will stand or fall on them.

The other thing we say to them is that for $368,000 it is about time we saw some legislation that is meaningful in this society. Do not present it to us as the member for Downsview says; do not bring it in here and let us have a look at it and then grab it back like Johnny going over to play with Billy with his toys and saying: "Here, you can play with them for awhile, but as soon as my old man comes home I gotta go home and I will take my toys home".

That is what the Attorney General has done with their legislation.

So I say to them, Godspeed them. Maybe at some early date they will get in here with some reform of the corpus of the laws in this province that will make life easier for every person. Every orderly civilized person, if he is to be a resident of this province, must live under a government of law, not of men.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will not take as long as the hon. member for Sudbury. I am not going to deal with some of the trivialities he recited so they could be placed in *Hansard*.

Mr. Sopha: That is the Attorney General's view?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, perhaps the member has provoked me into dealing with some of them. I would just say, for instance, that while he was at the Canadian bar meeting and twitting the Attorney General because members of his staff were not there—

Mr. Sopha: They were not there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, they were not there.

Mr. Sopha: No, they were not there. Only Mr. Thomas was there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the hon. member would care to listen! A week before the bar meeting, the conference on uniformity of laws, which was a working conference, took place and eight members of The Attorney General's Department were there working. That is a very different type of meeting than the Canadian bar association, as the hon. member well knows.

Mr. Sopha: Do not let me give the impression that I am criticizing them for not being there. They were not there, I leave it at that. It is their own business, they do not have to go in a democracy.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps I should not have been provoked to answer that triviality. Now, why should the members of the law reform commission sit at the desk in this House? The members of my staff are there to assist in giving answers to the members of the House; the civil servants who serve are there to provide details. The law reform commission is working on the matter of research, the study of law. They do not have to administer their department. There is no point in their being here. They are not going to get up and tell us about the subjects they are studying and researching tonight.

The hon. member for Sudbury says bring in some reform, and he cites with great approbation the remarks made by the former chairman of that commission. I agree with him that we must bring in law and reforms in law, and I would say to this House that if I were to select one vote from the estimates of this department, I would say you would get no better value in any vote than you get in this vote of $213,000 for research in the field of law; a continuing research facility in the field of law; a commission which has just been operating three short years or something just less than that.

I am not impatient that we have not produced in such great areas as real property—the whole study of land and land title and real property generally and the whole field of family law—that we have not yet come forward with legislation which I can present. I shall bring it into this House and I shall take it back if it is considered necessary for further study. I shall not be persuaded not to do that, because I think the study in these great areas is necessary.

The hon. member for Riverdale says, all you have to do or all you are doing, is adapting the laws of other jurisdictions to your own jurisdiction. He is critical and approbating in the same breath, blowing hot one moment and cold the next. He says you are just adapting. Yet when the Catzman legislation comes forward—which was a study adapting the law, as he admits of American states—we take it and we say it does not fit our situation and we will not adopt it as it stands to this jurisdiction. We will take it back and we will revise it; we will study it; we will moderate it. This we have done, and this we are doing. I say you cannot say that this is all you are doing, and then criticize because we do not enact without change the legislation as presented by the Catzman committee.

That was a bill, if I may be critical of it, designed by lawyers. Perhaps I can be critical of the profession for a moment, too. The Catzman committee did a tremendous work, but they produced a bill designed from the point of view of very capable lawyers. But I think it is proper that you hear the point of view of the man whose property is being offered as the security for the chattel mortgage, or for the loan, and that is what the law reform commission provides.

That is why the study of that report—presented in 1965, in the summer, before it was tabled in this House—was given wide dissemination. Then in 1966 we presented the bill and then that was taken back and studied and all the briefs have been heard. The work is now practically complete and it may yet be presented to this House this session.

But I make no apology for doing that study. I think it has been most worthwhile and I think hon. members, when they see the final result, will agree. We did not accept the Catzman bill as it was presented, and there were many hearings, many conferences, many discussions, over the terms of that legislation, all of which I think was well worthwhile.

I would say that if the hon. members could know the number of papers which have been prepared and presented in the whole field of the study of family law, including, for the sake of the hon. member for Sudbury, the matter of dower, they would understand why I do not bring forward a dower Act at this time. That will be included in the report of the law reform commission.

I think three years is a short time to do these very comprehensive and very deep studies into this whole field of our law. I think, with the hon. member for Sudbury,

that the former chairman of that commission is a great reformer, and I am glad that he is still a member of the commission. I think that when the work of the commission is presented to you, you will agree that a great advance has been made in these fields of law which I mention.

I say that this vote that you are now about to pass upon, is perhaps the best value you can get for the money you are spending.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 209 carried?

Mr. Singer: Before we leave 209, I wonder how long this government must investigate and get reports and so on, and get reports upon reports upon reports, before finally there is some action. How long is enough?

The Attorney General says three years is not too long if we do it properly. Well, what are we doing properly? Surely there is a duty on the Attorney General to bring before us at this time, in the third year of the life of the law reform commission, a meaningful report that tells what they have done. In the way that he has presented his estimates, it is obvious that he has no desire to tell us what is being done. It must appear from the debate that has taken place tonight that very little is being done.

Very simply I asked him about three quarters of an hour ago, what was going to be done about the recommendations in relation to medical evidence. The efforts of government to change the laws in relation to the admissibility of medical evidence in the courts have failed, and they have failed because the rules committee's decisions were ruled *ultra vires* of their powers by the court of appeal of the province of Ontario.

Did the Attorney General think it was a worthwhile reform? If so, why has he not followed it up?

In the Speech from the Throne we were going to hear about another important law reform—a committee to study the law of divorce. Has the Attorney General anything to report to us about that?

We have argued and debated the question of proper bail provisions in the province of Ontario. Surely this is a responsibility of any law reform commission. And what has the Attorney General done? He sloughed it off on a private service organization that operates out of the riding of Downsview.

Is that any law reform for the province of Ontario?

Surely, Mr. Chairman, after three years of dilly-dallying, of wasting time, and of spending copious quantities of public money, the Attorney General should be able to present to this Legislature, something meaningful in the field of law reform if he really believes in it. His lack of action leads one to conclude unfortunately, that he has either no real interest in this important matter, or that the people he has chosen to look after the public interest, have dismally failed.

Vote 209 agreed to.

On vote 210:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on vote 210, I want to say a word about the functioning of the board of negotiations which has been set up for the past two years. We all know that the difficulties associated with the acquisition of land by the public parts of this government have led to considerable unrest among land owners and others across the province. In my own case, being a land owner and associated with a farm that has been in our family for well over a century, I have been deeply concerned with the complaints that have come to me as the local member for Brant county, and it is in this connection that I would like to bring some of these matters to your attention.

I was quite struck by the phrase used by the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) when this legislation was brought down, enacting the board of negotiation, when he referred to it as the kitchen table board. It seems to me that what is needed is an objective group that could come into a situation where a certain amount of acrimony—a degree of acrimony—may have developed between the person from whom the land was being acquired and the arm of government that had the responsibility to acquire the land in the public interest.

Down through the years, our own farm in St. George has had to deal with these various arms of government, in total I think seven times. It was never by expropriation, because I have always been taught that progress cannot be impeded in any way and it is usually possible to come to some sort of amicable agreement. Yet I am sure the Attorney General knows that particularly in recent years, when the requirements for land have been so much greater than they have in the past, that there have been a number of people who can, with some seriousness and justification say publicly that they have not been fairly dealt with by the government, or the arm of government that is wielding the power of expropriation at that particular occasion.

Because of this, as I say, I have had a very near interest in finding out how this board is working, particularly since it was first brought into being to assist with the acquisition of land in the Upper Thames valley conservation authority, but has been used in a number of areas since that time.

My distinct impression is that the legislation setting this up was designed to bring into a situation that was otherwise going to have to go to arbitration, some real objective sense and an objective view of what the problem was. It may well be that those who have complained to me, whose opinion I have sought in this matter, have been something less than objective themselves. Yet their view has been that these men who would come in to hear supposedly at arm's length from both parties what fairness could be achieved, have often ended up simply arguing for the position taken by the expropriating authority.

I wonder what sort of instruction is given the board of negotiation, to ensure that they are going to have a sympathetic approach to those people who are being forced to sell their land to the government—or at least deal with the value of the land. Too often, as I say, there may be some unfairness on both sides.

There has been hesitancy among members of the board of negotiation to react sympathetically to those people who are faced with an expropriation position. Those people representing the authority of the government have at their disposal an appraised value that is not made known to land owners who must in turn go out and get an appraiser themselves.

These people have quoted to me remarks apparently made by the board of negotiation pooh poohing the professional appraisers that they have gone out and paid good money to put before them.

I must admit as well that one thing that roused my ire to some extent were remarks made about the local member who certainly had no place in these negotiations at all, though when people are in difficulty dealing with any department of the government they have a perfect right to come to me as the local member. In turn I have the responsibility to do what I can to serve them.

My experience is that the board has not been used extensively in my area. Where I have had some knowledge of it there has been this lack of objectivity which could, in fact, make it a true kitchen table board; a board that could have real sympathy for the position of the people who are not always trying to gouge the public purse; who have a real argument to put forward.

I would like some assurance from the Minister, as well as some facts as to the number of cases in which the board has been involved, and that their terms of reference do include strong admonition that they be objective, and if anything sympathetic to those people whose land is being expropriated.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have the remarkks of the hon. member. I would like to say first of all that the board of negotiation which commenced work on August 1, 1965, receives no instructions in the sense that they are told to follow a point of view of an expropriating authority.

The only instruction is to go out, sit down at the kitchen table if you like with the owner of the property, and see if they can strike a bargain which will be satisfactory; see what they can reach in the way of a settlement of the claim for the acquisition of the property. That is their instruction and that is the approach they take.

I have some figures before me which I think are quite impressive as to the work of this board of negotiation. From August 1 to the end of 1965 they dealt with 115 cases. In 1966 there were 339 cases heard and disposed of by that board of negotiation. That is a total of 454 separate individual situations that they have heard in the period since they started to work on August 1, 1965, up to the end of last year.

Mr. Singer: May I ask the Attorney General a question? What does he mean by the words "disposed of"?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was just going to come to that. The board was successful in solving and settling 64 per cent of the applications. They were unsuccessful in 27 and 9 per cent are pending—they have not been determined one way or the other. That was the figure as of the beginning of this year.

Mr. Nixon: While you are talking statistics, have you any information as to what the disposition was and in how many cases there were changes in the original position?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have not got that, but my statistics show the departments of government involved, the number of cases they had, the cities, universities, actually down to townships. In the latter part of 1955 there were three cases in the city of Brantford and one in 1966. I cannot find in this list, unless I am not familiar with one or two township

names, the township of Cumberland and the township of Bosanquet. I cannot find any others from the county of Brant at all.

Mr. Nixon: How about Norfolk and Oxford? I would like to see your report.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would be glad to make it available. I think this board has been singularly successful. Maybe 27 per cent unsettled is not what one might want to cheer about, but there has been a pretty good result in the work they have done.

They go out with no instruction to support the expropriating authority's attitude. They are local people. We have appointed members of the board from across the province who serve only when required in the local situation. They sit down and attempt to reach an agreement as to the value of the property. They have been reasonably successful, I think.

I am sorry to hear that any remarks were made of a disparaging nature about the hon. member, and I am sorry if remarks are made which are abrasive with the people they are dealing with. That certainly was not the intention, and it may be that some of the persons who have been appointed in local areas may not have grasped the thought behind this legislation and this appointment. It was designed simply to try to avoid any abrasive situation and to reach agreement so that there would be no expense, no need of counsel, no need of expense of any kind.

While I would not suggest that any evaluation or appraisal would not be a good thing to have, on the other hand, if an owner could say: "You are taking so many acres of my land and I think it is worth $500 an acre"—if they could agree on that there would be no need to have it appraised.

One of the purposes behind the legislation which constituted this board of negotiation was to avoid cost to the owner. I would be interested to know the situation where there was difficulty of the nature that the hon. member mentioned because it is certainly not our attitude that the board of negotiation should have that attitude.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if it would be possible for the report of the activities of the board to be tabled so that we could have a look at it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would be glad to make this available. I just would like to add to what I have said that one of the functions which this board of negotiations has carried on is to bring to our attention some of the practices which were adopted by various expropriating authorities so that we might correct them. This has been valuable in smoothing the path of expropriation, too. We have had some practices which were not good. I shall make this available, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: We were talking a few minutes ago about law reform and in no field has the government's lack of action in the reform of the law been more obvious than in the whole field of expropriation. At the present time, as I understand it, the civil rights commission of Mr. McRuer is studying one aspect of the law of expropriation, the law reform commission is studying another aspect of the law of expropriation, and the Attorney General has just told us that as a result of the sitting of these boards of negotiation several practices have been brought to his attention so that they can be corrected.

May I ask when they are going to be corrected? Are we going to get corrections within the law, or are are we getting corrections in some other mysterious manner?

If you find out The Department of Highways has been doing something wrong do you whisper in your colleague's ear, or do you change the law? If you find out a university that has authority to expropriate has been doing something wrong how do you correct it? Do you call the president in and slap his wrist, or do you change the law?

One would think that if the Attorney General, the chief law officer of the province of Ontario, finds that there are errors in ways of proceeding in matters of expropriation that he would, when he has discovered these, consider them and in due course bring into the House some changes in the appropriate legislation.

Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the fields in which we have been so sorely lacking in law reform is the whole field of expropriation of property. How many more reports does he want?

There was a very full report brought before this House a few weeks ago by the select committee on conservation. As I say, he has the McRuer commission studying it, he has the law reform commission studying it and he is getting all these little bits of information from these kitchen cabinet groups that keep on telling him what is wrong. How long do you have to find out something is wrong before you are going to change the law?

Again, Mr. Chairman, I object to the fact that the Attorney General has on his desk a summary of what these boards of negotiation have done, but we do not know what is in

that summary. As we are called upon to authorize this vote tonight, this vote of $74,000, the Attorney General once again has secret records that he will not reveal to the Legislature. He makes a face when I say secret records. Well, if they are not secret records, why then before you introduced your estimates, or before you came to this vote, could you not have put a copy of that report into our hands so that we could intelligently examine those figures and make meaningful criticism in regard to them?

I do not understand, Mr. Chairman, a man with the intelligence of the Attorney General going through these estimates day after day, hour after hour, and deliberately keeping from us the information that would allow us to meaningfully criticize what is coming before us. He has done it again in this estimate.

For instance, and I am going to try to make these things up as I go along, for instance, can you tell us, Mr. Attorney General—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): That is for sure.

Mr. Singer: Can you tell us, through you, Mr. Chairman, the value of the average of those 62 per cent of settlements? What was it in dollars?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, before I answer that specific question, I think it is unreasonable to ask me. I have not got that information. But the hon. member for Downsview gets up and says, the Attorney General has a secret report in his hand. I not only have nothing that is secret, but I have no report. That board of negotiation does not file a report. I have certain information and I am quite willing to read every word of it into the record right now, or at any time.

Mr. Singer: You should have read it before you brought this vote in.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No I should not.

Mr. Singer: Certainly you should.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is the utmost nonsense.

Mr. Singer: Is it nonsense because you inform the Legislature of what is going on?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No.

Mr. Singer: Is it nonsense that you should inform us of how the money is going to be spent? Or has been spent? Is that nonsense?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is it public business as to what one property or any other property—

Mr. Singer: Yes I do, and we are entitled to get it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Then you do not represent the thinking of rural people.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture and Food does not know what he is talking about, as usual.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I know for sure that you do not know what you are talking about in this estimate. That is for certain.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The Attorney General has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, what I said was that I was willing to read every word of this information onto the record. There is nothing secret about it. It is not a report, and I do not like the hon. member for Downsview getting up and saying it is and that I should furnish him this information, that I should have to put this in front of him before I start the estimates. That is nonsense.

This is a statistical report, the number of hearings held, where they were held, how many were held in 1965, how many in 1966. There is nothing hidden about this. There is nothing I want to hide about it. I am quite prepared to give it to the hon. member now, but to furnish a complete book of details such as I have with respect to my estimates in my department, I think is nonsense.

I am quite prepared to furnish reports as they are furnished to me, and as soon as they come to hand. I have just told the hon. leader of the Opposition that I would make this information available. For the hon. member for Downsview to get up and be critical and to say: "You should have this in your hands before", I think is rather puerile criticism, because it is not a case of trying to hide or withhold anything whatsoever.

I cannot tell the hon. member. I do not know that that statistic would be of great interest in any event. I might be able to get it. He asked what was the average settlement, or what were the amounts of these 454 settlements. I could perhaps find that from the records of that board of negotiation, but I do not know whether $10,000 would be meaningful in one, or $15,000 in another, or $45,000 in another one, and what an average figure of settlement of 454 various negotiations would do, I cannot see any great significance in it. I would be glad to try and get it, and I presume that the records of the

board of negotiation which has a chairman and a secretary may be able to furnish me with that information. I have no objection whatever in trying to get it and making it available to the hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Well Mr. Chairman, if it is puerile to ask that we should be informed in advance of what has gone on over a year in a board of negotiation that is asking for $74,000, then I must conclude that the Attorney General's estimate of the role of the Opposition is that their informed criticism is puerile. If that is his attitude, I cannot help it. I am sorry for him.

The significance of the amounts is this, Mr. Chairman, and I would have thought that a person as intelligent as the Attorney General would have spotted the significance of that question. I want to know, and I think we are entitled to know, whether or not the small person who has a small number of dollars at stake has been taken advantage of, or has been given every opportunity to proceed to a satisfactory settlement. The Attorney General knows, as do I and as does any lawyer who has had anything to do with expropriation matters, that lawyers avoid these boards of negotiation like the plague. The opinion in the profession is that all they are there for is to extract information from the land owner to the advantage of the authority, without disclosing any information that the authority has as to value.

This is the common impression throughout the profession in the province of Ontario, and if the Attorney General does not believe it, I would ask him to talk to his colleagues anywhere in the province of Ontario who deal with expropriation matters and ask them about this.

That is the point, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: To avoid the necessity for this—

Mr. Singer: It does not avoid the necessity at all.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It does.

Mr. Singer: In fact, what these boards of negotiation are doing, is that they are probing devices for the expropriating authority to extract information from the land owner and not to give him any in return.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Sixty-six per cent are settled satisfactorily without cost to the owner.

Mr. Singer: That is what happens, Mr. Chairman, and that is why these figures as to value are significant. It is the little man with the small number of dollars at stake who cannot afford to fight the big authorities; who cannot afford to get evaluations; and who cannot afford to pay for legal talent in order to get proper advice. If the government is at all serious about helping people who are concerned about expropriation then they will bring before us some sort of meaningful analysis of the work of these boards of negotiation. I am not alone in my opinion that this system has been a dismal failure, and that is why I want to see the statistics to be able to prove to the Attorney General that this has been, in fact, the result. We are denied those statistics, and if you say it is puerile that I call it a secret report, I say that you have missed the message of democracy.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You are not denied it.

Mr. Singer: It is high time that the government had the intelligence to bring before this Legislature proper laws in relation to expropriation which will protect the person whose land is being forcefully taken away. The actions of the government in this regard —the Attorney General's actions tonight— belie the thought that they have the interests of the small man at heart, in any shape or form. There is no point in arguing. The facts speak for themselves. The hurling of names backwards and forwards across the floor does not prove a thing. You do not want law reform. You want to continue the power in these expropriation bodies to take land away and settle matters on their own terms.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 210 carried?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before we leave vote 210, would the Attorney General tell me how many cases were through to the board of negotiations from the city of Toronto? What were the types of criticism which the board of negotiation relayed to the Attorney General in the procedures which have been followed by various expropriating authorities?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the cases from the city of Toronto, in 1965— the latter part of that year—were just three. In 1966 there were 69. In the municipality of Metro Toronto, in 1965—the end of that year, from August 1 onward—there were 16 and in the year 1966, there were just 15. That is the city of Toronto and the municipality of Metro Toronto. Altogether I think approximately 72 and 31.

Now, some of the things that have been brought to our attention were the approaches

of various expropriating authorities by their appraisers; the failure to reveal information which the board of negotiation thought might very well have been made available; and some rather abrupt approaches—not anything that was outside The Expropriation Procedures Act—a failure in the view of the members of the board of negotiation to approach these people with information, to give them time to assemble their information and that sort of thing. These we have tried to correct by suggestion.

I think generally that we may say that in our expropriation procedures, including the board of negotiation, we have a pretty fair set of procedures. This is, as far as I can discover, quite well recognized. Some of the expropriating authorities in their carrying out of those procedures, no matter how well defined and delimited they are, do not exercise some of the discretion one would like to see them use.

I think the main thing which is left—again I hesitate to mention the law reform commission—is a study which is being done by the law reform commission on the basis of compensation. This is the big thing. If we can get a satisfactory formula or approach or method to assess and evaluate how to compensate a person whose property is being taken away, I think our procedures will show us the road on which to proceed and the method to use. If we can arrive at a satisfactory basis of compensation for that person who is losing his property, his home, his farm or whatever it may be, then I think we will have achieved a fair measure of success.

I hope we shall have the answer to that question very soon. I know a great and expensive study has been made by the law reform commission in that area.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman!

Mr. White: The member for Downsview asks all the questions but does not remain for the answers.

Mr. Sopha: The member for London South was not here all afternoon.

Mr. White: Oh yes I was.

Mr. Sopha: He was not here all afternoon.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, does the Attorney General expect that report during this session?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order; order, please; The member for Riverdale has the floor.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, does the Attorney General expect that report—when he says "soon"—is it going to be at a time when it can be dealt with in this session of the Legislature, because the only reason for my comment is that this is the report which is standing in the way of the urban renewal projects in the city of Toronto, it is one of the main stumbling blocks for the possibility of urban renewal to be carried out in various parts of the city of Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I am just as concerned as the hon. member for Riverdale about this and I think he will appreciate that. The material which was given to me by the law reform commission in connection with these estimates referred to the study on the basis of compensation for expropriation and indicated it would be completed for presentation this year.

I cannot make it closer than that. I have not talked to the members of the commission recently, but I would hope to have that report soon. I cannot answer the hon. member to say that I will have it ready and completed in this session, but I think we will have it very soon.

Mr. Renwick: Am I correct then that the reference in the Speech from the Throne to equitable dealing with older people whose property was taken for community purposes in relation to compensation, is to be dealt with only in terms of the statement made by the Minister of Economics and Development and has nothing whatsoever to do with any fundamental change in the basis of compensation for property taken by way of expropriation?

In other words, we have heard all that the government has had to say about the remarks which appeared in the Speech from the Throne in the statement made by the Minister of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I do not recall the remarks of the Minister of Economics and Development to which the member refers, but I would say that there is nothing to prevent us concluding any number of expropriation settlements even if we did not receive the report, the study of the law reform commission, on this subject, the basis of compensation. That is not to say that you cannot achieve in any situation of expropriation a satisfactory basis, satisfactory settlement of compensation for the property taken.

With no law whatever to guide me I could sit down with a person whose property was

required by an expropriating authority and say "Well, we will reach a settlement which will be fair in your view and fair in ours." I would not need a study to do that.

But I think we have so many expropriating authorities and so many of these situations arising, and so many decisions by the courts, it is well that we have some guidelines which will be accepted, be firmed up and be known to all persons. But there is nothing to prevent us reaching a fair basis of compensation today or tomorrow, whether we see this report then or not.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, what I want to draw to the attention of the Attorney General is the statement in the Speech from the Throne that:

> My government recognizes that the problems of the small homeowner, who through expropriation loses his home for the good of the community and thereby faces relocation. This is a matter which must be settled satisfactorily for all concerned. Embodied in the programme of my government will be provisions to deal with such situations.

Now it had been my understanding, because of the study of the law reform commission on the basis of compensation, that this was at least going to be one part of the provision which this government intended to make for the small homeowner at this session. The only statement that so far has been made is the procedure which has been outlined by the Minister of Economics and Development on the question of the acquisition of the land and the leasing of the land, and sale of the building, with some deferred payment basis for older persons who happen to be caught in an urban renewal expropriation and require relocation.

I think I am entitled to a simple answer. Is the Attorney General, in his department, going to bring forward anything which will deal with that specific matter referred to in the Speech from the Throne or have we heard all that the government is going to say from his colleague, the Minister of Economics and Development?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the hon. member well knows that it is impossible for me to stand in my place here and say what the government may do in the course of this session.

Mr. Bryden: Well what does it mean in the Speech from the Throne?

Mr. Sopha: Because you said that once before and you got burned.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh no, I have not been burned.

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes, you have been burned.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, the member does not bother me with that statement at all.

Mr. Sopha: I have a high regard for the ability of the Attorney General and he is not going to get bitten twice.

Mr. Bryden: He had the rug pulled out from under him.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I appreciate the confidence of the member for Sudbury.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Beware of anybody bearing gifts from that side.

Mr. Bryden: Let us get back to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well I am answering the hon. member for Riverdale at the moment, and I say I cannot stand here in my place and tell him, and I do not think he expects me to say just what legislation may be presented in this area.

Mr. Bryden: Well Mr. Chairman, the Speech from the Throne is supposed to be an announcement in general terms of the government's legislative programme; so is there any Minister who can explain the particular sentence referred to by the hon. member for Riverdale?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Perhaps I could offer an explanation of this.

The particular sentence or paragraph to which the hon. member for Riverdale referred was really dealing with some facets of the HOME programme, which is dealt with by the Minister of Economics and Development. This does not mean it excludes legislation that might come forward here, which would be brought down by the Attorney General if it stemmed from some recommendations that might come from the committee on law reform. I think this is perhaps the answer that the hon. member for Riverdale is looking for.

The other members I do not think really want an answer. They just want to sit here and barrack a little bit, but this I think is the answer the hon. member for Riverdale is looking for.

In other words, that particular phrase he quotes from the Speech from the Throne refers more particularly to certain action being taken under the aegis of the Minister of Economics and Development rather than under the aegis of the Attorney General.

Mr. Sopha: Is there anybody in the House that feels enlightened with all of that?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I only make one comment on the remarks of the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just make the one comment on the remark of the Prime Minister that the statement of the Minister of Economics and Development related to this specific topic of the relocation of people in urban renewal areas which is the main reason for the inclusion of that statement. The Minister of Economics and Development limited his remarks entirely to the case of the elderly person who is placed in that position; and I assumed, therefore, that this phraseology has very little meaning other than within the context that the Minister of Economics and Development has stated.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I think the Prime Minister's statement will be a grave disappointment to a great many people. There is a serious problem and certainly some people thought that reference in the Speech from the Throne was an indication on the part of the government that it was aware of the problem and that it proposed to do something about it.

Two urban renewal projects in Toronto bogged down because of the problem of finding a fair price for the people who had to vacate. As I understand the problem as it arose, the city, acting under what it conceived to be its authority—I think it is well advised legally and in other ways—made offers to these people which it thought was the limit of the offers it could make. The people concerned simply could not find living accommodation at anything even close to the prices being offered.

This is a very serious problem and it is going to hold up redevelopment. There are other phases relating to housing programmes generally that we do not need to get into here, but the problem did arise specifically in relation to expropriation, and the city of Toronto felt that it was not legally competent to offer to these people what it thought was a fair price.

That is my understanding of what has happened after following it over a period of some time in the press. My friend from Riverdale has been much more closely associated with it than I have, but this is essentially the problem. I take it from what is now being said that the statement in the Speech from the Throne which many people, including myself, had assumed indicated a willingness on the part of the government to do something about this, really works out to hollow words. Nothing is going to be done about it, and Toronto is going to be up against this same problem like other municipalities which want to engage in urban renewal. People whose property, whose homes, are now in urban renewal areas are going to be up against the same stone wall as they have been up against in the past 18 months. I had hoped that something was going to be done to remedy this situation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, could I add just another word to this. First of all, let me point out that in reporting on the board of negotiation it was shown that in the 450-odd cases they had dealt with, 64 per cent agreement had been reached and nine per cent were still outstanding. So let us say that it is likely that in at least two-thirds or 70 per cent of these cases where property is taken, settlement is being agreed upon at the first stage; at the very first stage with the board of negotiation sitting at the kitchen table.

Even if we do not get—and I hope we shall get—the report on the basis of compensation immediately, we still have a very extensive system of procedures to follow to reach a finality in the matter of expropriation, settlement, payment, and so on. There is nothing to prevent expropriation going forward today first through the board of negotiation, then through the other procedures laid out in our Expropriation Procedures Act. The thing can be finalized. My colleague from The Department of Highways will tell you that he is succeeding, and that the department has in the past succeeded in achieving settlement in some 95 per cent, 96 per cent, or 97 per cent of those situations.

There is nothing to prevent any municipality, if it goes out and approaches the matter in a reasonable mood, achieving somewhat similar success. Here we are at the first stage, the very first approach, and we can achieve two-thirds success. That is not too bad. Then we have all the procedures if necessary – arbitration – and maybe we can succeed at the second stage. Then there is the appeal, and so on, but I would like to have that study on the basis of compensation.

We asked for it last year. I think we have to afford the time. I know the field studies that have been made—actual field studies have been made in situations relating to the research of expropriation. I would like to have that. I do not like to move or suggest something when I do not have the knowledge which will be afforded to us when the study is complete and the report received. But we are not bereft of means to reach some mode of action in these expropriation matters.

Mr. Sargent: In the meantime people are getting hurt.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps someone will always feel hurt no matter how perfectly you reach a decision.

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not pull up your socks and get moving on it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would say that even when that study is received and a basis of compensation is stipulated and laid down that there will still be people saying: "I would not have given up my home for $50,000 and all they paid me was $30,000." That may be twice what they could get perhaps on the market in the city where they live. We will never have everyone perfectly satisfied, but what I do point out is that there are means to reach a fairly reasonable percentage of satisfaction and, as I say, one of our departments is achieving almost 100 per cent results and has been doing so over a number of years.

Mr. Sopha: We must keep a proper balance about this. The notion is sometimes disseminated in this House—I must say that our friends on the left here are the chief disseminators—that in every negotiation for the expropriation of property by a government body, the government is always wrong, and it is the government that is oppressing the owners.

Mr. Bryden: We have never disseminated that. That must be one of your ideas.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed. I stood in this House one night when our friends here kept saying that they should make available all their evidence, all their ammunition, all their briefs to the—

Mr. Renwick: It is your colleague—

Mr. Sopha: Well all right, I will speak for myself in this regard—

Mr. Bryden: Do not speak for us, please.

Mr. Sopha: I will speak for you because the impression is given by you—

Mr. Bryden: You are wrong, but you are doubly wrong when you speak for us.

Mr. Sopha: Let us wait until he gets finished. He gets wound up like a top and we have to wait for him to run down.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Are you finished?

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest that you speak for yourself. You do not do very well at that —you are a terrible speaker.

Mr. Sopha: I am going to speak for you. I am going to put it in the record plainly that my friend from Woodbine, and to a great extent my friend from Riverdale and indeed the member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) were in the debate one night and they conveyed the impression that it is always the government that is the oppressor.

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. There has been no such debate at any time in this House. There was a specific case where we believed that an injustice was being done to specific individuals and we spent quite a bit of time on it, but the member for Sudbury would really be occupied full time explaining his own statements. I would appreciate it if he would not grossly misrepresent what we have said here, and I think he has to accept our statement as to what our position is.

Mr. Sopha: I am paraphrasing him accurately and I have never up to this time made any contribution of any nature to this matter of expropriation. I want to say now that it is my own view that in a good many cases, that one-third of the cases that the Attorney General refers to, you often have people who take a very unreasonable and unrealistic view of the value of their property.

I have noticed this about human nature, that often the heirs of the original owner of the property who themselves did nothing to add one iota of increment of value to that property, take a very pronounced and exaggerated view of its value. You would think that they themselves, to watch them, had made a vast contribution to its value. Frequently the value of the property is socially created.

I can think of one case, I do not want to mention it for it would lose me about 150

votes if I mentioned it, but I can think of one where people are taking a very unrealistic view against a public authority which intends to expropriate. The people involved are the heirs a couple of times removed from the original owner who put his sweat and his labour into giving that property its value. You would think that they had hold of the Irish sweepstakes.

You run up against people like that. You have got a ticket on the horse that is the favourite in the grand national, and that is the third.

We, as legislators, have got to take count of that, and to be fair about it, I say with all respect to my friends to the left here, and with the greatest respect to my colleagues, the public bodies are not always wrong. They frequently are, but they are not always. After all, let us say, and here is a safe statement of principle that I can put in the record, that our first duty—the first duty of the government—is to protect the public money, and not waste it, not go throwing it about. I will take the opportunity tonight to say that in any negotiations with people, the government does not have to show its trump card. They run up against shrewd enough people. People are shrewd and they are able to manoeuvre and get the most out of a situation.

Mr. Bryden: Some are.

Mr. Sopha: It makes me laugh you know, to hear these fellows, the Pharisees. When I think of the case of Sigmund Samuel and how he held up the government down on the waterfront of Toronto here, and took the city of Metropolitan Toronto all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada to have his way. The old scoundrel—*requiescat in pace*—on the way, let us remember what he said; he said if they do not give me the amount of money that I think I should get for the property I am going to cut the city of Toronto out of my will.

He did. That is a matter of record. He said that. He said, I will not give all this money to the city of Toronto because they have not paid me my inflated price for my property down on the Gardiner expressway. And finally, presumably, I hope he got near what—I hope he did not cut the city out. The Minister of Municipal Affiairs can probably tell us that.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suppose that at this time of night we would expect that the member for Sudbury would exceed even himself in fatuousness, but it is unfortunate —

Mr. Sopha: It makes me laugh, you know!

Mr. Bryden: —but it is unfortunate that he has dragged in, I suppose for the ten millionth time in this House, a total irrelevancy to distract attention from a very serious problem. There are a great many people being expropriated who are not Sigmund Samuels or even nodding acquaintances of anyone who was a nodding acquaintance of his or anywhere in his league. I am well aware that the government has to deal with many people in the category of Sigmund Samuel, and I am quite sure that—

Mr. Sopha: A member of your party has said so.

Mr. Bryden: —and I am quite sure that any people in that category can look after themselves. That is why we do not bother bringing up their cases. But we are concerned about the fact that it is also necessary, unfortunately, to expropriate the properties of people who shall we say, and this is, although I am not citing any specific case this is quite representative of cases, have spent their whole working lives buying a house, paying off a house, which may have a market value now of about $9,000 or $10,000. In the city of Toronto that is not very much of a house, admittedly, but it is their house, it is their life savings. They have brought up their families and this is all they have. They are happy to live there for the rest of their lives.

But an expropriating authority comes along, and I do not represent the city of Toronto in the situation I am talking about as an ogre at all, because it recognizes the problem as well as the rest of us. It comes along and offers these people the market value of their house; and of course that is no good to them because they cannot get another place to live.

Now this is the kind of problem we are up against and I say it is a serious problem and if the hon. member—

Mr. Sopha: And so do we!

Mr. Bryden: —if the hon. member for Sudbury thinks it is worthy of a diversion about Sigmund Samuel then let him think so; but I regret that we got away from the problem.

Mr. Sopha: You should have no malice about these things.

Mr. Bryden: Now as far as I personally am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to pursue it any further at this point because it probably does come—the total solution to

the problem—is perhaps better to be found in the activities of the Ontario housing corporation rather than in those of the Attorney General.

Unfortunately, I do not think that there has been any solution offered by the Ontario housing corporation. But it is a problem and if there is any agency or adviser to the government that can suggest ways out of it, I think it would be most helpful and useful if we could find them.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 210 carried?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just to finish this matter off. I do not want to leave any misapprehension in the mind of the Attorney General as to what the problem is that the member for Woodbine has put forward and which I have been discussing. I do not want anyone to think that the board of negotiation has got any leeway to provide the solution to the kind of problem which the government recognized in the Speech from the Throne.

In the city of Toronto when the real estate department of the city of Toronto under an expropriating authority goes in to purchase a property or to acquire it under its power of expropriation, whichever method it uses to do so, it has been eminently fair and proper in arriving at the only decision which it can arrive at under The Expropriation Procedures Act. The board of negotiation, in the cases where they have gone to the board of negotiation, the board of negotiation may have been able to vary the figure but within very minor limits.

Then over and above that is the problem which the member for Woodbine recognizes, that the people require an extra $2,000, $3,000, $4,000 or $5,000 in order to be able to be relocated in the city of Toronto in a house which they own.

Now I had thought that perhaps one of the matters which the board of negotiation would have raised with the Attorney General when they were commenting about the work of their board was to bring this to his attention, from their aspect, the fundamental injustice of what was taking place so that the Attorney General would be aware also of the reaction of the board of negotiation to the numerous cases which have obviously come to them from the city of Toronto. If my memory serves me correctly, the Attorney General said that during 1966 there were some 65 properties which came before the board of negotiation and of that 65 a substantial number of them would be from the urban-renewal areas in the city of Toronto, rather than from some other area under which expropriation could take place.

Now if that is so, and knowing that there was a study being done on the basis of compensation, I had, and it appears now in complete error, assumed that that particular part of the Speech from the Throne was directed toward solution of that kind of problem on a legal basis, and on a basis which would recognize the hardship and recognize that people were entitled to be relieved from it.

Well the only statement, of course, is the one to which the Prime Minister has referred and which the Minister of Economics and Development made, which deals only with the assistance to elderly owner-occupants whose properties have been expropriated and does not provide in any way for any permanent alleviation of this hardship problem. If they require a deferred basis of payment for their home on land which they do not own but which they lease, then the deferred payments will be picked up in the event of their death, or in the event of a sale of the property.

I would just ask the Attorney General and the Minister of Economics and Development and the Prime Minister to put themselves in the position of elderly people, or people in their early 50's who are placed in the position where they own their home and then must accept the substitute which this government is going to give them.

In most people's mind their status as homeowner in situations such as this is very important. In return, what do they have? They have a leased piece of property which they do not own but which they are leasing from the Ontario housing corporation. The cost of the home or the payments which they are going to make on their home are payments which are going to be piled up until their death intervenes, at which time it will be claimed from them, claimed from their estate and from those to whom they thought they were going to leave this little bit of property, which in the case of most of these people is the sole asset which they have accumulated.

Now from the point of view of the psychological reaction of people in that kind of situation, then I say that the solution of the Minister of Economics and Development and the lack of solution by the Attorney General on the question of the basis of compensation just does not meet the problem which has been faced by people in the Donmount urban

renewal area, would have been faced in the Trefan court urban renewal area had it not had to grind to a halt for a number of reasons of which this is one of the primary reasons, and has been faced by people in Donmount and has been faced by people in Alexander Park.

The problem is that this government bears the substantial responsibility for not providing the kind of procedures which will at least eliminate to a great extent this particular obstacle in the way of carrying out urban renewal schemes. There is a sufficient number of problems in urban renewal schemes and the whole question of the approach to them without having this continuing stumbling block.

I think if the Attorney General, under the urging of the Minister of Economics and Development, can require the law reform commission to produce ahead of all the other studies the study on condominium, I suggest the Attorney General should be able to get the law reform commission to produce this study on the basis of compensation, limited only to the basis of compensation and if necessary dealing only with the basis of compensation in cases where properties are taken under urban renewal schemes.

That is the whole substance of my remarks, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave the vote, I believe the Attorney General indicated that his boards of negotiation receive no special instructions. From what has been said here tonight I think it is time the policy of the government be made abundantly clear in these matters where the government itself or some board responsible to the government acquires land under The Expropriation Procedures Act.

Unfortunately, many of the departments of government, as the Attorney General has pointed out, are able to make these purchases without going through the negotiations even required under this board or beyond. But we must always bear in mind that in these cases the public good is being served against the wishes of the individual. Surely it is our responsibility here to concern ourselves for the individual more than has been done in the past.

All of us as members of this Legislature believe that the administration has to concern itself with protecting the public first. But ahead of that surely it must concern itself with seeing that justice is done, particularly in the acquisition of land under the circumstances that we are discussing in this particular vote.

It is because of this, Mr. Chairman, that I think it is important that the government and its boards do not approach this important matter as if it were a contest or a game, as is so often the practice in legal proceedings. I feel that it is extremely important that the information upon which the government board bases its evaluation be known to all parties taking part in a negotiation of this sort. The theory that trump cards and key information be retained so that the individual is going to receive a lesser price than its actual value on the basis that the public purse is protected is surely not admissible under these particular circumstances. The fairness in the treatment of the individual must come ahead of all other considerations.

Now this is a matter surely of principle, and one that I had thought had really been accepted by the government. Surely it is a situation that has given rise to many of the difficulties that the government has encountered in recent years and months. You need only go back to the acquisition of land for the Upper Thames Valley authority some months ago, some years ago, when as I understand it the Minister himself refused to allow the actual evaluation figures to be released until such time as the matter erupted to the point where these figures had to be made known and so that the board of negotiation could proceed with some possibility or some thought of achieving success. I do not want to labour the point at this point in our discussions, but I feel that this is the time when my view, at least the view of our party in this matter, should be made abundantly clear.

Vote 210 agreed to.

On vote 211:

Mr. Sargent: Are you going to continue this vote, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: On vote 211.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, thank you!

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps before we go on with vote 211; it is now 11.40 p.m. I suppose the Prime Minister is prepared to sit here indefinitely to complete this vote?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, why is it necessary? I do not think we should have to sit here—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Because we have been sitting

here listening to the same thing being repeated.

Mr. Bryden: What is the Minister talking about?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We debated expropriation two weeks ago for hours and it has all been repeated tonight.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister does not have sufficient confidence in his own words that he would even rise in his place to state them. As far as I am concerned, I do not think there has been any unnecessary discussion. I have personally participated very little and so have other members of this group in the discussion tonight.

I do not know how much time we have taken up, it may have been half an hour or three-quarters of an hour all told, but I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is unreasonable to expect the House to sit on towards midnight. We have had this sort of thing before and I suggest to the Prime Minister that it is time to call it a day.

I do not have any idea what his overall plans are, but I think reasonable hours should be followed in the business of this House except in cases of extreme emergency, which I do not see before us now. It is not good enough for the government to say that the Opposition is taking up too much time. Governments have always said that from the beginning of time, and no doubt will always think it; but the point is it is now 11.40 p.m. and I think it is time to knock off.

An hon. member: We have until June, have we not?

Mr. Chairman: In the absence of a motion, the member for Grey North may deal with vote 211.

Mr. Sargent: In view of the late hour, there are some very important questions I would like to ask on this vote, Mr. Chairman, but I do want to say it is a bit amazing that the Attorney General from time to time has made personal observations that he would not see fit to inculcate certain changes in laws from his own personal standpoint. I think it is a shocking thing that our civil rights are in the hands of one person who can make such a decision. It is another shocking thing that members of the law reform commission were not in this House tonight to hear the thoughts of members elected by the people, on what reforms they should make in laws. This is another example of an exercise in futility. We stand here—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member would indicate what change in the law he is talking about here that I will not accept or will not contemplate.

Mr. Sargent: The Attorney General has been very patient and I do say that we have put him through the wringer here all right, in the last ten days, but he did make reference to the fact that he was not personally in favour of pre-sentence reports, and so in. I do not think it is the right of any one man to make laws himself personally. But I will get on to the vote now.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, we are on provincial police.

Mr. Sargent: Some people I know approach these things with an open mouth, and I can think of some people!

But, Mr. Chairman, the most important thing I think in the lives of small people are the laws that affect us and can take away our freedom. The most serious approach that has been made in all our current democracy in America has been currently completed in the United States in the national crime commission's survey. Briefly, they make recommendations that this government has made partial steps towards doing in the modern methods of crime detection, and for the protection of people and property. But I think you are moving very slowly and I would like, in summary, to suggest—they say in summary that the commission is convinced the only way to improve the situation is by amalgamating or pooling thousands of such small police forces so that a single authority can oversee the population groups of at least 50,000 people, which you are doing progressively in the OPP that we are discussing now.

They go on to say that they recommend new standardized communications equipment to provide most patrolmen with cigarette pack size walkie-talkies that would keep them in constant touch with headquarters. I am constantly uninformed or unaware of what you are doing insofar as getting new technology into your department, but no one seems to want to talk about it.

They say further that computerized operations for large departments would vastly increase the speed with which a telephoned alarm can be processed at headquarters and flashed to the squad car closest to the scene. We do not know why you are going to need

this $8 million more you are asking for in 1967-68.

They suggest further that you do a great community relations programme, including regular meetings with neighbourhood committees to explain police problems and to hear citizens' grievances. This is an approach that has never been tried, I do not think in my life in politics in Canada. The averages are, on things that happen in the United States, that one tenth of this is the picture in Canada. The authorities tell us there that there is organized crime there; which this government says there is not in Ontario, but which we proved there was. They say that $50 billion a year is spent on gambling in the United States, so using the average, $5 billion a year are spent in this country on gambling, and this is a greater income than the 20 top corporations in this country.

Yet here we are in this vote getting down to the area of spending less than .005 per cent to protect our people. It averages that there are 16,000 bookmakers in Ontario—now it is apparently a very sane proposition that the hon. the Attorney General bet nine races at Greenwood on an afternoon—

An hon. member: There are only eight races run there.

Mr. Sargent: Well, the cops can arrest any citizen for doing the same thing on the other side of the fence. It is apparently a state of moral grace if you are one of the 17,000 inside the fence who can afford to take the day off, pay the car fare, provide for lunch and get out to the racetrack, but immoral if you can slip two bucks to the bookmaker.

The figure goes on to say that in Canada there are 7,000,000 decks of cards purchased each year and about 40,000 of these are marked—they are crooked cards. There are about 400,000 pairs of dice and 15,000 pair of loaded dice. We are told that the mob, or the mafia, or the syndicate, or the cosa nostra, if you will, are now allied with the labour unions in the United States and possibly that could happen in Canada. We do not know, but they control gambling grossing $1 billion, and half of this money goes for payoffs to cops and crooked politicians, fees and salaries, and so on.

We have known members of the past government of the Tories to be on the take too, we know that. But while the average citizen struggles to pay his taxes, these people get away without paying any income tax on this money. My plea is that: we know what is going on so if you are going to spend $32 million in this department of the OPP and I take it you need some modern technology there, we should know from the Attorney General what is going on.

We have purchase of mobile equipment here, $3 million roughly, that is one million up from last year, for cars and mobile equipment. When we questioned the Minister of Highways if there were commissions paid on the cars he and the hon. Provincial Treasurer said they knew of no such thing. I was told, and I will go before a Royal commission to tell this, a top General Motors official told me they did pay off on instructions from the government. I would like to know who is the bag man who takes the money from the government and who distributes it? I would like to know if there are commissions on these $3 million worth of cars? I would like to know how you buy the cars? Are there bids on them? I would like to know how you let contracts where Shell Oil gets $339,000 worth while Sun Oil gets $86,000; Tip Top Tailors getting a contract for $155,000; Canada Church getting a $35,000 contract; London Life Insurance have a contract for the insurance for the OPP. Is this on a bid deal? How did they get these contracts?

There is so much to talk about, but the thing is that we need to go through this matter, which is so important to the lives of all our people, and we have to do it here at ten minutes to twelve at night when no one cares a thing about it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member on the purchase of the cars, bids are asked for from four manufacturers for every single car. The lowest bid is accepted and no commissions are paid. That is the way the cars are bought. They are bought from the manufacturer. Requirements of the force are set out and the four manufacturers asked to bid, and that is the way they are purchased on the low tender.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, is there a policy of rotation from year to year? Who writes the "specs" for these?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, there is no policy of rotation. There are four manufacturers—that would be Ford, Chrysler, General Motors and Rambler. Those are the people that we purchase the cars from. That is how they are purchased.

Mr. Sargent: Then there are no commissions paid to dealers?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: On the other items, the hon. member reeled off some figures to various firms—

Mr. Sargent: There was no orderly presentation, but I went through the accounts here and we have no way of knowing whether these were on a bid deal or not. It is not fair for me to ask you this now, but I would like to know if every bid we see here is a low bid deal.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is right.

Mr. Sargent: An invitation or a low bid?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We pick the lowest bidder in all cases.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 211; the member for Bracondale.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, not too long ago the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) tabled in the House a report which gave statistics with reference to accidents on the highways in the province of Ontario. This report showed that in 1966 there were a total of 1,347 fatal accidents. Of these 913 were on rural highways. It continues to amaze me that we place such a great emphasis on the preservation of property, but so little emphasis on the preservation of life.

The Ontario Provincial Police pride themselves on how quickly they can arrive at the scene of an accident. The OPP keep cars cruising the highways to be able to get to scenes of accidents in a hurry and keep traffic moving. But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the OPP does very little to see that the people injured in those accidents are taken to the hospital as quickly and as expeditiously as possible.

What happens at the present time if there is an accident on the highway? I do not know how long it takes an Ontario police car to arrive there, but I am willing to grant the Attorney General that it arrives there quite quickly. What happens then? That car has to radio for an ambulance to come to the scene and there is an interminably long wait.

It seems to me that something should be done in this regard. One of the things that could be done is for the Ontario Provincial Police to consider the Montreal example where station wagons were converted into cruiser-ambulances, and there was one for every police subdivision with one spare. They cruised as a normal police scout car. They operated under normal circumstances by police as they would a scout car, except that the police had received special training in first aid.

I would suggest that it is high time that the Ontario Provincial Police adopted this procedure, and out of every police division they had at least two cruiser-ambulances which would be continually patrolling the highways.

That in itself is not enough, Mr. Chairman, because those of you who have travelled the major highways, like Queen Elizabeth, or Frederick Gardiner, or 401, which is now called the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, or 400, know that even if you did have these ambulances, in some cases it would still be difficult to get the victims to the hospital in time. What we do have in the metropolitan area are helicopters operated by the major radio stations in this city. They are operated for the purpose of conveying to the motoring public the road conditions to be able to expedite their travel. They inform them how traffic is flowing, quickly or slowly, where the traffic bottlenecks are, telling them how to divert and so forth.

I think that to supplement a system of ambulances to be operated by the provincial police, they could also make arrangements with these radio stations who operate these helicopters, or even with other helicopter services in the area, that so many of the helicopters be converted into stretcher carriers, so that if there is a major accident on a highway during peak traffic where it would be difficult if not impossible for an ambulance to get to the scene of that accident and then from the scene of the accident to the hospital in time sufficient to see that the life of the victim was safe, then helicopters could be called in which would wait at the side of the road, pick up the victim and whisk him to the nearest hospital.

Now surely it is about time, considering the revenue that is taken from automobile owners in this province, that some of those funds were diverted to trying to save the lives of those people who are innocent victims in highway accidents, including the people who caused the accidents. This would not entail a great expenditure.

The Montreal police are able to supply such an ambulance at $7,000 each. They did their own work. They bought a station wagon and converted it. When you are out to save a life it is not important how cushy the ride is, but how fast you get to the hospital. I think it would be a simple matter

to supply two of these ambulances to every division in the province.

You must remember that they are not supplied in addition to existing scout cars, or cruisers, but they are replacing existing scout cars; so the difference would be the cost of conversion only and they can be used for this purpose, plus the helicopter service. I dare say—I am almost positive—that this figure of 1,347 will be reduced drastically and the number of serious injuries would also be reduced drastically.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would say that what the hon. member has suggested is known to us, but he does mention that this ambulance situation, with the police operating, is practiced in the city of Montreal. Now this is quite feasible perhaps in a metropolitan city, or in any fairly large city as a city proposition where perhaps there are two men assigned to a vehicle and it is a congested area and the police are close at hand to carry on the policing work.

But for the provincial police, through the province, in outlying areas, to attempt to provide an ambulance service with police personnel would be very impracticable.

First of all, if they were to pick up the injured and rush that injured person to hospital, with say two policemen assigned to that patrol to serve as first aid ambulance personnel on that trip, the accident goes uninvestigated. There is no direction of traffic.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Now let me finish!

You can do this in a city but you cannot do it out on a highway, unless you are going to take the police off their police duties and put them to work doing ambulance duty. Because if they are to pick up the injured and get them to hospital immediately, who remains to investigate the accident, who remains to direct the traffic, to make sure that another accident does not occur as a result of the traffic jam? This is not a feasible suggestion for the Ontario Provincial Police on the highways outside the cities. This is not feasible.

It would be far better to have ambulance personnel. The Department of Health have offered great assistance and made progress in that, but I think it is an impractical suggestion for the Ontario Provincial Police.

Mr. Ben: With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with the hon. Attorney General. I would point out however that he is still placing greater emphasis on the investigation of an accident than the saving of a life.

Let us take the situation where the Ontario Provincial Police are in one-man cars. The police have come to the scene of an accident. A person is injured. How long would it take to obtain the name and the driver's licence—that is the person involved, his driver's licence—take the man's name and his driver's licence and his insurance papers, the licence number of the motor vehicle, get the motor vehicles off the road and then proceed to the hospital after he has radioed what he has done to his headquarters.

As far as investigating the scene of an accident on a crowded highway, by the time the Ontario Provincial Police car normally reaches the scene of an accident, especially on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays, the marks of the accident have long been obliterated.

Now need I say to the Attorney General he is stressing the necessity for investigating an accident rather than saving a life, because in order to get the vital information for prosecution, or for interviewing witnesses, it would take less than two minutes. You say: Give me your licence, is this your name, is this your address, is this your insurance paper? And you; give me your licence, is this your licence, is this your name, is this your address, are these your insurance papers; were you driving that car, were you driving that car? I have to take the victim to the hospital, I want you to remain here until another constable from the OPP comes here to investigate; goodbye.

Now it takes just about as long as I took to say it, but the Attorney General seems to feel that it is more important for the policeman to remain on the scene, direct traffic, than it is to save a life. I think it is a deplorable attitude to be adopted by any member of this government, or in fact anybody.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 211 carried?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the Attorney General; has the department ever considered supplying the hospitals with transmitter receivers tuned to the same frequency that the provincial police use, so in case of an accident like this the hospital is alerted that the injured individual is going to this hospital in the community; and likewise possibly someone could be telling how serious the injury actually is and the hospital would be prepared well in advance.

This was used very well on the accident in which the sand truck and the bus were involved back in Essex county and I think it is a thing that could be used throughout the province well.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is practically so. Almost all hospital ambulance services are on the same frequency as the provincial police. They have tried to work this out and it has been largely accomplished.

I would like to return for just a moment to the hon. member for Bracondale. As he recites checking the accident, getting the name, the licence, the particulars. It is not just that easy, it is not just that quick. I would like to suggest this to him, that the investigation of an accident, the securing of the evidence and the prosecution of the driver who is guilty perhaps of some negligence or perhaps a quasi-criminal or criminal act, in connection with that accident, is just as important as saving life and perhaps more important than getting one or two injured persons to hospital, because—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I say that the investigation of the accident, so that accidents may be prevented by prosecution of those who offend, is an important feature of saving life and the prevention of accidents.

Mr. Ben: That is not the way the Attorney General said it the first time!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I perhaps did change it on second thought, to say that it is a very important feature in the saving of life.

Mr. Ben: Every action in the long run involves making some change. The mere fact of clinically observing something affects the experiment that you are conducting.

But here again I suggest that the Attorney General is more interested in supplying figures for the statistics compiled by the Minister of Transport and he is not saving lives.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask the Attorney General how many jurisdictions, additional jurisdictions, the Ontario Provincial Police took over in the last preceding year?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Fifty-five.

Mr. Sopha: How many municipalities are they now responsible for?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: As near as I can say quickly, 90; in that neighbourhood, 90 municipalities—

Mr. Sopha: What real progress is being made in getting rid of the small force as recommended in the report of the commissioner of a few years ago?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, we discussed this in my estimates when we were discussing the Ontario police commission estimate. I am not sure whether the hon. member was here. We have mentioned it in the House in debate. The policy of the Ontario Provincial Police as enunciated by the Ontario police commission and approved by the government, is to take over these smaller forces and have them policed by the Ontario Provincial Police. We started and have completed the take-over of the one-man forces. That was initiated last year, toward the end of the year, and we have done 45, I believe.

Municipalities were offered that. One-man forces were offered that option and the greater number of them, with the exception of I think four or five or six, came in on that plan. I think the reason for the others delaying was to make arrangements for their present one-man personnel.

We are proposing to move to the two, three, four and five men forces as soon as that can feasibly be accomplished. We are asking in these estimates tonight for an increase of 200 personnel—that is uniformed personnel—and 25, I think it is, secretarial or office personnel.

I think that fairly well answers the question of the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Just one other thing. Is the Attorney General aware, that there is a blot on the escutcheon of human dignity in one facet of the Ontario Provincial Police work, and that is the existence of this so-called anti-gambling squad? Does the Attorney General know what they do? They go about this province and they literally smash down doors of private homes with sledge hammers and break up poker games where the stakes are a quarter and a half-dollar. A bunch of people will foregather and the police will spend days in watching and besetting these premises. They will finally break up a game of that nature. I say to the Attorney General that this is, in my view, a tremendous assault on human dignity. Yet if you belong to a private club—to see the grossness of it—then within the safety of the walls of that club, people can engage in poker games with hundreds of dollars.

There is one private club that it is said to be as exclusive as the Toronto stock exchange, but the provincial police would

never think of breaking into that one and arresting the people. Can you imagine the enormity of this conduct?

I must put on the record that I am involved in a case right now, but that does not constrain me from mentioning the enormity of this conduct, where you have paid public servants going around the province and bothering people who are really committing no social harm. It is not harmful for them to play in a quarter poker game.

I disagree totally and unreservedly with the person who says it is harmful. There is nothing wrong with that. I would far rather see people involved in a little game of poker than to see them sit around beer parlours day after day and neglect to take the pay cheque home to the wife because they are drinking up the suds in some bistro.

This has created great activity over in front of the Attorney General, but I speak the truth when I say that this is what is going on. They have this foolish squad within the provincial police that—well, let us be specific about it. There was a case some years ago which is illustrative. I remember telling Kelso Roberts about this case where you had a group of Slav workers at INCO.

Here were Slavs who were single or were married and their wives were back in the old country. In Sudbury they had a place, a rooming house, and every Saturday night or frequently there would be a little game and the stakes were a quarter or a half-dollar. The provincial police came up there and here is what they did.

One of these anti-gambling fellows got a job at the same place as one of the players. It took two or three months to give him the proper front to get the confidence. Then he finally got invited into the game and he played in the game two or three times. Eventually, in came this anti-gambling squad and the evidence was produced by the agent provocateur who was in the game. He himself was one of the anti-gambling squad.

I would like somebody to try to convince me that this group of Ukrainians and Croatians or Serbians as they were and the fact that they played in a little game of that nature caused any social harm or in any way interfered with the morals of the people of the city of Sudbury, much less to say, their own morals.

That is an actual case and that is the extent to which this foolishness goes. It may be that the commissioner has in his mind that he has to stamp out every infringement of sections 161 through 175 of the criminal code, whatever its nature. Well, to that, as I have already said, apply the law equally. If you are going to break into a rooming house where some Slavic workers play, then take the Queen's writ into some of the better private clubs on a Sunday afternoon. Do not discriminate.

On the other hand, if the commissioner thinks there is a social harm here, there is an evil or a vice to be eradicated, then the Attorney General, Mr. Chairman, should correct him, and should say to him: "Stop this."

I cannot imagine any greater assault on human dignity than at two o'clock in the morning they knock twice in order to comply with that part of the criminal code that says they are to try to gain entry in the normal way. Now nobody in one millionth of a second could possibly get to the door in that time. So having knocked twice, up with the sledge hammer, which is at the ready, and they knock the door right off its hinges and in they go.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Is the door locked in this case?

Mr. Sopha: Well, are you not allowed to lock your door? I lock mine, but I do not expect a provincial policeman to knock it down.

An hon. member: You wait till you have—

Mr. Sopha: Well, I will confess that I have had a game at my house, and indeed magistrates have played in it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But did you lock the door?

Mr. Sopha: And lawyers too.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, and no rake-off either, and it is going to be demonstrated in the case at bar that there was no rake-off either, but we will not try that here. We will try that elsewhere. But you see the point I make, that if they were playing for a quarter ante, there is nothing wrong with a little rake-off in my view. It is only that it is illegal.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: But there is nothing morally wrong about that. A lot more anti-social and evil and damaging conduct goes on within this society than that. It is interesting to note that these anti-gambling people, when they are not out smashing somebody's door down

about the province, they are up here protecting us. I know them all, and they have been around here in their spare time. And something—let us just leave that allusion. I say to my friend from St. George, something may happen around here. Let us just leave it like that, without saying any more. But they are here because it is said that Gruber is coming up and he is going to hang from the balconies and read his petition with one hand. When they are not busy, as I say, out in the province doing this, they are up around here. I am willing to say that I think it is just simply terrible that the people in this province, in a democracy, have to be victimized by that type of conduct of an arm of the law, and all in the name of the administration of justice. Those are my views and I will stand or fall by them.

Vote 211 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, will there be the private members' hour at five o'clock, as usual, tomorrow?

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.15 o'clock, a.m.

No. 53

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, April 5, 1967

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 5, 1967

Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Smith, first reading 1757

Air Pollution Control Act, 1967, bill intituled, Mr. Dymond, first reading 1759

Questions to Mr. Randall re geared-to-income housing units, Mr. Newman 1761

Questions to Mr. Robarts re Niagara parks commission, Mr. Nixon 1761

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall 1762

On notice of motion No. 5, Mr. Rowe, Mr. Farquhar, Mr. MacDonald 1782

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Dymond, agreed to 1792

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1967

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students in the east gallery from Our Lady of Victory separate school, Toronto; in the west gallery St. Mark's separate school, Stouffville; a group of ladies from Westway United Church women's group from Etobicoke in the Speaker's gallery, and guests from Clarke institute, Toronto, in the west gallery.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to introduce to the House 30 civil servants from many parts of the world, who are at present seated under your gallery at the north of the chamber. They have been attending a three-day seminar arranged by my department in cooperation with the external aid office, Department of External Affairs, and five Ontario government departments which have provided speakers. The departments are those of Education, Health, Labour, Municipal Affairs and the Treasury board, all of which have described to these students the procedures which govern the operations of these departments of the government of Ontario.

All of these officials, Mr. Speaker, have been chosen by their governments to learn as much as they can about Canadian forms of administration and we are very happy that Ontario has been chosen, for the fourth consecutive year, to conduct this seminar. Perhaps I should also add that these young people have been taking a course in public administration at Carleton University in Ottawa and with them is Professor A. M. Willms, who is responsible for this part of their Canadian education.

Instead of giving you the names of their countries in alphabetical order, I thought I would give you them by regions of the world. We have representatives from Korea, Malaysia and Thailand in Asia; the African country of Nigeria; the West Indian islands of Barbados, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Dominica and Jamaica, and from the Central American countries of Guyana and British Honduras. As well, there is one official from the Mediterranean island fortress of Malta.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I speak for all members of the House when I wish them every success in their studies here and even greater success when they proceed to apply what they have learned to the greater advancements of the countries from which they have come.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Smith: The purpose of the bill is to make it illegal to possess LSD.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I rise on a question, I assume of personal privilege. Yesterday there were some remarks bandied about in this House concerning the McNamaras, and then subsequent to that the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) apparently went out in the hall and spoke to the press. There is a report in today's *Globe and Mail* in which he said that Mr. Robarts and Mr. McNamara are personal friends, and they were recently at a hockey game together occupying a box in the reds.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Terrible crime, that.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would like to set the record straight. There is an inference, of course, in the member's remarks that there is some large arrangement between Mr. McNamara and myself in order that he could get this business at Expo. On that particular occasion when I went to a hockey match, I was asked by the directors of Maple Leaf Gardens and the officials of the

Maple Leaf hockey team to drop the first puck in order to open the NHL season in the city of Toronto.

This was an occasion, I might say, that I enjoyed very much. Mr. McNamara happens to be a director of the Maple Leaf hockey club, and I attended on that occasion for that game in the company of all the directors of the Maple Leaf hockey club. Mr. McNamara happened to be one of them, so that is the fact behind this allegation of me attending hockey games with Mr. McNamara.

Now then, I will deal with the $100 dinner proposition. Quoting from the *Globe and Mail* he—I presume this is the member for Sudbury—said, "Mr. McNamara tendered a $100-a-plate dinner for Mr. Robarts shortly after he became Premier." Then there are brackets: "The dinner was held at the then new Ports of Call restaurant on Yonge Street in 1962, the night before the official opening of the restaurant." Mr. Speaker, there was a $100-a-plate dinner tendered me at the Ports of Call. Mr. McNamara is the proprietor of the Ports of Call.

I have checked with the man who organized this dinner—of course these things are not unusual in the political world—and Mr. McNamara, not Mr. McNamara personally but his organization that operates the Ports of Call, was paid the sum of $20 a plate for whatever it provided. I might say it was a very good dinner, and certainly the quality of the catering that Mr. McNamara provides is very high indeed. But the dinner was not tendered by Mr. McNamara; he was simply the proprietor of the establishment in which the dinner was held. The arrangements were not made by me; I was a guest at the dinner. Therefore the inference that the member tries to elicit in this case is just about as phoney as the inference he is trying to draw from the hockey match.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): How much was raised at the dinner?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is none of the member's business, and in any event I really do not know. I was a guest there and happy to attend.

I would just say this, Mr. Speaker, it is not really very pleasant to have to rise in one's place in this House to answer these really trifling allegations such as are brought forward in this case. I do not think the member does himself, his party, or this House any favour whatsoever when he makes remarks similar to this.

Mr. Sopha: I rise on a point of personal privilege. I wish to observe to you, Your Honour, as the servant of the House, that yesterday when I attempted to rise on a point of personal privilege I was not accorded the free opportunity of speaking that has been accorded to the Prime Minister today.

However, yesterday, sir, an aspersion was cast against me by a Minister of the Crown which not only impugned my honour but also constituted an affront to the people whom I represent. This morning I was gratified to have a communication at the earliest time—at nine o'clock this morning—from the president of the united steel workers of Sudbury, who told me that he was then in the act of making a personal communication to the Minister of Economics and Development in order to convey to him his resentment at the type of language that that Minister used against me yesterday.

As a matter of principle, sir, I want to say in this House as a member, and on behalf of the people I represent, that I deeply resent the words used by that Minister and I ask you, sir, as the Speaker of the House to ask him at this time to withdraw them from the record.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister wish to speak to the point of order?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Yes I do, Mr. Speaker.

You know the old saying that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. I think the hon. member for Sudbury should remember that when he wants to hand it out he should be prepared to take it. I give him fair warning that I am prepared to hand it out if I have to take it. I am not at all impressed with his court room manner up in Sudbury. It means nothing to me down here.

Mr. Sopha: He continues this scurrilous attack!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I have always assumed that the hon. member for Sudbury was a fair and a just man in dealing with the people on this side of the House until he made these unprecedented and unwarranted insinuations yesterday of improprieties against my people and Mr. McNamara in this House. If he has had an opportunity to read the statement—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I think in all due respect to the Minister, the point of order is on the remark, the interjection that was made by the Minister and not really on the subject matter of the question which was asked and answered. So I think perhaps in speaking to the point of order the remarks should be confined to the point that was raised that the member feels offended about, and which the Minister made in the form of an interjection. I might say at this point that all interjections in the House are out of order, and therefore when the member rose yesterday to speak to this point of order I was of the opinion that there was no point of order because the interjections made by the Minister were out of order. In fact both members were out of order for a considerable length of time, and therefore I was ruling the matter out at that time. So if the Minister would speak to the point of order, and only on the subject matter of the point of order—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to abide by your ruling, but perhaps I am not as familiar with the parliamentary procedures as my hon. friend over here. But let me suggest this: I think I can make him happy this afternoon, that is why I am here. I do not want to see him upset, believe me. After tossing and turning all night and recognizing that I had perhaps upset the hon. member for Sudbury, I am quite prepared to withdraw the statement I made that I think he must have a criminal mind—I said "must" —I did not say he had.

However, if he finds this offensive I am quite prepared to withdraw it.

Now I wonder if he, in fairness to Mr. McNamara, without a shred of evidence that he has on the matter he spoke about yesterday, if he also would be fair enough to stand up and withdraw the allegation made against me, the people in my department and Mr. McNamara.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I have always been taught at my mother's knee to forgive those who transgress and the Minister has my forgiveness.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to revert to bills? I am sorry that I was delayed.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Minister the unanimous consent of the House to revert to the introduction of bills?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Is this to capitulate to the doctors? OK, we will let the Minister do it!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is to capitulate.

THE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, 1967

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled The Air Pollution Control Act, 1967.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This legislation is the result of much study and progressive action over the past eight years. Initially, the control of air pollution was delegated in its entirety to the municipalities. While this met with some success, it became apparent that the industrial aspects were really beyond the scope of municipalities and were being neglected. In 1963, the Act was amended to provide for provincial control of industrial sources of air pollution, while the control of the products of combustion, or fuel burning operations remained with the municipalities.

While some 26 municipalities passed by-laws under The Air Pollution Control Act, 1959, and three municipalities continued to operate under provisions of The Municipal Act (since repealed), only four municipalities went forward to employ a staff full time on air pollution control work.

Over the past several years, the concepts of air pollution control have advanced considerably. Originally, restrictive measures were predicted on the basis of municipal boundaries and employed emission standards based on available equipment. Today, because of our advances in technology, we are employing the concept of ambient air quality, which means the quality of our atmosphere expressed as the concentration of specific air contaminants which relates to human, animal or plant life. In using this approach, it is necessary to take into account the many factors which affect the contaminant after its release to the atmosphere. Based on available data of the effects of contaminants on human health, on vegetation, and on animal life, ambient air quality criteria will be set.

These criteria will be used to arrive at the degree of air pollution control required throughout the province. Factors such as topography, meteorology, land usage, and density of population, have an important role, and are all considered in arriving at the control required. Some areas in the province

experience more frequent and prolonged temperature inversions than others; therefore, more restrictive control measures are required because the pollutants do not disperse readily. Similarly, for sources located in valleys, more restrictive control is required.

Specific air contaminants have injurious effects on certain types of vegetation; high rise buildings present specific problems; therefore, the land usage is of importance when setting controls.

Because of the complexity of the problem, and since air pollution is no respecter of municipal, provincial or international boundaries, the new legislation will provide for centralized control in one agency. We believe we have fairly tried first, municipal control, then divided control, and neither have met with the measure of success necessary or possible. Therefore, because of local effects of air pollution, district and regional offices will be set up so that contact will be maintained with the public.

Existing municipal air pollution control agencies will be absorbed into the new structure on an orderly basis to provide for a continuation and expansion of existing programmes.

All matters of trans-boundary flow of air pollution between the United States and Canada are referred to the international joint commission. A member of my staff serves on the advisory board for the new air pollution reference, covering the Sarnia-Windsor area, and will play a major role in the work under this reference.

Also included in the proposed legislation are sections which will enable the province to deal with the problem of automobile exhausts. Control will be exercised by means of regulations which will require the installation of the necessary devices at the manufacturing level. Recent information from California has indicated that the presently installed devices are experiencing substantial losses in efficiency in the first year of operation. Therefore, it is not intended to make the automotive exhaust control regulations effective until this loss in efficiency, with its attendant servicing problem, has been rectified. However, these controls will be established on motor vehicles in Ontario, to meet our Ontario situation, as soon as control devices are considered practical and effective.

Under this legislation, it is proposed also to set up a negotiations procedure which would be implemented when it is considered that air pollution has caused damage to agricultural crops or livestock.

The air pollution control service of The Department of Health will be expanded to undertake its new duties of enforcement. Additional personnel will be recruited to broaden the ambient air quality, meteorological effects, and laboratory programmes which are already under way.

It should be stressed, sir, that this is not a crash programme, but an orderly progression of control with built-in flexibility which has evolved over the past eight years.

In order to provide for an orderly transition period from municipal to provincial control, existing municipal by-laws will continue to operate until such time as the provincial regulation is made effective in that area.

The following is an outline of the timing and phasing of the provincial air pollution control programme.

Metropolitan Toronto, Peel county, Hamilton and London employ full-time staff, and as such will be included in the first phase.

Municipalities such as Oshawa, Ottawa, Windsor and St. Catharines have either part-time staff or have indicated a strong interest and should be associated with the second phase of the programme.

The third phase of the programme would encompass the starting of activities in the Kitchener-Waterloo-Galt-Guelph area and an expansion of the Peel county operation to include Halton county.

The fourth phase of the programme would see the expansion of the first, second and third phases, as well as the incorporation of the remaining areas to provide for total control in those areas which require it.

Because of the flexibility built into the total programme, it will not be necessary to adhere rigidly to the above phasing. Consequently, it may be possible to speed up the programme as it progresses.

Each phase of the programme is estimated as taking one year to complete with the exception of the first phase which will take 18 months, assuming a starting date of June, 1967.

It should be noted that the control of industrial emissions will proceed regardless of the phasing in the total programme, since it will be carried out on an industry basis. For this purpose, an industry classification system based on air pollution potential will be used, and all sources in any one classification will be subject to control at the same time irrespective of location.

We still believe that our previously estimated time of five years for the industrial aspect of the programme is reasonable and possible.

With the proposed phasing just announced, we aim to achieve effective control of all air pollution, where this is possible, within this five-year period, but I repeat, we are determined to keep all of our programmes flexible, to the end that we are not slavishly wedded to a stated dateline. We hope to attain our objective as quickly as possible and this will always be our aim.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, notice of which has been submitted to him.

In view of the press release announcing that a new schedule of lower rates for geared-to-income housing units was to be effective on April 1, will the Minister state why the proposed reduction in rental has been postponed? Will any rent reductions be made retroactive to April 1?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question the press release which I issued on February 8, 1967, dealing with the introduction of a new rental scale applicable to all geared-to-income rental developments administered by or on behalf of the Ontario housing corporation did not state the scale would go into effect on April 1, 1967. What I did say was: "the new scale will be put into effect in the immediate future".

As the hon. member is particularly interested in the new rental scale as it affects the city of Windsor, perhaps a recent letter addressed to the mayor of that city by the Ontario housing corporation will effectively reply to the questions which he has raised, and I quote:

> I have for acknowledgment your telegram concerning the introduction of the new rental scale in Ontario.
>
> Your understanding that the scale will go into effect May 1, 1967, is correct. However, I am afraid it will not be possible to adopt your suggestion that it be made retroactive to April 1, 1967, with a resulting rebate for any overpayment of rent during the period April 1, to April 30, 1967.
>
> For your information there are some 20 variations of the basic scale depending on the area and type of accommodation provided. Furthermore some 8,000 tenants are affected, and from this you will appreciate the tremendous amount of work that is involved. It was suggested by central mortgage and housing corporation that we might wish to introduce the scale progressively in view of the work involved. However, we felt that in fairness to all of our tenants, the scale should go into effect simultaneously in all of our developments across the province.

Mr. Newman: If I may ask a supplementary question of the Minister. Am I to assume the press release issued by the Ontario housing corporation announcing on February 24 a new schedule of lower rates which were to become effective April 1 is incorrect? I am reading from the Wednesday, March 29, issue of the Windsor *Star*.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that statement was made by central mortgage and housing. We were not notified of it until March 3. There may be some confusion in the paper, but our notification came through from Ottawa on March 3.

Mr. Newman: The press release specifically states Ontario housing corporation.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You see I do not know. I cannot answer that. I simply say that we were notified on March 3 that the scale could be changed.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Now that the Prime Minister has officially acknowledged and accepted the resignations of the Niagara parks commission, can he inform the House the nature of the complaints expressed in the letters leading to the resignations?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there is no change in the status of the letters which I received from those members of the Niagara parks commission who chose to resign and whose resignations have been accepted. Therefore I do not propose to alter my decision or my opinion that I have previously expressed in the House, in regard to revealing the contents of the letters.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): They did not give any reasons.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Ask the Prime Minister.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the Prime Minister would permit a supplementary question?

Does he, in his position of responsibility, believe that an operation like the Niagara parks commission can have its leading executives retire under this particular cloud without feeling it necessary that the people of Ontario know the reasons for the disruption?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the game, it is not a question of the people of Ontario knowing the reasons for the disruption. What we are dealing with here are letters that are written to me and that are marked either "personal and confidential" or "private and confidential."

Mr. Nixon: This is public business.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now just a moment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I cannot start to reveal to this House or to anybody else, communications that are so marked to me. I receive a certain number of communications from people who are not necessarily of my own political persuasion. Of course there must be correspondence that goes to the member's office on the same basis. I am not arguing, nor am I discussing with him here at this time, the contents of these letters. I am just discussing the principle as to whether I can reveal contents of mail that is sent to me and marked in that particular way. It is my own opinion that I cannot. It is my own opinion that if I were to do so, there would be all kinds of mail that simply would not come to me if—

Mr. Nixon: This is a public agency.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —if such a qualification is put on the communication to me. I recognize the difficulty that the member raises. On the other hand, I have received no communication from any of these people. If they want to reveal what they have put in a letter to me and marked private and confidential, that is their affair, but I cannot see how I can preserve my own position if I reveal such information. I do not know what the leader of the Opposition himself would feel if he were to write me a letter and so mark it, and then find out that I had released it. I have had some experience in this area myself and frankly, if things are so marked and the request ignored, you simply stop writing letters.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He has defended the indefensible in the operation of that government agency.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): That is off the record.

Mr. MacDonald: No, it is on the record.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I had a question yesterday of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) and he said he would answer it today.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The tenth order; House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, the basic purpose of my department is to plan and carry out activities which will lead to optimum performance of the Ontario economy. Our economic and statistical research seeks to provide an analysis of economic conditions and circumstances, upon which the financial and economic policies of the whole government may be based, as described in the recent Budget statement. The operating agencies of my department are designed to create a congenial climate for business investment and productive enterprise, and to fulfil directly a number of our economic and social requirements.

Before going into the plans and programmes of my department, I would like to review briefly the progress Ontario is making towards achieving its long-run economic goals. This review will help to provide a framework within which our many programmes such as housing, immigration, and trade and industrial promotion can be discussed.

As you will recall, the targets we have set for the Ontario economy for the period 1963 to 1970 were described in the Legislature in April, 1965, and they are as follows:

An average annual growth rate in gross provincial product of 5.5 per cent in constant dollars; an average increase of 75,000 new jobs each year; reduction of unemployment to a rate of no more than two per cent by 1970; an average productivity increase of 2.5

per cent per year; substantially higher exports of manufactured goods of 10 per cent each year, with an overall increase of exports averaging five per cent a year.

Now what are the achievements?

A comparative analysis indicates that in 1964, 1965, and again in 1966, we made impressive progress towards realizing and exceeding these goals. Our economic achievements over these three years measure up against our targets as I will outline:

Ontario's gross provincial product in real terms has grown by 20.4 per cent since 1963, compared with our target of 5.5 per cent a year. In current dollar value, our gross provincial product reached $22.8 billion in 1966.

Since 1963, our total employment has risen by 268,000 to a level of 2,650,000. This exceeds our employment goal by 43,000 jobs. In 1966 alone, the number of people employed rose by 102,000 as compared with our target of 75,000 new jobs annually.

This rise in employment was produced by new factories and business expansions. During 1966, all sections of manufacturing industry shared in the expansion of Ontario's industrial base. Across the province, 179 new manufacturing plants were established in 1966, for a total investment of $357.5 million in land, buildings, and equipment. This investment provided 10,265 people with employment, on 3,277 acres of newly acquired property, in 7.9 million square feet of manufacturing space.

In addition to these new industrial plants, nine joint ventures were established in Ontario last year. These new companies are classified as jointly owned through mutual participation of equity and/or patented product contribution. New plant expansions in 1966 totalled 391, providing jobs for 15,412 people and 14 million square feet of space. Total investment for plant expansions amounted to $389 million across the province.

Also in 1966, a total of 123 licensing agreements were successfully negotiated in the province.

These few facts illustrate the dynamic expansion taking place in this province despite heavy competition from other highly industrialized areas of the world.

Our goal is to reduce unemployment to two per cent of the labour force by 1970. In 1964, we reduced the unemployment rate to 3.2 per cent, and in 1965 reduced it further to 2.5 per cent. Last year we maintained this level of 2.5 per cent, a considerable accomplishment in a year of very high immigration and very large growth in the labour force.

On the score of productivity, the economy has also run ahead of schedule. Our goal for productivity improvement is a compound annual rate of 2.5 per cent. Actually, we have achieved a productivity gain of 2.7 per cent on average over the last three years. The productivity rise in 1966, however, was below target, and considerably less than the three per cent advances recorded in 1964 and 1965. The slowing of the economy last year, particularly the manufacturing sector, undoubtedly contributed to this lower rate of productivity gain in 1966. A reduced rate of growth in such high productivity industries as automobiles, as occurred last year, has a very significant impact on our overall productivity performance. To achieve our long-term productivity goal therefore, we must keep the economy operating at a high level and pursue the kind of growth policies set out in this year's Budget.

Our export performance has also been extremely satisfying. Canadian exports of fully manufactured goods which largely originate from Ontario, rose by 42 per cent in 1964 and 17 per cent in 1965, as compared to the target increase of 10 per cent a year. In 1966, there was a further rise in exports of manufactured goods of 63 per cent. This puts us far ahead of our target to date, and the remarkable advances in exports we have achieved demonstrate the effectiveness of our programme to promote exports and to improve access by our manufacturers to foreign markets. That is pre-selling Ontario as a source of manufactured goods of high quality, contributed greatly to this export increase in 1966.

To sum up, the overall performance of the Ontario economy to the end of 1966 compares very favourably with the targets we have set for ourselves.

Turning now to 1967 and beyond, I believe we can confidently expect further substantial advances towards our economic goals. Certainly the plans and activities of my department have this as their ultimate aim, and I would like to touch on just a few of these in the next few minutes.

First, Ontario's high prosperity, along with our efforts to attract skilled workers, will ensure continued high immigration.

Some 330 Ontario employers used the services and facilities of the immigration branch in recruiting personnel overseas in 1966 and they spent about $190,000 in advertising their needs. All the necessary follow-up regarding immigration formalities and travel was taken care of by the branch on behalf of the employers and their new employees.

In addition, some 12,000 applications, received from skilled intending immigrants, were circulated by the Toronto office to about 900 potential Ontario employers.

Net results were that over 3,000 job offers were made to intending immigrants by Ontario employers in 1966.

Although it is not possible to pinpoint the total number of immigrants who are influenced to come to Ontario through the counselling and promotional efforts of our immigration branch, the total figure for this year shows that about 38,000 immigrants came from Britain. It is known also that about 65 per cent of these immigrants were destined to come to Ontario. As a matter of further interest, immigration from Britain is up 52 per cent over the same period last year.

Total immigration into Ontario for 1966 was 107,621 which was 54 per cent of the total immigration into Canada.

Second, Mr. Chairman, we must intensify our efforts to encourage research and stimulate industrial innovation to help raise productivity.

To this end, the new Ontario research foundation building at Sheridan Park will be substantially completed during April. And work has commenced on the installation of the in-lab services and equipment. Naturally, this phase of construction will continue beyond the completion of the general contract, but plans are being prepared for moving equipment and personnel from Queen's Park during the month of May.

This year the province will provide a grant of $775,000 to the ORF for research. The largest portion of this grant is for backup research, which is essential in order to keep up with current scientific activities.

In addition, my department's trade and indutry branch will provide funds for certain industrial research services performed by ORF. This is a free service to Ontario's manufacturing industries that provides field engineering and technical information. It is particularly valuable to small companies that have limited or no technical resources.

Sheridan Park is unique in Canada. It gives our scientists and engineers a chance to build a research future at home—discourage the brain drain—and offers their creative minds the challenge of new product development, without which our economy cannot grow.

Third, Mr. Chairman, but of greatest importance, will be our efforts to increase exports, through trade and industry branch programmes, which will lead to further expansion of our strong secondary manufacturing sector.

One innovation in our sales programme this year is the Ontario international task force—a special group of trade experts assigned to service world markets.

The duties and responsibilities of this initial 12-man task force will be to find development capital, seek new industries, and promote technological advance through the association of joint industrial ventures and licensing arrangements both at home and abroad. In addition, the task force will explore untapped markets for the sale of Ontario products, and promote the use of Ontario engineering services for construction projects in foreign markets.

The realignment of Ontario commercial trade officers now abroad is most essential if this province is to play its part in meeting Canada's drive for increased export sales.

I might say the splendid cooperation extended by the federal Department of Trade and Commerce and its many commercial trade representatives in various parts of the world has done much to assist Ontario manufacturers in becoming established in new export markets. But the need to follow-up leads uncovered by Ontario manufacturers in these markets is a prime requisite if the export of Canada's manufactured goods is to improve or even hold its own in the competitive months that lie ahead. This new task force will supplement the good work already being done by the federal Department of Trade and Commerce.

And fourth, Mr. Chairman, the activities of our Ontario development corporation will assist Ontario firms to become more efficient and competitive, and aid slow growth areas of the province.

Since it was proclaimed June 6 last year, the corporation has approved seven long-term capital loans, amounting to $1.9 million. Another 16 applications involving a further $4.6 million are receiving active consideration and some of these will undoubtedly be approved within the next two or three months.

The seven loans already approved will provide additional jobs for more than 500 people in our slow growth areas and it is expected that by the end of 1967 this total will have been substantially increased.

While the corporation's main efforts were directed towards the new capital loan programme, it continued to provide advisory and technical services in various parts of the

province. During 1966, the corporation's consultants provided advice and guidance to 2,600 companies and individuals from all parts of Ontario. In addition to the services provided in Toronto, the consultants visited some 31 locations throughout the province to provide "on-the-spot" advisory services. Visits were paid to both northeastern and northwestern Ontario with very gratifying results. The corporation took over the loan guarantee programme of the former Ontario development agency and I am pleased to report that most of the guaranteed loans are being repaid regularly. Only one loss, amounting to some $19,000 in principal, was sustained during the year, while three loans were completely retired. Out of a total of $5 million advanced under the guarantee programme, less than $1 million is now outstanding.

As a result of the advisory and technical services provided by the corporation in 1966, small businesses in Ontario were able to obtain a further $3 million without any financial participation by the government of Ontario.

We believe the successful efforts of the Ontario development corporation have already demonstrated that it can make a most substantial contribution to the Ontario government design for a development programme now well underway.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the research and planning functions of the office of the chief economist will continue to provide the guideposts for an effective and balanced economic and social programme in this province.

In all of these efforts, I would like to stress that we believe the government has a responsibility to generate a positive mood and an enthusiasm in our economic life. We regard economic problems and bottlenecks as challenges not as harbingers of gloom. We have demonstrated we are prepared to meet problems directly, and to cut a path through the impediments to economic progress. We will continue to seek positive means of ensuring the purposeful development of our resources, the improvement of the quality of life of our people, and the creation of an atmosphere congenial to economic development. We believe that in this fashion we will contribute to a healthy economy and, in turn, to the generation of revenues from which to meet the needs of our people without imposing financial burdens that dull the imagination and stifle initiative.

As all these activities and those of other government departments have a very great significance on the future expansion of our province, I would like to emphasize the approach and philosophy we have taken with regard to regional development.

We are well aware that statements on the overall economic performance do not have the same significance for all sectors or all individuals in our economy. We are equally aware that the economic policies which are suitable to the overall performance of the economy must be tailored to suit the needs of such individuals and particular sectors of our economic spectrum. Such is the purpose of any regional development programme.

A regional development programme cannot be separated from overall economic development. Rather, it must fill out any deficiencies or any lags in the broad programme. This is why we are operating on two fronts simultaneously. On the one hand, we have the "design for development" programme, introduced nearly a year ago in the Legislature, and now, we are preparing to develop our "provincial development" programme which is concerned with carrying out the fulfilment of our economic targets over the next few years.

In his speech in the Legislature, the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) described in some detail the nature and objectives of these two programmes and the manner in which they were complementary rather than competitive.

I will not elaborate in any great detail upon the thorough and comprehensive presentation that the Prime Minister gave in his review of overall policy following the Speech from the Throne. I would stress again, however, that in our programme of provincial development, we are going to survey all government policies and programmes with a view to their interrelationship and to their effectiveness in assuring the fullest development of our human and physical resources, and in ensuring that we are providing the type of social capital that will enable this economy and its resources to reach their highest productivity potential. This programme and continuing review is a matter for the general concern of the new Cabinet committee on economics and finance, and will be a major part of the work undertaken in the office of the chief economist in the next few months.

Our "design for development" programme will deal with the particular problems of the 10 economic regions of the province in a coordinated and comprehensive manner. You know the general instruments by which this is to be attained, working down from the Cabinet committee on regional development, through the advisory committee composed of senior civil servants in various government

departments, and then supported and fortified by the two groups in the fields—the 10 regional development councils of citizens and the 10 regional economic boards of civil servants throughout the province. No one has suggested that such a complex programme is easy to administer, nor is anyone suggesting that the mere presentation of the words "regional development" will guarantee that all of our economic problems will be solved immediately.

We are engaged on a long-term process, and we have set up the machinery to be certain that we will move systematically and thoroughly toward long-term goals and targets in each of the regions of the province. By involving the individuals in the different regions in an intimate manner, we will be certain that no set theories and no set dogmas will be applied that might run counter to the basic needs and basic characteristics of each of the regions. We recognize that the solutions required for economic progress in northern Ontario are very different from those in eastern Ontario, and both are different from those required in Metropolitian Toronto.

Under the guidance of our regional development branch, we are working toward the formulation of plans which will diagnose the requirements of each of the regions and then enable the government to assist the regions in upgrading their economic life. We are aware that one cannot proceed without long-term goals, but we also know that one cannot live only for the long run, for as John Maynard Keynes said: "In the long run, we are all dead."

I submit that the government and my department are concerned with providing short-term solutions consistent with their long-erm objectives. As the Prime Minister suggested, the expenditures of every department of government, in a Budget that is now over $2 billion, are directed toward the purposeful development of the different regions of the province. We are concentrating our effort on those areas within the regions that will develop as centres of growth and centres of attraction for related economic activity in each of the regions.

The impact of highways, of power lines, of community colleges, is clearly a significant part of regional development. I could provide a number of success stories which involved our trade and industry branch, our Ontario development corporation, and various agencies of this government. The assumption that the government is the only instrument in this process, however, does an injustice to the individuals and the institutions across this province who are each concerned with providing initiative and leadership in various fields. It is essential to remember that we believe in the importance of the partnership between government and business, of working closely with all the cross sections of individuals in business in this province to ensure that the government will provide the climate within which business can help to achieve the highest rate of economic growth.

This does not mean that in those areas where, for whatever reason, the private sector has been unable to achieve a rate of development we would regard as appropriate, this government is unwilling to operate directly. The Ontario development corporation has already operated directly in the field of financial assistance. Our comprehensive housing programme is operating directly in terms of providing individuals with the basic foundation upon which they can build their lives in a free and productive manner. This is the challenge of a complex economic world, and it is also the challenge of regional development.

We are determined to guard against doctrinaire approaches to regional development because the one thing that was demonstrated unequivocally by our regional development conference two years ago was that solutions borrowed from one jurisdiction can readily fall flat in another. If Ontario has economic problems, they are Ontario problems, and we are determined to provide Ontario solutions.

It would be misleading for anyone to suggest to the people that there is some quick panacea for any ills which might be felt regionally. Rather, we prefer to seek out strengths, to concentrate those strengths and to fortify these strengths and to provide the equipment by which individuals can apply themselves to the development of their own economic life. Needless to say, as the recent Budget demonstrated, we place the very highest priority on giving people an opportunity to advance themselves economically by providing the widest degree within the best possible combination of educational opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, this is a province of opportunity. It is a province of educational opportunity. It is a province of equal opportunity, and we believe these responsibilities assumed by this government ensure our economic progress.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, the Minister as usual has

given us a forceful résumé of the programme that his department has been operating during the previous 12 months, and his view of what the future holds under the responsibility of this administration.

We well know that before the estimates that are before us are completely spent, the people of Ontario will have an opportunity once again to choose their representatives on the local level. It is my considered opinion, sir, that there is a widespread and growing feeling in the province that this Minister, whose department is surely among the most important, is not providing the leadership needed to develop Ontario as an overall community; that we are forgetting many of the areas of this province that have been economic back-waters under this government for too long; that the population is moving out of a good many of these centres, not necessarily only rural centres.

These young people are coming into the great metropolitan centres, not just because this is where the action is, but because the unplanned approach that this Minister takes to the economic development of the province is such that in a province of opportunity, as he describes it, there are too many areas where there are no opportunities.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Right.

Mr. Nixon: These people then are adding to the population programmes, the population difficulties in so many of the centres like Metropolitan Toronto. It is this theme that I want to take this afternoon in being critical of what the government has been doing, not only under this Minister, but in years gone by in not developing the overall community of Ontario.

I would point out to you that the estimates before us carry an amount of about $250,000 that will be spent on the regional development of the province. The Minister will be quick to say that most of his actions are designed to improve the development of the province. Nevertheless, when we come to programmes that have as their specific aim the equality of opportunity, economic and otherwise, across the length and breadth of Ontario, we have a figure of $250,000.

Now I ask you to compare it with the budgetary requirements of the Buy-Canada programme that has been getting such emphasis under the direction of this government in recent months. We have not seen anything like it since the moose and the hippo wandered off the political stage in 1963. The sum of $450,000 has been allocated by this Ontario government for a series of advertisements in 40 daily newspapers, colour ads on television, which, down at the bottom if you look carefully, refer to the need of the people in the province of Ontario to buy goods made in Canada.

Naturally this is something much to be desired by any thinking citizen. It is very difficult, however, for the same thinking citizens to look at these quarter-page advertisements arriving in the mail day after day, which are pushing the supposed development of the province under the particular administration that is paying for the ad. We in the Opposition are perhaps more sensitive to this than the government would be, but I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the citizens of the province are deeply concerned presumably about economy, and surely the present programme of advertising the government of Ontario and the Conservative Party with public funds, is not based on any view of economy or careful use of public funds.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Right.

Mr. Nixon: Secondly, the people of Ontario are prepared to compare the advertising programme in this one section of government alone—close to a half a million dollars—with the puny $250,000 that we are called upon to vote in support of a regional development programme that has been so inactive in the past and must be made more effective in the years that lie ahead.

Now I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the present programme of ads is somewhat more attractive than the moose and the hippo. I could not see any specific connection between that programme fostered by the Minister's predecessor, and the development of Ontario in any way. I must say the ad agency who has the contract this time is doing a better job of it, but we still compare the half million dollars that is being spent in the next few weeks by this Minister, in support of his own government, with the unimaginative programme for the development of the province as a whole that is summed up in the $250,000 that is available, we hope, for regional development.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, it is common knowledge that 60 per cent of the industry that develops and expands in this province, and comes to this province, locates within 25 miles of the city of Toronto. All of us are proud of our provincial capital. It is a real swinging town. We have a great city hall.

The government, with the concurrence of the Legislature, is expanding the facilities for our provincial government to the east of the present building and I believe we are going to be very proud of those buildings.

But, we are also very much concerned with the people across this province who, although they look to Toronto as the seat of government, are also looking for leadership from this government—which they are not receiving—in order to distribute the responsibility of government across the province, and with it the leadership that will also bring industry to other areas of the province that is so desperately needed.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nixon: Now, I suppose in recent days there have been many politicians and others who have set themselves up as experts in housing. This is a matter that we will be discussing under these estimates this afternoon and later in the consideration of this department, but the problems associated with it in this town are tremendous. In other urban areas across the province it is, of course, a crisis situation that all of us, whatever party we support, are deeply concerned with.

But, when we look at the metropolitan areas of Toronto and otherwise in Ontario, we see that many of these problems—housing, the provision of adequate education, the proper servicing of new lands for the expansion of the municipality, the provision of recreation, the control of pollution—all of these things are associated with the unplanned expansion of the community. Contrasted with this, Mr. Chairman, we can look at some other centres. I would recall your mind to your own town of Preston and Galt, in that particular area, Mr. Chairman. There are many cities and smaller centres across this province which, in fact, have not been growing at a rate that is in any way comparable to the big major centres.

This is a problem to the people in these particular centres. The young people, having been educated at great expense at the local level, are moving away from the smaller communities and making the problem locally even greater than it would ordinarily be. We know, as well that these particular centres do have adequate systems of education and hospitals that have been bought and paid for with provincial and federal assistance, as well as out of the pockets of the local people.

We find that there are adequate recreation facilities, curling clubs, golf clubs, in some cases hunting clubs which have open memberships available to people who would be able to take advantage of these many and varied useful recreation facilities that are becoming increasingly difficult to come by in the big centres. Surely it is abundantly obvious to the government of the day, as it is to the citizens of Ontario, that balanced approach to our expanding economy has not been the guiding rule of the present administration, and is something that is desperately needed at the present time.

I want to refer specifically in some detail to the need for a more adequate regional development policy in the province of Ontario. I would say that the government policy at the present time is anything but effective. In past years we have had promises, and some programmes with very attractive names like "design for development", many talks and speeches and statistics. I even hear that there is a new programme that is coming forward for regional development that is still in the back of the Minister's mind. In short, we have had everything except results.

The only way to judge a programme properly is to find out what is happening, if anything, at the local level. In this regard I would like to comment on a brochure outlining the regional development programme for 1966-67, of the Niagara regional development council in which my own constituency is located. As a matter of fact, the Lake Erie regional development council is another large and important area that also overlaps into my own constituency. I get the publications and information from both of them and I am able to compare their approach and the effectiveness of what these programmes are doing.

In the first paragraph of the brochure put out by the Niagara regional development council, I found something that was particularly interesting, and I quote as follows:

> As there are some 20 full- or part-time persons engaged in industrial development, representing various municipalities or areas in the Niagara region, it is the policy of the NRDC not to infringe on the activities and responsibilities of these persons to encourage industry to locate in his particular area.

We are concerned with the fair distribution of the means of economic expansion across the whole community of Ontario. The regional development councils have been assigned this as their prime task, and yet in the opening words of this particular brochure, the Niagara regional development council washes its hands of any responsibility in this

regard and continues to leave it up to the municipalities as individuals, with all of the cut-throat competition that is experienced at the municipal level in their efforts to increase their assessment. In other words, if you are interested in industrial development, do not come and see the NRDC. Well, what do they do? In quoting directly from their brochure, I find that they are going to do as follows:

> The NRDC is going to compile an industrial manual. It is going to help make a film showing the benefits to a municipality that an industry brings. It is going to organize bus tours for interested people. It is going to convene workshops based on the need for industrial expansion. It is going to distribute newsletters, invitations to meetings and conferences, and assist when approached by industries in the region.

I cannot and I do not castigate the NRDC for this programme. It and most of the other regional development councils are labouring under fantastic handicaps. There is a job to be done but the provincial government has refused time and again to give them the funds and the money to get on with the job.

I would like to look at some of the specific problems that the regional development councils must face. The councils get $15,000 a year from the provincial government, plus another $10,000 on a matching basis. In other words, if they get up and go out into their area, and get the support from the municipalities, the government will match these support programmes to the extent of an additional $10,000. This is enough to hire a manager, a public relations officer and a secretary in most cases, but not much more staff. This is a case where the government in some cases is wasting money because it adamantly refuses to give the councils a viable working budget.

There are two ways to go in this particular problem. My own view is that the regional development councils are not performing an adequate job to even merit the funds that are available to them. The government has successfully fallen between two stools: It wants to put the responsibility out into the countryside and yet it will not finance this responsibility adequately so that it can be done and accepted effectively. I believe that the regional development councils could do an effective job if they had budgets that would prepare them to accept the responsibilities that are there and are obvious.

Secondly, the councils have to deal with complex, fragmented municipal structures. For example, the Central Ontario regional development council, which covers Halton, Peel, York and Ontario counties, and Metro Toronto, must deal with 68 municipalities of varying sizes and importance. This is, of course, an impossible task.

Thirdly, the councils must spend a lot of valuable time collecting membership fees. In some cases, this is a full-time occupation for the few members of the council staff. The Minister is surely aware of the problem here; the staffs of the regional development councils go around from municipality to municipality bolstering the support, which is wavering at best at the municipal level. The municipal taxpayers are very keen to get value for the funds that are spent, and sometimes it is difficult to convince them that their funds should be spent on a body, superimposed on the municipalities, with some responsibility for their development. They are already spending, in most cases, great sums of money for the expansion of their own economic base.

Many of the councils do not have a research arm, and this is the fourth difficulty. They have access to universities, I suppose. It was emphasized in the Prime Minister's design-for-development statement more than a year ago. Of course, it sounds good to say that in each of these areas is located a growing university facility, but in order to involve them in their responsibilities for research, I find that just a few people are put on the firing line on many occasions, in fact almost all, when any research project is being undertaken.

You need only look at the notices for the various meetings that are convened by the development councils, to see that the same four or five names appear time after time. These men have a good background, often in community planning, but it is surely an impossible task to spread them over the whole of the developing areas of Ontario and expect them to give the guidance that surely would be only made possible by a budget that was going to be large enough so that research could be undertaken at the local level. The alternative to this, of course, is to do away with the regional development councils and have the government on a centralized basis do the research and planning that is needed for the councils, and perhaps this would be a better and more economical solution.

But the present situation is neither fish nor fowl; it simply uses up the efforts of the regional development people, often in a most inefficient way, in simply trying to raise enough funds to begin to attempt the job.

The councils have nothing in the way of incentives to offer industry, as the Minister knows. They have very great knowledge of the political difficulties associated with any programme of designation where one area has an advantage over another. The Minister himself has been critical of the federal programme that designates certain areas of Canada, many of them in the province of Ontario, for special assistance in their economic development. The areas are picked out only on the basis—at least up until recently—of the unemployment level in the particular areas.

Now the Minister is predicting that we are going to have an unemployment level of something less than two per cent on a continuing basis and this is welcome news indeed. I hope he is successful in laying plans that will accomplish this in the years that lie ahead. But even though in the broad statistical average we have this excellent unemployment record and one that has been achieved in recent months and we hope will be viable enough to remain with us, the Minister must recognize that there are many areas of the province that are disguised in their economic difficulties by the Minister's assistants, who are prone to average over much too large an area.

Despite the fact that two per cent unemployment is a most commendable figure—something that would be asserted by anyone—the Minister also knows that there are many specific areas in this province, many of them very large—really the whole of eastern Ontario, northeastern Ontario and northwestern Ontario as well—where statistics other than the average unemployment are the meaningful ones, a comparison of the gross rate in those areas with gross rates elsewhere in Ontario and in Canada. There is an economic council responsible to the Minister which must surely be able to give him this information, and I trust they do give him the information that makes it abundantly clear that unless we can bring in some programme where the economic areas are not treated identically, that unless we do branch out and take the politically risky decision associated with giving some of these economically backward areas the tools to improve themselves, we are not in fact going to develop the community of Ontario in the way that we would all wish.

Going on in listing the difficulties that the regional development councils are experiencing, I would say they do not have the incentives that can only come from the decision of the provincial government. They have real trouble with coordinating planning programmes. The Minister and his colleague in The Department of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) must surely be aware of the tremendous tensions, pressures and strain that enlarged planning areas have on local citizens.

The London *Free Press,* that great daily from the midwestern section of the province, does get down into our areas and I read it very carefully to see what is going on in the Whip's part of the country. I am much impressed, for example, with the way that the difficulties have been expanding without any government assistance to alleviate them in the Elgin county area, where the planning decisions in the Lake Erie regional development area have disrupted the whole municipal structure. Surely the government is going to have to take some effective steps in the very near future to alleviate the difficulties that are so well known.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): On that point, Mr. Chairman, the government is doing an immense amount in the way of providing regional facilities to cope with that new industrial development of Ford's. The Minister will be able to give further details. The government has agreed to build two pipelines, and there are very substantial highway developments taking place.

Mr. Nixon: Are you asking a question, or making a speech?

Mr. White: Ontario is playing a full role in it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for London South is going to have to make a good many speeches, and speeches more effective than the one that he has just made, if he is going to satisfy the citizens of Elgin county—

Mr. White: They are getting along all right.

Mr. Nixon: —in the programme that his government has implemented in that area.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): You are in trouble down there.

Mr. Nixon: I would say further, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. White: They do not want to hear the truth—

Mr. Nixon: —that the regional development councils are hard pressed when it comes

to the provision of industrial parks, serviced land for industry. There is no programme that the government has except in very secluded areas, special areas. There is no programme that is effective across the province in this connection. They have no say over hydro rates. They have no incentives whatever that can be offered industry that may be planning expansion in other areas.

Since I have mentioned hydro rates in this connection, I know that the vice-chairman of Hydro, the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) although he is not in his place at the present time, would be up on his feet now saying that Hydro, of course, has a policy that is impregnable and it simply cannot be touched by government in order to give some advantages to industry in areas where hydro-electric power or electrical power is of such prime importance in the development of industry. Surely a programme with some imagination could be worked out, whereby the inviolable status of Hydro could be maintained and the government of Ontario, through the cooperation of taxpayers across the province, could give the kind of assistance that would be needed to provide this sort of incentive for the development of the more backward parts of the province, at least economically, that the Chairman, the member from Ottawa area, is so familiar with.

I would say further, Mr. Chairman, that the regional development councils feel deeply frustrated because they have not been able to convince the provincial government to date to decentralize its own operations. Hydro itself occupies one of the most expensive pieces of real estate in the entire country, on the corner of College Street and University Avenue. It expanded its holdings to include the old Conservatory of Music, as you know. Surely it would be a good economy measure and it would provide real leadership to the development of the whole province if Hydro's head office would be moved out from under the shining lights of Queen's Park and put out into some area in the province where, with modern communication, it could very adequately control the business of the commission, and at the same time provide the stimulation for some other community. With all humility, Mr. Chairman, Brant county and Brantford come to mind.

There are some other members I know who would feel it would be reasonable that the new facility in Pickering township could be expanded. We already hear rumours that it is going to be doubled in the years that lie immediately ahead. It could be expanded to provide the office facilities for the head office staff of Ontario Hydro and take some of the crowds of people, who at the present time funnel down into the centre of this metropolitan area, outside the metropolitan area, and provide at least this single approach that could be so useful.

I would say further, of course, that the head office staff for the hospitalization commission and the OMSIP staff could very well be located somewhere other than in the heart of Metropolitan Toronto. I do not believe that there is a department of government that could not be decentralized from Toronto, the capital. As long as the Minister responsible and the representatives of the people are here at Queen's Park, modern communications could very well see that we were accepting our responsibilities in that regard and give some impetus to the development of other areas in the province.

I say further, Mr. Chairman, that there is very little evidence of the coordination and cooperation that we would hope for between the regional development councils and the government departments, particularly Municipal Affairs, Lands and Forests, and Highways. They have little or no say in federal programmes, such as the area development programmes and ARDA as it is administered in this province.

I have attended regional development meetings and sometimes it makes the sweat come out on my forehead when I hear some of the people who are employed by the regional development councils say there is a Cabinet committee chaired by the Prime Minister himself. Believe me there is a real aura that extends right down into the regional development area from this sort of an approach, this design-for-development hocus-pocus that is sold by this government from time to time but mostly just before elections. There is no evidence whatsoever that this Cabinet committee that we hear of so frequently as solving all of the problems of coordination has been able to make any effective decision that will really economically develop the outlying parts of this province.

As a matter of fact, I was very interested the other day when the Prime Minister made his comments about the Niagara escarpment decision by the government—that the government would consider the development of a new conservation area, or a programme following the contours of the Niagara escarpment. He said, "This is the sort of thing that the Cabinet, dealing with regional

development under the Prime Minister's chairmanship, would consider." Surely this is an important matter, but it has little or nothing to do with the economic development of the broad areas of the province that we are so concerned with.

I am not at all convinced that this Cabinet committee that we hear of so frequently is effective in any way, and I would be very interested if the Minister, who is going to answer some questions on this matter later in the day, will be able to tell us some of the details of the functioning of that much-touted window-dressing committee.

Further, The Department of Economics and Development has done little to help rural municipalities with housing. The development councils are confused about the overall programme, if there is one at all, that the province has for developing industry in outlying areas. So far as many councils are concerned, the Ontario development corporation has been completely inadequate and ineffective in its assigned responsibilities.

These are a few of the councils' complaints —complaints that have not really been tackled by this government. The complaints have not come so much from the staff of the councils themselves. Most of these people are anxious to make the system work, as it is presently presented to them by the government, but their inability to do this under the leadership that is prevailing at the present time in the province is obvious. We are going nowhere in this regional development matter.

I feel that the time has long passed when government can play around with regional development. For too many years the government has made regional development a hobby. The government does nothing about it in concrete terms, because I do not believe it has confidence in the regional development of the province. The government will never believe in regional development. The Minister, with the backing of the Prime Minister, has the idea that is deeply imbedded in Conserative philosophy that in this province the rich should grow richer and they should grow richer at the expense of the outlying areas in the province. They will not do anything for the less-well-off areas of Ontario, except to give them projects that cannot be completed, projects that for the most part are designed not for development, but really for frustration.

My party believes firmly in regional development, and I say further that this is going to be one of the most important issues in the coming election. The people across this province, as I say, are proud of the development of Toronto, Hamilton, London, Windsor, and to a lesser extent, Ottawa, which has sort of its own special industry that is developing it there. But think of the many places in this province, in the north and in the western areas particularly, where the small towns have been supported in years gone by by the farming industry. Nothing is going on there. The towns are stagnating, the young people are leaving. From time to time the Minister rises in his place and indicates that an acquisition of a new industry has taken place. But there is nothing that would make us believe that Ontario is advancing in a balanced way towards economic prosperity for all of our cities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the assistance from my colleagues and now I would like to say further that we in the Liberal Party are concerned about this programme, a programme that is only a part of the Minister's responsibilities. We feel that obvious changes can be made; that the boundaries of the present economic regions are out of date; that in too many cases the boundaries put together people and communities with varying interests and it is really impossible for any council, no matter how well financed or well motivated, to allow them to move forward together in real cooperation.

I know this was raised last year and I well remember the Minister himself saying that the rationalization of the boundaries was something that he was considering and that his experts were looking into. I would hope that some announcement could be made during his estimates that would indicate that some decisions had been reached because these boundaries are based on studies made immediately following 1945, and they are inadequate under present requirements.

I believe further, that it is not enough that each economic region be treated precisely the same as every other one. If we are going to bring ahead those parts of the province that have not shared in the prosperity and growth of this province of opportunity in the past, it will be necessary for us to bring about a system of or a programme that will offer the development councils something to attract industry into these areas, so that industry will not simply flock to the four or five major centres of growth in this province.

I believe that the Minister himself must be armed with many more tools to enable his work to be more effective and more readily understood by the people of this province. I feel that in many rural areas ARDA itself, under the direction of the Minister of Agriculture, has not been properly brought to bear in the development of rural communities.

It is interesting that the Minister himself, although he has the responsibility for the housing corporation, has nothing to say about community planning. This is the responsibility of one of his colleagues. It is interesting as well that although this Minister, when his advisors and others talk to industries to bring them into various parts of the province of Ontario, has nothing to say about the provision of energy, the provision of adequate transportation, the provision of adequate communications.

All of these are matters that could be rationalized and developed so that the work of regional development would be much more effective than it has been in the past.

I believe that in one department we should have the important levers of economic growth. For the first time the province would be able to launch a full-scale attack on poverty, on slums, on over-centralization, and the thing that I believe is the answer to many of these problems, the uniform development of Ontario as a whole.

The new sections would have to work hand-in-glove with the department's present regional development branch and expanded Ontario development corporation and, of course, the trade and industry branch.

I was interested, Mr. Chairman, to read in at least the press reports of the Carter commission on taxation an indication that the commissioners felt that up until now much of the regional development has been in their words "simply a shot in the dark". There is no doubt, and I am sure the Minister would agree with me in this, that they were critical of the federal programme for regional development as well as that programme which is taking place in the various provinces. But with the knowledge that is now available to us, and the will to make this a strong and viable programme, much more can be accomplished.

I do not want to take our time here this afternoon. I feel I have emphasized the matter as much as I am capable of doing, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to take the time to compare the puny efforts of the province of Ontario with what has been carried out in the other provinces of Canada. I suppose the Minister well recalls the loss of major industries from Ontario to Quebec and the Maritimes and other areas which really have not shared in the development of the economy as fortunately as Ontario has.

But our programme has been inadequate. We need only look at what the Ontario development agency has done over the past year and see that there is much more that could be done if we were to set out on a programme not only to bring industry into this province and foster its development here, but see that every effort is made to locate these industries where it would be to the best advantage of the even development of our province.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned as well with another area that comes under the jurisdiction of this Minister and that has to do with the advisory committee on our constitutional affairs and our federal-provincial affairs. I feel sure, however, that there will be more fitting opportunities for us to comment on the usefulness of this particualr commission and its effect on the present policy of the government of Ontario. It seems to me really that this area of financial responsibility should be removed from this department and put under the Prime Minister's department, because it is his responsibility to deal with the sister provinces of this country and the government of Canada in the orderly discussion and development of our Confederation. We have a resolution on the order paper that I feel would be a better vehicle for the discussion of this point, but we are concerned with the expenditure of this department and it seems to me that this is an area that might better come under the jurisdiction of the Prime Minister of Ontario rather than this particular Minister.

Mr. Chairman, the other area of broad importance, and probably of more immediate importance than anything else at this particular time and in this particular session, is the provincial responsibility for the provision of adequate housing in this province. I had the great pleasure and honour of addressing the builders of Ontario, or a large number of them, today at noon at the national homes show out in the exhibition grounds and certainly had plenty of opportunity to get their views beforehand and just after the meeting. It seems to me that the citizens of Ontario, particularly those with some special information and some special approach to the problem of housing, have not really fulfilled their responsibilities as citizens in coming forward to individual members of this Legislature and to the government itself

in order to give their views based on their expert knowledge of what is going on in the housing situation in the province.

Naturally builders give advice and have opinions and prejudices based on only a very subjective view of the problem. Nevertheless these people are in the field, and when it comes to their problems, their problems dealing with the community planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs, and their problems as they see them developing under the provisions of the new HOME programme, these are an area of public interest that can be served by many citizens of the province, and not just those of us who have responsibilities to speak for specific areas in the province or for certain specific areas of responsibility here in the Legislature. But I want to give you my views, Mr. Chairman, on the HOME programme as it has been described and put forward by the Ministry in recent days, and what I feel might be a method of alleviating the situation as we find it increasing in complexity in the days that lie ahead. Last December, in a statement, I advocated—and I quote from the statement at the present time—certain things that could be done by the government in meeting the crisis in housing in the province of Ontario. Quoting from the statement, and it is very brief:

> The Ontario housing corporation must work with central mortgage and housing to assemble land for housing projects on the outskirts of large cities. The federal government, through CMHC, may provide up to 75 per cent of the cost of assembling raw land for residential development. The remainder is borne by the province, who may ask the municipality concerned to assume a portion of the provincial government's share. The costs of land assembly projects are recoverable from the sale of lots to purchasers. In 1965, according to CMHC's annual report, only three federal-provincial land assembly projects were approved and only one of these was in Ontario.

I understand it was in the Arnprior area with 88 lots. That is the end of the quote that I had at that time.

The first point, then, is that although land assembly has been around for a good many years, the provincial government as usual did not get around to really using it until a crisis in housing developed. I said further at the time of my previous statement:

> Now the Ontario housing corporation should make an effort to conclude land leasing arrangements under this scheme. OHC could assemble tracts of suitable land, instal water and sewer services, then lease serviced lots to home owners for a long term of years at a reasonable rent. The lease holder would only have to pay constructing a house.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I have taken your time in reading this quote from my previous statement, is that having made that approach before the government programme called HOME was announced, it is not reasonable for me to stand in my place now and criticize them for doing what is essentially what we have advocated ourselves previously.

I am not saying for a moment that we were the authors of this idea originally. The Minister knows well that it has been experimented with and used to good effect in other parts of this country, as a matter of fact, and in other parts of the world, so this is a part of the HOME programme in which we are willing to cooperate with the present administration. We think that this is part of the solution.

There have been some criticisms—such as the fact that we are infringing on the area of free enterprise, but of course the government has this responsibility. When a matter of this proportion comes along, the government must take the steps to alleviate the problem and get the houses built. The Minister, I know, is as concerned about this as anyone in this House, and surely we are going to give him every support that we can in the parts of his programme that we believe will effectively meet the requirements as we see them. But really I did not say, and I do not say now, that the HOME programme is the whole solution. Other basic reforms must be made and I would like to list some of them for you.

Before I do that I would say that the basic criticism of the Minister's approach to the programme is that he seems to look at the programme or the problem through almost blinkers, or restricted-field binoculars. He sees one specific answer. He is prepared through his responsibility for Ontario housing corporation to take some steps that will assist along these lines. Surely the answer is much broader than that. Once again it extends into many other departments of government, and I think that many of the Minister's colleagues are remiss in not taking the steps that would provide the assistance needed at the present time.

Listing some of the reforms that must be made: First, the government must keep firmly

in mind that it has an obligation to help increase the total supply of housing in this province. The OHC, particularly in Metro, has bought up a good number of private houses and town houses. This narrows the housing market for people who do not qualify for public housing. We have to remember that the vacancy rate in Metro is not a comparable seven or eight per cent, but less than one per cent. I agree with the OHC's belief that the less affluent must be helped to get a fair share of the housing that exists, but it would be preferable if the OHC and the government helped add to the total stock of housing rather than relying so much on the purchase of housing that is already in existence. Its present policy simply means that the OHC is worsening the housing shortage for some in many urban areas.

Second, the Ontario housing corporation is still involved in a more or less running battle with at least two other levels of government, and perhaps with all three. In Metro Toronto, aside from the city of Toronto itself, which has its own housing authority, OHC handles both the construction and the management of public housing. With this kind of situation the top executives of OHC are spreading themselves too thin. I have been told that some days they spend 70 per cent of their time on the telephone talking to politicians and other people about getting citizens into decent and adequate housing.

I would suggest that OHC should concentrate on the construction and financing of housing, and leave the management of the projects to the municipalities. The system has worked well in some Ontario communities, such as Windsor, for example. The municipalities manage the projects according to an OHC manual, and they must check with the OHC before they do anything that would depart from the general approach to this management situation. As well, this system allows for close cooperation between municipal welfare departments and housing management officials.

Third, as I have said, Mr. Chairman, the HOME programme is nothing very new because government land assembly has been a feature of Canadian housing since 1949. In the Metro Toronto area, land was assembled this way for Malvern at Lawrence Avenue, the public housing project with the most acreage in Canada, and for Thistletown.

In Manitoba one of the largest private developers in the province is leasing land to customers. This firm tried to sell houses the traditional way for $30,000 and was not doing too well. Then it decided to sell the homes for $20,000 and lease the $10,000 lot. The lease is for 40 years with an option to purchase the land at the original price. This move has the approval of CMHC and it allows many more people to obtain decent housing.

I feel OHC should encourage more private developers to start this kind of arrangement. There is no reason why OHC must be the only one to offer homes on leased land, and naturally it would meet the argument that is being put by many people that the government is moving much too far into the area of private enterprise in meeting this particular responsibility.

Fourth, it must be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that the Ontario housing corporation and the HOME programme will encounter many of the stumbling blocks that hamper private development. This is because the government has refused to take the basic steps necessary to ensure that the present housing crisis is not prolonged. In Ontario we are still trying to cope with a twentieth century housing crisis with outdated municipal laws. The Ontario housing corporation and the private developers have to contend with the fact that it takes two years, and sometimes longer, to get a housing development approved, and this extends beyond municipal bylaws right into the realm—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Who said that?

Mr. Nixon: I said that. I have had constituents—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: You are basing your experience on this?

Mr. Nixon: It is true, and I would say that it extends considerably beyond the municipalities and into the community planning branch of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. There have been many cases where citizens in my community have come to me for what assistance I can offer to get the Minister's advisers at least to act definitely yes or no on proposals that have been put before them. I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, that there is no doubt about the goodwill of the Minister himself, and whenever I have brought it to his attention personally on behalf of those constituents who have come to me for assistance, he has taken definite action. Usually he has turned around and said, "Well after all this delay the answer is no, and is that definite enough for you?"

That is his responsibility and I am prepared to accept it on that basis, but think of

the people who are sitting on land, in many cases serviced land, who cannot get the approval at the local level, and in the other cases of land that could be serviced.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: There is no reason for that, Mr. Chairman, with very great respect; if the land is serviced and the subdivision plan has been approved by me as Minister of Municipal Affairs there is no reason why they cannot get approval.

Mr. Nixon: That is it.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No need at all.

Mr. Nixon: It is approval of the subdivision land by him that we are concerned about and the Minister cannot possibly do this in an effective way from one end of the province to the other.

We have had legislation that was changed, two or three years ago; there were some changes that were intended to bring this about more rapidly, but there are many communities across this province, and the Minister knows them well, where the expansion of these communities is being held up by the difficulty in getting approval for a plan of subdivision by the Minister himself.

Now I must point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that the Ontario housing corporation in the HOME programme will encounter, as I have said, many of the stumbling blocks that other developers are aware of and this is something that really the Minister himself must be prepared to deal with. Because he can surely go to the other colleagues, his colleagues in the Cabinet, and see that approval is available; that the red tape is eliminated. The serviced land is there and building can take place.

When we read the statistics about the starts in single dwelling construction in the Toronto area compared with the starts a year ago, it is truly shocking because there has been every indication for many months that the problem was becoming increasingly more difficult to deal with. Even though the Minister some weeks ago was making pronouncements and statements, his people have been working hard on this, and I am sure they are deeply concerned that some effective action be taken. Still, the most recent reports are that the housing starts are down close to 60 per cent over the comparative figure a year ago.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that one of the difficulties that does occur is the fact that the municipalities are not in a position to provide the services that are needed in order to get the approval that the Minister can give for a plan of subdivision. I know he has some things he wants to say about this. Even in the city of Hamilton, the mountain area, not adequately served I am told by sewage and water facilities, is going to require major expenditure by the corporation of that city in the immediate future, and the difficulty is where the financing can be made available—whether it is through the water resources commission or through some special fund that can be made available. The city is already deeply concerned about meeting its fiscal requirements, its economic requirements.

The government must take the lead in allowing these major centres to provide the serviced land that is really the answer to the problem that lies before us at the present time. The housing crisis is a very serious symptom of a much larger problem. The government has refused to tackle the basic administrative and financial problems facing our municipalities. The time has come for action on this front and we can delay no longer. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the government's adamant refusal to face the issue will be one of the basic issues in the coming election. We know what must be done, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to set the points out at this time.

First, the Ontario housing corporation must be moved to a reformed department that contains within itself the community planning responsibilities that presently are scattered through the administration. With this, sir, the government would have a single department responsible for meeting and solving the problems as they face the people of Ontario.

Second, the province must assume more of the cost of education. There is no doubt that the present housing crisis has been worsened by the fact that our municipalities are bogged down to the hubcaps in obligations they cannot meet with their present resources.

Third, the Ontario water resources commission must work much more closely with The Department of Municipal Affairs to open up many more areas for housing. In the Toronto township area, Mr. Chairman, the OWRC has been talking for years about building water and sewage lines but there has been little action. What is needed is a sound development plan worked out with the help of the municipalities involved.

Fourth, we have to scythe much of the red tape that has tied the hands of municipalities in the housing field. I would not favour, and I do not advocate, sloppy ill-considered hous-

ing development. I do not think it is necessary for developers, however, to appear so often and so frequently with repeated information and papers and plans before the many councils and planning boards and the community planning branch of the provincial government itself. Surely this can be put on a straightforward basis so that the planning and the development of our communities can go forward in an orderly way.

Fifth, the government must set out, with the help of the municipalities, a plan for modern municipal reform. Our municipalities have been largely unchanged for many years —more than a century ago the original legislation was passed as you know. I know the government claims to be a great defender of local autonomy but in reality its refusal to act in the field of municipal reform has left many of our municipalities weaker than they once were. This government is not the champion of local interests; in many respects it is the greatest enemy of local autonomy. In a way it is an odd sort of enemy; it hurts the municipalities not so much by what it does but by what it has failed to do. Its numerous omissions in the municipal field have left some of our communities in a dangerously weakened condition.

Sixth, the province will have to come to grips with planning. At present, about 150 of our 974 municipalities have official plans. I wonder if the Minister knows the delays and frustrations, the bitter feelings, caused when a developer tries to put a housing scheme into a municipality that is not sure where housing should be located. And it must be remembered that there are many of our municipalities that are not concerned with the rapid expansion that some developers would like. The costs of education associated with these new housing developments, particularly single family developments, simply cannot be met by any assessment that would be put on them and these municipalities are frightened of their financial life—of committing themselves to financial expenditures that under the programme of this government they can never hope to meet in the years that lie ahead.

Seventh, the government must take action to weed out the province's jungle of building bylaws. A magazine called *Canadian Builder* says the overgrown field of building bylaws, possibly more than anything else, is slowing development and the sale of inexpensive mass-produced homes. The national research council has had a national building code available for 25 years but only half of Canada's municipalities have adopted it. In Metro, for example, you can have a door opening directly from your house to your garage in Scarborough, but across the street in Toronto this is not allowed.

Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned some of the basic municipal reforms the government must make if we are to avoid a prolonged housing crisis, but other steps must be taken as well. The provincial government must accept the recommendations of the economic council of Canada with respect to housing and inflation. The council says in effect that both the federal and provincial governments crack down too hard on housing in inflationary periods. The Provincial Treasurer probably has his doubts about this. He feels now that we are coming into a period where there is not the same pressure. But the recommendations are there from those who are responsible in an objective way for advising government, and we have our own economic council here.

If we want to hear it from some other authoritative body, that may very well be it, but the government of this province is prone to the same reactions as in other jurisdictions in this matter of housing. These governments, the council says, must cooperate better and adjust their own spending programmes to leave more room for housing in inflationary periods. In short, the council argues—and I agree—that housing is an essential service; it should be one of the last sectors of the economy to feel the effect of government and the inflationary measures instead of one of the first.

I have suggested reasonable government second mortgages that would lead to lower down payments. This particular proposal—that the government of Ontario re-enter the second-mortgage field—I suppose could be called an inflationary programme, and yet it is a means whereby the home ownership that all of our families, whether young or old, aspire to, can be brought within their financial grasp and reach.

It is interesting that shortly after the 1948 election, when there was another housing squeeze, the government set up the housing corporation limited, not to be confused with OHC, and went into the second-mortgage market. This corporation accepted applications for about three years and during that time it made 14,000 loans totalling $16 million. The maximum loan was for $1,250, interest at 3,5 per cent, term 20 years. All the loans will be paid back by 1970. So far the corporation, which comes under The Treasury Department, has been paid back

most of its money and has had surprisingly few bad debts, almost a vanishingly small percentage. This arrangement made it possible for a person to get a home with a modest down payment and this is the crux of some of the difficulty that is facing a good many of the citizens of Metro Toronto and other areas of the province.

I believe the scheme should be revived to help solve the present housing mess. We must have new, vital, imaginative programmes to improve the quality of housing in rural Ontario. I have mentioned this many times. The Provincial Treasurer, who happens to be paying some attention at the moment, I think, is aware of these problems in his own constituency of Huron, just as they are found in many of the other areas across the province, areas where—I hate to describe them as rural slums—we know that the provision of adequate housing is just as immediate a problem as it is anywhere else.

And this is something that the government has taken little or no action on: There are 70 communities in Ontario, of 500 or more population, with no sewage systems at all. Obviously, the OWRC must give these communities more help. The Ontario housing corporation must help them in planning housing, including housing for elderly persons on pension. There are too many crossroad hamlets whose slums unfortunately rival anything found in our big cities.

The province must show a better appreciation of the connection between industry and housing. On the eastern approaches of Metro Toronto there is a well-known community, Bay Ridges. The homes there were built with the hope that a concentration of people would attract industry. Unfortunately, this hope has not been fully realized. Because of the lack of industry, a person owning a house assessed at $5,000 in Bay Ridges must pay more than $500 a year in taxes. Now contrast this with Bramalea in the constituency of the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) which does have industry and where a person owning a house assessed at $5,000 pays about $300 a year in municipal taxes.

Look at the odd situation in Woodstock. There a Montreal firm is building a 75,000 square foot plant, but it is having trouble getting workers because of a housing shortage in Woodstock. Ironically, the firm is Alcan Designed Homes Limited and the plant will produce massed produced housing, so it is one of those difficult situations where government assistance might very well be in order so that the roadblocks can be cleared and this sort of imaginative programme can go ahead.

Then there is a serious situation in the London area, and I regret that the member for London South is not in his place. Oh, there he is. There, the large Ford auto plant has been located beyond the boundaries of the city. The city of London is expected to educate and house many of the Ford workers, yet it does not get any benefit from the assessment on the Ford plant.

There are numerous examples of industry locating just beyond the borders of our larger municipalities for similar reasons. They locate there because they know they will have to pay less in taxes. But surely in this age of the automobile, which makes more workers highly mobile, the government must at the very least, take steps to set up an arrangement whereby the areas under municipal jurisdiction would be large enough to include the assessment they need to provide the services demanded of them and work with the municipalities to see that housing is available when industry requires it.

We must encourage communities such as Bramalea in the shadow of the Metro Toronto area; I can see a number of new towns. The Minister of National Defence has been talking about these in recent months, along with other things, and I believe that these new towns with a proper industrial basis and proper facilities and community centres, can spring up in the future and provide the long range answer to the crisis that we are trying to solve with short range programmes.

These towns would be linked with each other and the surrounding metro areas by high-speed highways and commuter lines. Around them there will be conservation areas, farm land and green belt. At present however, this government is making absolutely no provision for these towns. It is content to allow urban development to spill across the landscape like milk from an upturned pitcher, in the words of a farmer.

Too many of our suburban communities, really not communities at all, are collections of box-like homes with no core, no industry, few if any parks, and hosts of problems that are developing because of the hands-off attitude of governments at three levels, in the appropriate development of these particular centres.

Now despite many statements of good intention, housing for Indians is still in poor shape. I want to mention this specifically, because the Minister and the government are

proud of the inter-departmental horizontal committee that deals with these individual problems.

As an example, last July 4, at the Quetico centre in northwestern Ontario, the federal-provincial committee for Indians in Ontario signed an agreement. The agreement called for the relocation and training of 15 Indians from remote northern areas of the province. So far no training has been done, no houses for the Indians have been built. A new letter from the centre says, and I quote it:

> The centre appointed two people to the project and began looking for others. Facility and other commitments were made. Quetico centre was asked to submit bills for payment, then the roof fell in on everyone involved because the key part of the project, housing, had not been approved. Without housing there could not be a project.

Now this is what we call the responsibility of one of these Cabinet programmes that of course has federal ramifications. It has ramifications right down the line, but the province of Ontario is not providing the leadership and assistance in this specialized area that it surely should be accepting. The new houses were to be built at one particular centre, but central mortgage and housing corporation wanted them built at Atikokan and there the matter rests. So the blame falls on both your houses and I am certainly not in a position to defend either one of you.

The government must stimulate more research in the housing field. The 1966 research index compiled by the Minister's own economic council lists projects being carried out with the Ontario government departments and agencies and in a number of companies operating within the province. It does not have even a section on architecture and housing design. The reason, the report says, is due to the fact that no replies were received in this category.

Well if the industry is not prepared to undertake the research that is obviously necessary, surely the government must again step into a position of leadership and provide something that is going to lead in the future to the provision of adequate housing.

Now the Aluminum Company of Canada, as I mentioned a few moments ago, is doing research in a very interesting way. We look forward, for example to seeing what the architects are doing at Expo '67 in the design and construction of Habitat. All of these things are research that has taken place in other areas, which may very well apply here, but the government must accept the leadership in this matter and see that it applies where it is possible.

Now in urban areas, Mr. Chairman, new prototypes of housing must be developed which permit higher population densities thus making better use of the available serviced land. There are at present no satisfactory apartment designs for families with children. The experience of European countries indicates that family life and occupancy of multiple housing structures are by no means mutually exclusive. It is equally obvious however, that the apartments presently being built are not suitable for families with children.

I can well remember looking at public housing facilities in some European centres, many years ago, and being completely impressed with the efficiency of the structure that allowed for family privacy, adequate playgrounds and family recreation areas associated with it. And of course, associated with it even further, and this does get beyond the Minister's responsibility, was the adequate oversight of the day nursery system. This happened to be in Denmark, which allowed both mother and father in these particular families where there were multiple dwelling units, to avail themselves of a whole range of services that really were most efficient and impressive and this was as far back as 1950.

It must be noted that buildings are built today in very much the same way they were 100 years ago. Rising standards of living and the corresponding increase in the cost of labour have pushed construction costs to a very high level. Interestingly, in contrast to overall building costs, the cost of fabricated components of housing has risen hardly at all in recent times. Now this pre-fabrication business associated with housing is expanding very rapidly, particularly in other jurisdictions. We hope that it will become a part of housing in this province as well.

Attempts should obviously be made to reduce the site labour required in housing construction. This would help alleviate the shortage of skilled workers in the construction field. A great number of pre-fabricating systems for multiple housing have been developed in Great Britain and Europe, though none of these is directly applicable to our conditions. North American efforts in the same direction have to an even greater extent than the European ones, depended on single industries developing their own systems with

no overall coordination or control of the research that must lead in this field.

It is up to the government to initiate an approach to this problem which will involve the various industries in a joint effort. A development of this kind could well result in considerable export of pre-fabricated housing on a world-wide basis and lead to industrial development in this province that we all so seriously and sincerely desire.

It is obvious that something must be done when you consider that it took nearly 15 months to construct the 309 units at Thistletown, associated with the housing programme in that area. The old construction techniques are one of the reasons that under the HOME programme it will take a down payment of $1,250 to purchase a $15,000 home on a leased lot and monthly payments of $190. The $15,000 home is the most expensive available, as the Minister has pointed out, but it is hardly a mansion and to pay for this house it is estimated that you must have an income in excess of $8,000 a year; a sum that is not available to people that we must reach if our housing programme is going to be effective.

Mr. Chairman, I did want to make some comments about the provision of residences and housing at the university level, but I think I will take an opportunity to deal with that under another point in the estimates.

I have been talking about reforms this government must make if it is to have a total housing policy, a policy which will meet the needs of our people now and in the future. We cannot be complacent about the fact that nationally this year it is estimated that housing completions will be 15 per cent below the economic council's target of 170,000 new homes a year.

I now want to turn briefly to another problem area—public housing and urban renewal, and with this my remarks will be completed. I will speak in more detail about this subject at another time but I want to point out to the Minister now that two of the very real trouble spots in this particular housing field are the rehabilitation of existing housing and our outdated expropriation procedures, which we were discussing last night under a different vote.

First, there can no longer be any doubt, except perhaps in the minds of some of the members of this government, that our antiquated and unfair expropriation procedures are delaying urban renewal projects and in far too many cases causing real hardship in redevelopment areas. It is ironic, but true, that redevelopment at the present time hurts as many people as it helps. The people whose properties are expropriated do not get enough money to buy a decent house and are forced to move, in many cases, to housing which is worse than that which is being torn down. In short, expropriation has forced them down the housing scale—and then the Minister wonders why there are such serious and extensive programmes and complaints against the redevelopment programme, usually against the municipal government because it is the one that has to administer it at the local level.

In expropriation for urban renewal, I join with those who have already put this point so forcibly in the Legislature that we must offer people — and all of them in urban renewal circumstances, not just the elderly people—a price which will allow them to move on to decent housing. We must help them financially if they wish to appeal a case and take it to court. We must provide facilities where expropriation matters can be heard quickly and properly. We must set up a central expropriating body with adequate staff to replace the thousand-odd bodies which have this tremendous power at the present time, and make full use of independent outside appraisals. This is a matter that we have discussed previously and I want to put this on record in association with housing policy where I feel it is important at this time.

Secondly, much more can be done in the field of rehabilitating existing housing. This kind of urban renewal is cheaper, obviously, than tearing down buildings and in many ways it causes less suffering and upheaval. The field of rehabilitation has never been properly explored in this province. As a start the province must encourage the federal government to liberalize the terms for National Housing Act mortgages for older homes. As of last December you could get a maximum NHA-approved mortgage on an older house of $10,000 or 90 per cent of the home's approved value, whichever was less. This will help some people in the province but it is not of much help in communities such as Metro Toronto where the price of an older home averages $23,000.

As well, the province should offer grants or loans, after taking a lien on the property, to people who want to fix up the home in which they live. The government should encourage people to fix up their home by allowing them to deduct a portion of the cost of the improvement from one year's property tax. If

a person puts $300 in improvements into a house, he could, under our plan, deduct a portion of that from the year's municipal tax. This would be fairer than the present system and it would encourage people to refurbish their property and help prevent urban blight. The scheme would not result in much lost income because in the following year the person's assessment would obviously increase.

Mr. Chairman, we ignore these proposals associated with the housing crisis at our peril. It is estimated by the end of the century the population of our cities will have doubled and will contain up to 95 per cent of all of the people in this province. In Canada it has been said that the volume of new building in the next four decades will equal all existing building in the country and this would mean the equivalent construction of a complete new city of 70,000 inhabitants each and every month in the year 2000. Already in Ontario seven cities house 55 per cent of the province's residents. As I said in the beginning this government is trying to meet this challenge with nineteenth century laws and with nineteenth century views. It has indicated time and again that it has no intention of working for the basic reforms that the province so badly needs. This lack of concern for the real problems of the people, let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, will be one of the real issues in the coming campaign.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would like first of all, in making a few introductory comments on the estimates of the Minister of Economics and Development, to say how happy I am, and I am sure all the members of the House are, to have seen the evidence of his rapid and complete recovery from the emergency operation he was required to undergo just when he was on the point of presenting his estimates to this House on a previous occasion. We see that he is back in his breeziest, best form, full of energy, vim, vigour and vitality, and I am sure that we all rejoice at that fact. I listened to his introductory—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do you want to quit right there while I am ahead?

Mr. Bryden: You can count yourself ahead for the present at any rate.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with considerable interest to his introductory comments to his estimates. I would judge that they were substantially reduced in size during his stay in hospital, partly no doubt because he found it necessary to announce what he had to say about housing on other occasions and thus did not include it here. He did, however, give, as he usually does, a quite comprehensive review of the activities of his department in quite reasonable scope. Unfortunately he omitted to make any reference at all to what seems to me to be unquestionably his outstanding achievement to date, perhaps the only achievement for which he will be remembered. That is the production of a film spectacular which I believe goes under the title of, "Selling is like shaving — if you do not do a little of it every day you soon get to look like a bum" — or something like that, it is rather a long title.

I have not had the privilege of seeing the film but I understand it is right up with the best of them, such as are shown in theatres with advance reservations. And who is the hero of this great spectacular, Mr. Chairman? Why none other than the Minister himself, who will no doubt become known as "heartthrob Randall" to the generation that is passing from the scene. I am not so sure that he will have quite the same rapport with the upcoming generation. At any rate, if one can judge from the title which he has assigned to this spectacular, I have a feeling that many of the rising generation would be more inclined to say that "Selling is like beard growing—if you do not do a little of it every day you soon get to look like a plucked chicken."

However, I do not pretend to speak for them, I am merely suggesting to the Minister that perhaps some of his slogans and allusions are a little passé. At any rate, I hope that we in this House and others in the province of Ontario will have an opportunity of seeing this great spectacular. To date I have only been able to read about it in the press. I would like to see it, I think everybody should have an opportunity to see it whether they want to see it or not, because there is absolutely no doubt that the people of Ontario have paid for most of it. So they should at least be able to see it since they put up the money to produce it in the main.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Would the hon. member permit an interjection?

Mr. Whicher: He will never get an Oscar for it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is a Randallian extravaganza.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will be very happy to lend you this for any nomination meeting for the NDP or any election campaigns. I got it for my own nomination because I thought

people were a little tired of hearing about politicians; I thought maybe they would like to see what the politician had been doing for them.

Mr. MacDonald: It is an alternative to Bugs Bunny.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The film was put together from what they call "offs" that the companies—the CBC and the rest of them—take during the course of the year. They take two or three shots and throw two away and use the best one. I was able to gather up some of these shots. I paid $188 of my own money for them. I would be glad to show you the receipt; it did not cost the taxpayer a dime.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I was not suggesting that the actual editing of the film and putting together of these clippings was charged to the people of Ontario, I certainly do not want to suggest that. All I have in mind is that unquestionably a large part of the actual filming that produced the basis of this film was done at the cost of the taxpayers of Ontario. Therefore I am not sure how interested the taxpayers may be to view the film, but I think they should at least be able to see it. I have no doubt some of them would be interested in seeing it if for no other reason than as a documentary of an old-style politician in action. I think it will become an interesting addition to the historical archives of the province, and after the election is over and the Minister finds no further use for it, I hope he will deposit it in that building across the crescent here, at Queen's Park.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: We will burn it.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh no, do not do that.

Mr. Bryden: Now, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, before the member goes into the main part of his address, he might accept my motion that the committee rise, it being five o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 5, by Mr. R. D. Rowe.

RESOLUTION,

that marketing boards should explore the possibilities of agreements to do with the inter-provincial and international movement of farm products.

Mr. R. D. Rowe (Northumberland): I move resolution No. 5 standing in my name, which has just been read.

I would like to begin by complimenting our Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) for his selfless devotion to the cause of Ontario agriculture. It is the Minister's constant aim to devise policies which will provide the maximum economic advancement of the farmers of this province, and to ensure that their standard of living and the amenities available to them should be fully equivalent to those available to the rest of our society.

The Minister is fully aware that our farmers are the foundation stone of our rich and varied society, and are therefore as entitled to equal opportunities for a full and meaningful life as are the citizens in any other segment of this society. Mr. Speaker, most of us are prepared to recognize that the attainment of these objectives has become increasingly difficult in recent years. Changes in farm technology have been phenomenal. In addition, there have been complex adjustments in our society as a whole.

In order to keep pace, our farmers have been forced to adjust rapidly to the new scheme of things, in which they have become much more dependent on purchased production input such as fertilizer, feed, machinery and maintenance of their equipment. These inputs, bought from the industrial sector of our economy for the most part, have been steadily and rapidly increasing in cost. This steadily increasing pressure of rising prices has left farmers in a most unenviable position, a position which, since their postwar prosperity, has steadily eroded away.

To their great credit, our farmers have done much to aid themselves. They have increased productivity at an average of 5.3 per cent per year since the war while in industry the increase has only been about two per cent. This increase in productivity on the part of our farmers on a per-man basis has surpassed any era in history and is therefore a major factor in the industrial expansion of our economy. Nevertheless, our farmers have not shared as fully as they should in the prosperity

which Canada has enjoyed in recent years. In this regard, Ontario farmers are in a similar situation to the farmers of other provinces, and indeed of other countries as well. This fact was brought out at the Vineland conference in October of last year.

In the food production industry, farming is not limited to provincial scope. Indeed, not even national boundaries restrict our horizons in the business of food production. We must consistently seek to evolve programmes aimed at providing our farmers with a good standard of living and an adequate return on investment. In doing so, we are always conscious of the limitations in our efforts—limitations which stem from the interdependence between various governments and levels of governments within our country.

In recognition of this fact, my colleague, the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hamilton) recently pointed out the need for the development of a national agricultural policy for Canada. In his address, he stated that without such a policy the government of Ontario would be unable to ensure that our farmers participate fully in the growth and prosperity of the nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I wish today to discuss one important aspect of a national policy for agriculture, namely, the marketing of farm products. The key to a healthy agriculture industry is the producers' ability to market their products at a profit. It is in this area of marketing, Mr. Speaker, that we must be aware of a unique character of our agriculture producers and the disadvantage which faces each of them in our modern society.

Let us consider for a moment the industrial giants from whom our farmers must purchase their equipment. For example, General Motors. Because of its tremendous size, this giant corporation is able to exert a very strong influence over the price which it pays for raw materials and for wages, as well as over the selling price of its products. It has a well-established worldwide marketing organization and spends hundreds of millions of dollars on advertising each year. If a farmer wishes to purchase a truck from General Motors, he may visit many different salesmen but the price that he must pay for the vehicle is unlikely to differ in any marked degree from one dealer to another.

The prices that the farmers must pay for their production input are therefore relatively insensitive to the economics of supply and demand. On the other hand, the farmers' products are extremely sensitive to these factors of supply and demand. It has been said that a five per cent surplus in any farm commodity results in a 25 per cent reduction in the price of that commodity and a five per cent deficit has the reverse effect. However, in the last 25 years, our agriculture has been adjusting to a technological revolution and the increased food demands of the second world war. Throughout this period, production has consistently exceeded demand by approximately five per cent and the problem has been to maintain reasonable price levels for the producers and to dispose of our surplus.

In addition to this important fact, we have witnessed a tremendous concentration of marketing power through the growth of chain stores and in the food processing sector of our economy. Today, 70 to 80 per cent of the Canadian food trade is controlled by about five chain stores. These chains, as with our example of General Motors, operate under very competitive conditions and are so large that they can exert considerable pressure upon their suppliers and upon the selling price of their commodities.

In the face of this concentration of power, it is apparent that a single agricultural producer, among thousands, has little or no effective bargaining power.

By himself, he can exert no influence whatsoever on the price he may receive for his product. Under these circumstances some form of assistance for the individual producer is essential.

The 1920's and 1930's produced many examples of the need for such assistance. Consequently, during the 1930's, compulsory procedure marketing organizations, commonly called boards or commissions, were formed in many Canadian provinces under the auspices of the government legislation.

They were designed to improve the bargaining position of producers so that they might derive higher and more stable prices for their produce. The basic need for marketing boards remains unchanged today.

They establish quotas; they provide storage facilities and pooling of products; they act on behalf of producers to establish reasonable prices; they carry out market research; they circulate market information, promote the sale of their products and provide a central selling agency.

Marketing boards have been a hotly debated issue in Canada, both within and outside the agricultural community. The consensus issue generally centres around the

compulsory aspect and rarely about the value of the benefits which accrue from the existence of a board. Our citizens appear to object to compulsory issues, regardless of whether or not these are in the public's best interest.

The establishment of these marketing boards, Mr. Speaker, is both a logical and a necessary development in our economy. Throughout history, groups have been organized to counteract concentrations of power and to protect common group interests. Our labour unions, ratepayers associations, are notable examples.

The existence of these marketing boards benefits more than our producers. In the situations where assembly of products and a one-price policy exists, buyers and our society also benefit.

Agriculture is composed of many individual producers, as we all know. It becomes very costly for buyers in our modern, high-priced labour market to assemble products. The assembly of products then, on an organized basis, reduces buyers' costs and these savings may be passed on to producers and consumers alike.

A one-price policy promotes efficiency throughout the whole food chain. The avenues for profit are restricted to production efficiencies, rather than the purchasing department's ability to buy cheaper than anyone else. This, in turn, facilitates the best allocation of resources in the economy.

Now the declaration in 1957, that The National Products Marketing Act of 1934 was unconstitutional, has probably been the single, most important factor in the development of provincial, rather than national, marketing boards. The vast expanse of our country and agriculture has also contributed towards marketing board organization on a provincial basis.

The Canada wheat board and the recently formed national dairy commission are two recent exceptions. Provincial marketing boards operate under provincial legislation, although federal authority is required to deduct levies for export and inter-provincial activities. The Canada wheat board also operates under both federal and provincial legislation.

Today, Canada has approximately 105 provincial and regional boards responsible for about 40 commodities, with 16 more boards expected.

What is the present situation? The Ontario farm products marketing board has placed, in the hands of Ontario's farmers, marketing authority to assist in increasing their farm prices and to provide for more orderly marketing of farm products.

At present, we have 19 marketing plans covering 38 farm products, operating under this legislation. Dairy marketing, of course, is under other legislation.

It has been estimated that $400 million of farm products are sold under the marketing board plans and $240 million under The Milk Act in 1965. More than 70 per cent of Ontario farm products are sold under the auspices of a marketing plan, compared with about 15 per cent in other provinces. Approximately 90 per cent of our commercial farmers market their produce under some type of marketing plan.

It is anticipated that new additional plans may be introduced in the forseeable future, if the producers concerned so indicate. Thus in the area of marketing of farm products Ontario leads all other jurisdictions in Canada.

Yet, impressive as our progress has been to date, it is clear that further substantial improvement to farm incomes is possible only through the development of a national agriculture policy.

On December 14, the Ontario hog producers association presented a brief to our government's farm income committee. I would like to quote, if I may, from this brief to indicate the value of this marketing board to our hog producers, and some of the problems which face the board at the present time. I quote:

> In the fiscal period 1965-66, just ended, the hog producers marketing board marketed 2,368,421 hogs, realizing a value to producers of $141,327,330. The 1965 year showed sales of 2,419,673 at a value of $125,576,054. This means that 51,000 fewer hogs were marketed with gross receipts of $15.75 million greater.
>
> This all-time high in gross sales must be qualified by an increase in the cost of cereal grain and protein supplement, ranging from five per cent to 20 per cent, not to mention the continuing increase in cost of other goods and services required in the farm business.
>
> It should also be noted that this high in the price cycle has come after a number of years of low prices. Production forecasts are for a six per cent increase in the U.S. and a 25 per cent increase in Canada—which will inevitably lead to lower prices with no corresponding relief from present costs. On the optimistic side, however, there is increasing evidence to support the view

that the producer is less tolerant of low prices than he was in the past. The strong prices prevailing in the U.S. and Canada for the past 18 months are a direct result of cut-backs in the face of unprofitable prices. The Ontario hog producers marketing board, in common with other similar boards, has had a considerable measure of success in improving the farmers' marketing efficiency.

For the record, we set forth the achievements and the limitations as they appear to us. It has been able to do the following:

It has been able to provide a province-wide open market for the product, so total supply may be matched with total demand for the establishment of a fair price, taking into account, however, the fact that producers have no control over total supplies.

It has been able to even out the distribution of products arriving on the market so that processor and consumer demand are more effectively met.

It has been able to cooperate with government inspectors and graders to improve the quality of the product at the farm and on reaching the consumer.

It has been able to publicize the fluctuations and short run supplies on the market and thus, both to strengthen short run price and by effecting longer term production, plans to improve the long run price. Though prices are influenced by the North American economy it has given price leadership regionally.

and the brief goes on to say:

However, the following limitations apply: (a) no control can be exercised over total supplies since the price rises supplies will move in from out of the province; (b) long run predictions about demand and supply are impossible for almost the same reasons; (c) since the effort is provincial, advertising and promotion have serious shortcomings to producers supporting the effort for the benefits will be obscured through increased competition from out of the province suppliers; (d) little incentive to produce high quality hogs may be provided since benefits will be diluted by out of province competition.

Notwithstanding the considerable progress in the passage of enabling legislation by which farmers can organize their marketing, there is a tendency by all governments to reluctantly participate and instead, only to referee.

The main emphasis by governments has gress has been made by emphasis on this been on production, although great pro- aspect of farm problems and it has been less controversial. The omission by extension specialists to include markets and bargaining power as equally important essentials of farm business, has tended to identify these problems with the less affluent or unsuccessful.

Only recently, with the sheer weight of reality, are our large volume producers realizing the importance of what happens when a product is ready for sale. For those who would champion agriculture, the complete yardstick for efficiency must include marketing as well as production.

This ends the quote from the Ontario hog producers' association.

Similar impressive results have been achieved by the other marketing boards of this province—for example, the broiler chicken producers marketing board. In one year, profits to our broiler growers increased nearly $2 million through planned marketing, despite the fact that the average cost of production rose one cent a pound live weight.

The chairman of the producers section quota advisory committee of this board recently presented figures to the Canadian broiler council to show how easy it is to overproduce a market, and without any increase in dollar sales. The chairman stated:

> Twenty-three per cent more birds in 1961 grossed only 2 per cent more dollars with a loss of over $2 million to producers. A further increase of 10 per cent in 1964, brought only 1.5 per cent more dollars which scarcely covered the cost of production.

In 1965, Mr. Speaker, Ontario sold nearly 48 million birds at 18.6 cents per pound average, with gross sales of $32,963,000, providing a profit to growers of $2,836,000. The estimate for 1966—57,770 birds at 20½ cents per pound average, grossing $39,555,000, a 20 per cent increase, returning $4,823,000 to growers. And now, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the national situation. National marketing boards of a coordinating nature are needed for those commodities produced in more than one province. A coordinating type of board rather than an all powerful board delegating authority is probably the only type satisfactory to Ontario farmers.

Canada is still a country with vastly different conditions in agriculture. Too much

centralization of powers would not be in the best interests of our food industry and consumers. National commodity boards would be in a position to support provincial programmes designed to improve farm income situations. This would ensure that all approaches taken by a marketing board would enhance the farmers' position.

The proliferation of marketing boards during the next few years in the various provinces, Mr. Speaker, will undoubtedly result in more conflicting provincial marketing plans if some system of interprovincial coordination is not implemented in the very near future. A national commodity board would be in a position to advise the federal government on situations which affect producers in British Columbia, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, and in fact producers across Canada.

At the present time some provinces have boards and others have not. Under these circumstances, it is virtually impossible to objectively evaluate the effects such things as subsidies, tariffs, and below cost price imports have on Canadian producers. Last year British Columbia potato producers complained about the effects of cheap California imports on their industry. This happens to be a Canadian problem common to all provinces which necessitates action across the country and not just in one province.

Mr. Speaker, had a national potato board existed at that time a fast, accurate assessment of the situation would have been provided. A national voice carries a great deal of weight in Ottawa and is most effective in generating positive action. In the past it has been argued by the federal stabilization board that action cannot be taken for one province, that the programme must be country wide. Some people consider that this is more of an excuse than an argument, and problems materialize and would certainly provide a catalyst for positive action.

National commodity groups, Mr. Speaker, would be in a position to negotiate more favourable freight rates. Domestic food products would be competitive on more Canadian markets if our freight rates were comparable to those below the border, since freight costs affect the competitiveness of an industry. The Canadian wheat board has been able to negotiate very favourable rates, as have the Maritime producers and other organizations.

The Ontario winter wheat producers marketing board has had some success with rate reduction. However, individuals frequently encounter the argument from transportation companies that the rate will go down only if volume is available. Naturally, if you cannot be competitive at current rates it is most difficult to generate volume. High and inequitable freight rates are not in the best interests of Canadian agriculture nor of the whole economy.

This is an area, Mr. Speaker, in which a national organization could do a great service for Canadian agriculture. It must be recognized, however, that a national marketing structure could have certain dangers as far as the province of Ontario is concerned. It would possibly not be too realistic of this province to donate generously towards the development of certain other provinces with problems, on the one hand, and then be party to the development at the same time of a national marketing structure which could curtail the markets of Ontario farmers in order to make them available to farmers in other provinces.

I think that the social problems of other provinces must be recognized. I think that inefficiencies in any industry, including agriculture, must be recognized in Ontario and outside of Ontario. I feel it is most important that where there is a national coordination in the marketing of any agricultural product, be it milk or potatoes, real recognition and opportunity should be given to those areas which have the capability of efficient and economical production.

We must not sacrifice our efficient farmers in order to take care of social problems which may exist in some other areas of Canada. This would not make a sound Canadian agriculture or contribute to the soundness of our Canadian economy. We must recognize as well that the province of Ontario with its population approaching seven million is looked upon as a most desirable market by anyone with something to sell.

Provincial subsidies on product prices can create problems for producers in other provinces. It is reported that surplus broilers from British Columbia were recently sold on the Toronto market under some form of subsidy. This depressed prices considerably and weakened the purpose of the Ontario broiler chicken plan. The Ontario broiler chicken marketing board has set quotas on production to bring fair returns to the broiler industry in Ontario in the face of increasing production in other provinces.

Ontario is presently providing the umbrella for expansion in other provinces. If national marketing coordination means that Ontario farmers, even in the face of their own efficiency, would have to cut back their production

to allow access to other provinces without any real common national policy of fair play for agriculture, then it would be violently opposed.

It is quite a prevalent opinion that eastern agriculture, and Ontario agriculture in particular, Mr. Speaker, has been the victim of trade policy designed to help non-agricultural sectors. The fruit and vegetable industry and its problems with the United States imports is a prime example of Ottawa's lack of interest in Ontario grower problems. The similar cavalier and autocratic manner in which the Minister of Agriculture, in Ottawa at the January national convention of the dairy farmers of Canada, effectively tied the hands of the new milk commission is a further indication of current Ottawa official attitudes.

I mention this, Mr. Speaker, because if we are to have successful coordinating groups such as the national milk commission then they must be given at least a fighting chance by the federal government and by the federal Minister of Agriculture. They must be given time to consider their responsibilities and to make recommendations. Time must also be given to the special advisory board, in the case of the dairy industry, to make their recommendations.

Instead of this, the hon. Mr. Greene, without the advice of experts and by gazing into his own private crystal ball, which he obviously had dropped in the mud, made his pronouncement. And what was his pronouncement? That it would not be in the interests of the taxpayers to give any increased financial support to the dairy industry.

This must have been a moment of great disillusionment for all the dairy farmers gathered in conference. Here was their expected champion emerging with feet of clay. This was the official agricultural voice of Ottawa, Mr. Speaker; this was the official influence of government as far as agricultural policies and programmes were concerned. Many shook their heads and wondered. If this was what the Minister said publicly, they were indeed fearful of what he must be saying privately to his Cabinet colleagues. Others, of course, said he was preaching for a call. To realize these ambitions, the farmer could be the sacrificial goat.

However, colleagues of the federal Minister of Agriculture must have persuaded him to change his mind, because contrary to his announced "no-change" in federal subsidies for industrial milk, the new federal dairy support price provides for an increase of some $30 million over the federal support programme of $90 million in the last dairy year. In any case, I would suggest that many farmers in Ontario now have the measure of the hon. federal Minister of Agriculture, and any time in the future when he addresses farm groups in this province, they will remember his tendencies and his ambitions.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): They will vote for him.

Mr. Rowe: While many people now recognize and accept the necessity for an interprovincial and national coordination of the marketing of many farm products, I am sure as well they agree that the basic requirement is a sincerity of purpose and an honesty of effort at the federal level insofar as agriculture is concerned, which apparently they do not have at the present moment.

Canadian agriculture is at the crossroads in its development. For the first time in 15 years, Mr. Speaker, production and demand are almost in balance. There is a great future for the orderly expansion of farm production to feed our growing population. There is a potential for increased producer returns through organizing a more streamlined food supply system.

National marketing boards would be in a prime position to organize the supply of markets by producers most suited economically. Production and marketing controls, wherever necessary, are only effectively applied on a national basis. Prices are no longer set on a provincial basis, but rather on a national and international basis. National and international supplies tend to affect prices, not just provincial supplies. To be effective in stabilizing and maintaining prices, any adjustment of supply must be on a national basis.

Importing companies want some assurance of continuity in supply and a sufficient volume of the various kinds and grades of products. In many cases, provincial boards, individuals and organizations have not been in a position to meet such requirements. Virtually every developed country in the world subsidizes agriculture to some extent, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately Canada is near the bottom of the totem pole in its level of support for agriculture. In addition, most countries erect tariffs or other barriers against agricultural imports. Canada has lower barriers than most countries.

Apparently one of the most effective means of attaining access to a foreign market is to negotiate for a qualitative guarantee of access. This implies a commitment to allow the same amount of import as during recent years and

to give exporters a share in any growth of local consumption. A national marketing board along with the federal government could negotiate such agreements to the advantage of Canadian producers, Mr. Speaker.

It has been suggested that the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations will reduce tariffs on agricultural products. This means that Canadian producers must have a national voice to advise the federal government to what extent tariff reductions will affect our producers competing against farmers with higher subsidies.

We certainly do not have a national voice for farmers' interests in the government at Ottawa and they need all the advice they can get.

We will probably see the need for more international commodity agreements during the next few years, and national marketing boards or commissions will be essential before such negotiations take place.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the need for national commodity organizations has been reviewed and the advantages of such organizations has been put forth. The development of these boards will of course require concessions, cooperation, and much negotiation among producers and governments. Canadians are supposedly well renowned for their skills in solving irresolvable problems. The development of national marketing organizations is not a difficult problem; it will not even require a Ministerial visit to London or Washington.

However, national marketing boards, if developed in such a way as not to jeopardize the production efficiency of any province, can be vital for the well-being of Canadian agriculture, and must be implemented if Canadian producers are to retain their rightful portion of domestic and export markets.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, today's resolution standing in the name of the member for Northumberland bears a remarkable similarity to the resolution debated here a few weeks ago, which was proposed by the member for Renfrew North. Both of these resolutions concern themselves with the operation and desirability of a national agricultural policy for Canada.

I will have to admit, Mr. Speaker, to a good degree of confusion. It is going to be hard for me to find anything new to say that has not already been said in the previous resolution, including the speech, by an hon. member of this party, the member for Kent East (Mr. Spence).

My first reaction was to go through *Hansard* covering the previous resolution, which in effect called for a national agricultural policy. And I find that practically the same theme, if not the same words, is being used here today. It occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that there are still many items to be discussed in our precious members' hours and I was prepared to object to the use of two occasions for the same purpose. However, there is a small difference and since the resolution is obviously meant for home consumption, perhaps there are a few pertinent points that have not previously been made.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the idea of exploring the possibilities is elementary to say the least, inasmuch as it appears to admit a failure on the part of the government and the marketing boards in this essential area. Surely the exploring of possibilities has already been done by Ontario marketing boards in cases where boards of a similar nature exist in other provinces.

The resolution reads:

> That marketing boards should explore the possibilities of agreements to do with the inter-provincial and international movement of farm products.

I can only say that if such explorations have not been made, and are not now being made, the time is long overdue. It must also follow that if a counterpart to an Ontario board does not exist in other provinces, why, negotiations are impossible. This is the item in this resolution that is so confusing, and I will have to repeat: if a counterpart to an Ontario board exists elsewhere, negotiations are long overdue; if not, negotiations are impossible.

We like to think, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario has the most advanced form of collective marketing machinery of any of the provinces in Canada, and I expect that at the interprovincial level what can be done is already being done. In my opinion, however, provincial marketing boards have no business or right to become involved beyond negotiations interprovincially.

Ontario has tried with some success to sell many tons of beans in Britain and other countries through the bean board, and certainly the same applies to the wheat board and to an extent the tobacco board. But full cooperation will not be possible to the advantage of all concerned unless these and other products come under a national marketing board as is the case at the present time with milk.

The dairy commission of Canada, a recently formed body, of course, has now the responsibility over all dairy policies. We can spend hours in this forum tearing the government of Canada and The Department of Agriculture apart, but this is the fact. It is to be hoped that other products will follow suit.

This, of course, is only part of the development of an overall national agricultural policy, but this is the type of policy we support. The mover of the resolution certainly has made some very potent points and has pointed up many of the problems in agriculture which have created so much controversy among our farm population of recent years.

Certainly, the government through its efforts to work with producer groups to try to achieve orderly and fair marketing policies and prices, has struggled manfully and with some success. Certainly, the principle of marketing boards is the right principle in this day and age. And I think all members will agree that strictly provincially-oriented marketing boards are only a partial answer and can always be only a partial answer, and the scope of marketing authority certainly must be broadened.

There is only one way to broaden this scope and that is to press for the inclusion of more farm commodities in an overall national marketing authority, rather than extending the authority of provincial bodies.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, it is fascinating to watch the pattern of the government tactics unfold. Before Easter, we were given an opportunity to debate a motion introduced by the hon. member for Renfrew North with regard to a national agricultural policy.

Ostensibly, it was on the national agricultural policy. In reality, most of his speech was an attack on Ottawa for not doing enough.

Therefore, to divert attention from the great sins of omission on the part of this government, we were told before Easter, Mr. Speaker, by none other than the Prime Minister and many other government spokesmen, that there would be no private members' hours after Easter—and now they are extended.

Forgive me for being so suspicious as to believe that they are extended because the government wanted to use them, at least in this instance, to complete this pattern which has been established within the Tory caucus.

We now have a second motion. The second motion is to establish national marketing boards. Ostensibly, that is the purpose of the motion. In reality, the great substance of what the hon. member for Northumberland had to say, was an attack upon the federal government for its failure in agricultural policy.

It was shown in the context of his introductory remarks about the "selfless devotion" of the Minister of Agriculture and Food—a great political panegyric about the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

The fact of the matter is this, Mr. Speaker, the government members are painfully aware that never has there been greater protest in rural Ontario with regard to the failures of the Minister of Agriculture and Food than at the present time.

And the pattern, and the purpose, of the resolution before Easter, and the pattern and the purpose of the resolution now, is to direct the attack on Ottawa and to try to divert attention from what this government has failed to do. It is the old story, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member for Northumberland gets up and accuses Joe Greene of not treating the farmers well, and Joe Greene is accusing the Minister of Agriculture and Food here of not doing his duty by the farmers.

The hon. member for Northumberland says that Joe Greene comes up with only $4.75 for milk—and indeed we are not even certain it is going to be $4.75 when some other deductions are now made from it for handling industrial milk—and what Joe Greene was doing he says, was pursuing the relentless political battle of leaving the remaining 25 cents to get to the necessary $5 so that they could then direct the attack back at the provincial government.

The two of them are fighting it over the body of the agricultural industry, which is struggling for survival—at least for security in the course of its survival.

Now, let us face exactly what is happening here, Mr. Speaker. I would not object to the substance of these two motions that the House has been given then, and now.

The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin is correct, Mr. Speaker, that much of what has been said on both of them is identical material; they are both designed to present the Tory Ontario agricultural policy, which is basically an analysis of agricultural ills, and pointing the finger at Ottawa, because they know they have to point it somewhere. They cannot point it at the Minister of Agriculture

and Food because he has failed to face up to these problems.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): He is not even here now.

Mr. MacDonald: Of course he is not even here now, he is not interested. He is never around when the basic problems that agriculture has to cope with are on the mat. He never is in the agricultural estimates because he does not face up to these basic problems.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me come to the substance of it. I cannot find any quarrel with the substance of this motion calling upon marketing boards to study the proposition to explore the "possibilities of agreement to do with inter-provincial and international movement of farm products."

As was pointed out by the hon. member for Northumberland, owing to the decisions of the Privy Council back in the 1930's, agricultural marketing has to be started at the provincial level because it was ruled *ultra vires* at the federal level. Then we have to coordinate it at the federal level.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are going to get that degree of coordination to meet the basic needs of agriculture only if we get some leadership from government. Once again, this Conservative Party, through its spokesman on the eve on an election, are pointing at Ottawa and pointing at the provincial marketing boards instead of pointing where they should be directing their fire—at the Minister of Agriculture and Food and what he has failed to do.

He has failed to give the necessary leadership in the sesions with Ottawa to bring together marketing boards dealing with a similar commodity all across this country, so that you can get some sort of a national marketing board.

Certainly it is necessary. Certainly a marketing board, which is going to attempt to establish order in marketing and some stability of prices within a single province, is faced with impossible difficulty if there is any inter-provincial or export trade. Let us take, for example, the instance of hogs, with which the hon. member for Northumberland has dealt.

If hogs are going to come in from western Canada, if there is going to be any significant border crossing of hogs from Quebec to the province of Ontario, it obviously undermines the efforts to establish orderly marketing.

Indeed, in the efforts to establish orderly marketing through the marketing board in the province of Ontario, one of the battles that had to be fought by the marketing boards, was that the so-called free enterprisers defied the law of the province of Ontario, and wanted to ship their hogs directly into the province of Quebec and not put them through the necessary channels, as laid down by the marketing scheme that was established in the province of Ontario. So obviously this is a problem.

Indeed last year, if we may dwell for one moment again on the hog marketing board, when hogs in the province of Ontario rose to heights which were unheard of for quite some time, over $40 a hundredweight—

An hon. member: $44.

Mr. MacDonald: $44, right.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): What they should be.

Mr. MacDonald: What they should be if you are going to have some profit and some security for the hog producers. It was interesting that some of the importers or some of the packers—somebody, and you cannot quite find out who—decided that they were going to undercut this market, and so they imported extensive amounts of processed meat from northern Ireland. Now the interesting problem, Mr. Speaker, is that by the time that meat got to the province of Ontario, the prices were away down. And I am not so certain that the people who were engaged in it got their fingers burned a little. They maybe did not make as much money as they thought they were going to make.

But the other interesting aspect of the situation is: to what extent did the prices come down because there was this uncontrolled, unregulated importation from outside of the country, with nobody knowing exactly what the quality is, nobody knowing exactly what the cost is—the kind of uncontrolled situation which means that while the government talks as though you are going to have orderly marketing, it permits a few people to act in such a fashion that it creates a disorderly marketing. The minority can destroy the achievements of the majority in establishing orderly marketing and some better price security.

It is as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, that the Ontario hog producers at their annual meeting, which has just concluded, presented the resolution embodying the material which I think was quoted to some degree by the hon. member for Northumberland from the producers' brief to the special committee of

the Minister of Agriculture on farm income. The brief has now been adopted by their membership. I quote once again with pleasure from the *Farm and Country* in its current edition. It is headed: "National hog marketing? Asks for commission". The introductory paragraph:

> Ontario hog producers are asking for a national hog commission similar to the brand new dairy commission of Canada. It would have authority over exports, imports of fresh and processed pork products and would allow local marketing boards to have more authority over pig movements.

Then later they spell out specifically the main points of the committee's recommendations as follows:

> (1) A national hog and pork products commission. (2) Unified selling by the industry to the United States or other countries. (3) Teletype selling of hogs coming into Ontario from other provinces. (4) Import prices that will not jeopardize Canadian prices. (5) Control of subsidized pork and pork products from other countries. (6) Power from the Ontario hog producers marketing board to require importers to disclose the class, the quality and the price of imports.

Mr. Speaker, that is all very fine, and one would assume by implication from the comments of the hon. member for Northumberland on the eve of an election, speaking on behalf of the Conservative Party, that they support that. But, Mr. Speaker, that kind of action is the most devastating undermining of the free enterprise approach to marketing that this government is committed to normally.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Are you looking at me?

Mr. MacDonald: No, I am not looking at you. I would not pretend to be looking at you, but if your conscience bothers you, I will look at you when I say that, Mr. Speaker.

In other words, the government is paying lip service to the establishment of the kind of orderly marketing which would, in their terms, put free enterprise in a straitjacket. Quite frankly, if the farmers are going to get justice, free enterprise has to be put into a straitjacket. So it is just to face the fact that while you pay lip service to this now, your basic principles and your basic ideology is in opposition to it.

So I wonder, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the impressive speech that the hon. member for Northumberland read, whether this government really believes in the control over the economy that national marketing boards would involve.

If this government really believed in it, Mr. Speaker, I think we would have had some evidence of their belief in the form, not of pre-election words, but of some action, some leadership on the part of this government, to take the initiative with Ottawa to establish national marketing boards.

We have had no such leadership from them. This is the great void—this is the reason why the hon. member for Northumberland has to heap paeans of praise on the Minister of Agriculture and Food to try to refurbish his image, because he is so unpopular out in the rural areas of the province at the present time. Never has he been faced with such a protest from the rural parts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go back and tie these two motions together, because they really are closely related. Marketing can do something on the job. True! But the significant thing—and I now go back to the key point in the resolution of the member for Renfrew North about our national agricultural policy—is that this was presumably to work out an income incentive policy.

I ask the question again, where does this government stand on that issue? Last spring, when the farmers of the province of Ontario were in a revolt, such as we had not seen since the end of the first world war, this government had no answer to their basic problem of income, except to call a conference at Vineland.

In the conference at Vineland last fall, Mr. Speaker, they eventually emerged with the setting up of a committee of five people to look into a proposal that was made by the federation of agriculture, namely for the working out of the details of an income incentive policy for agriculture.

Now this is fine; it was an encouraging development, Mr. Speaker, because it meant that the federation of agriculture had reversed most of its basic approach from even the previous year, as admitted by Tom Robson and Art Musgrave, who spoke on behalf of their marketing committee.

They said:

> We are not now in favour of the proposition of eliminating a cheap food policy because there are social values in a cheap food policy.

We are not now persuaded that farmers can go into the market place and get everything they need from marketing boards, because we have discovered that there are limits to which the marketing boards can get an income for the farmers.

If they drive the prices too high, then the prices become too high for the consumers and that is not good socially. If they drive them too high, they get them to the point where imports will come in from the United States, where subsidized food from the United States will come in and, in effect, take away the market from the Ontario producer.

We are in favour of doing as much as we can through marketing boards to wring as much out of the market place as you can, to meet the needs of the farmers, but let us recognize in advance that marketing boards cannot get everything that the farmers need to be able to survive economically and therefore the farmer should have —and I am going to use a horrible word— a subsidy, an income incentive programme to supplement what they can get out of the marketplace to make certain that they get enough to cover their cost of production and the expenses on their capital needs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture and Food accepted this principle of income incentive programme for agriculture—presumably he accepted it because he set up a committee to study it.

They have been studying it now for some four or five months and I remind this House again, as I reminded them in the last debate on the resolution from the hon. member for Renfrew North, that we have not yet had from the Minister of Agriculture, or from any other member on the government side of the House, a statement to the effect that the Conservative Party supports an income incentive programme for agriculture, even in principle.

Now, I do not ask the government to spell out the detail. That is the purpose of the committee—to work out the details. But I think the farmers of the province of Ontario are entitled to assurance from the Minister of Agriculture, and the government, and the back benchers speaking on behalf of the party, that the Conservative Party is in favour of an income incentive programme.

We have had no assurance from them that they are in favour of that, because once again, an income incentive programme is in violation of the basic free enterprise approach of this government. They are talking out of both sides of their mouth.

They are trying to curry votes in the rural areas of the province on the eve of an election, and after the election is over, then you will see all of the normal forces in the Conservative Party in favour of free enterprise, contending that to regulate the market, such a fashion is going to take away from people their basic freedom—all the rest of the kind of clap-trap that we usually hear, Mr. Speaker.

We have not heard from the government whether they are in support of an income incentive programme. We have not had from the government, in what is more important than the words of the hon. member this afternoon, namely action by the government, some indication that they are really in favour of national marketing boards—otherwise they would go out and build those national marketing boards to assist the farmers to get adequate income.

So Mr. Speaker, all I can conclude is by saying that this motion is like a motion in favour of motherhood, God, the Queen—I am in favour of it, everybody is going to be in favour of it, even hon. members on the other side of the House are going to be in favour of it on the eve of an election.

But when the election is over, and you come to the working out of the details of the income incentive policy, we will then find, just as we have noted an absence of support for its principle, that you have not got a real support for it.

We have not got the support for it from this government in terms of building national marketing boards, and I would have been much more impressed with support of that kind than all of these fine words, and panegyrics of the Minister, that we have been entertained with this afternoon.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will return to the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development. These will be followed by the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information.

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:00 o'clock, p.m.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 54

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 6, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 6, 1967

Final report, select committee on youth, Mr. Apps 1795

Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 1800

Hospital Services Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 1801

Pension Benefits Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 1801

Question to Mr. Gomme re Niagara parks commission, Mr. Nixon 1801

Questions to Mr. Gomme re historic sites and parks, Mrs. Pritchard 1801

Question to Mr. Haskett re crash helmets for motorcyclists, Mr. Paterson 1802

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the coroner for Metro, Mr. Singer 1802

Questions to Mr. Spooner re the OMERS Act, Mr. Bryden 1802

Question to Mr. Wishart re labour injunctions, Mr. Singer 1803

Question to Mr. Auld re hotel and motel rates in the Cornwall area, Mr. Paterson 1803

Question to Mr. Davis re student awards, Mr. MacDonald 1803

Questions to Mr. Simonett re gas pipelines, Mr. MacDonald 1804

Question to Mr. Simonett re the Ontario water resources commission, Mr. Smith 1804

Questions to Mr. Gomme re Amherst Island ferry, Mr. Newman 1804

Statement by Mr. Gomme re television spot-announcement award 1805

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 1805

Recess, 6 o'clock 1833

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: in the east gallery, Corpus Christi separate school, Toronto; in the west gallery, Fern Avenue public school, Toronto, and Appleby college, Oakville.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I am pleased to table the final report on the Ontario Legislature's select committee on youth.

Mr. Speaker, this report represents some two and one half years of investigation and study by the select committee of the Ontario Legislature on youth. The committee began its work shortly after being appointed May 8, 1964, and its task proved to be far-reaching. For example, visitations and meetings totalled 162 days and 698 briefs were submitted.

Response from all areas visited was most enthusiastic and encouraging. It resulted in our obtaining a large quantity of evidence which proved invaluable in helping the committee to form its recommendations.

The committee was most impressed with, and appreciative of, the extensive work and cooperation received from the elected officials and senior executives of the municipalities visited during 1964, 1965 and 1966. The work of the chairmen and officers of the 18 youth committees formed by the municipal executives—who organized the agency and individual resources of their respective areas in anticipation of the select committee's visits and hearings—was outstanding.

It is with satisfaction and deep appreciation that I think the many agencies, departments of government and individual persons who have extended to this committee their most excellent cooperation and assistance. Without their help this report would not have been possible.

Although the committee cannot claim to have produced the final answers to the many questions asked respecting our terms of reference, our recommendations have been made on the basis of an evaluation of the most extensive information available to us. This information has not only been personally gleaned from our own province, but from our sister provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Quebec, as well as the states of New York, New Jersey, Michigan and California.

Also, an extensive interchange of correspondence regarding similar matters throughout Canadian provinces and foreign countries was undertaken to obtain an international as well as domestic view of youth problems and services as a background to our own provincial area of study.

One of the many things learned from this study is that the rapidly and ever-changing pattern of activities which affects youth will inevitably reveal new information. Such information must be constantly observed and appraised by a competent and authoritative body.

Canada's future is inextricably woven with the need for youth to be trained to assume increasing responsibilities in every field of endeavour. Hinging on this, the committee feels that major efforts must be made to encourage youth to find more positive and creative roles in the community.

As chairman of the select committee, I would like to express my warmest appreciation to my fellow members for their dedication and the endless patience they have shown in the work of our committee. They have sacrificed much of their business time, and also their normally free and family time to the cause of the problems presented to the committee. Individually they brought wide experience to our deliberations, and gave much inspiration to the areas they visited. The impact of their work may well be felt for many years to come in broader fields than the original terms of reference stipulated.

Our committee was deeply shocked on learning of the death of one of its members

on June 26, 1965, Mr. Leo Troy, who represented the riding of Nipissing, and who had been making such a valuable contribution to the work of the committee. Mr. Troy's wealth of experience in youth work, his patience and understanding, and his keen interest in the work of the committee was a great inspiration to all of us.

The select committee wishes to thank Dr. Walter Koerber of the Scarborough special education branch for his wise assistance in the early days of this committee's existence. Unfortunately, due to ill health in July, 1964, Dr. Koerber had to relinquish his appointment as secretary to the committee.

I would also like to thank the secretary of our committee, Judge William T. Little, of the juvenile and family court of Metropolitan Toronto, and his very competent staff, which included our research officer, Mr. George Repar, and Mrs. Anne Dempster, secretary to Judge Little. They have all made outstanding contributions to the work of our committee.

For the purposes of this report, the term "youth" has been defined as those persons of both sexes in Ontario between the ages of 14 and 24 years inclusive, with considerable flexibility at the lower age limit. Full realization of the impact of pre-adolescent years on maturing youth has been acknowledged by the committee through its examination of many briefs and visitations respecting children's needs who are under 14 years of age. It is apparent that many of the problems that young teenagers are having have their beginning at a very young age.

The significant aspect of the population trend for this committee has been the shifting of the median age. Median age represents the age above which, and below which, half the population lies. It is estimated that in the 1961-1971 period the median age will fall below 25 years of age. In 1961 the median age was 26.3 years. By 1971, 50.6 per cent of the population will be found in the 0 to 24 age sector of the population.

No matter how they are viewed or the statistics to which one turns, this startling increase in the number of young people is a dramatic story which has resulted in certain anxieties as to the role these young people will play in this province, as well as with some of the problems that are a direct result of this rapid increase in lower age numbers.

The committee has talked to many young people in all walks of life, because, although we have been very interested in the suggestions of those working with young people, we also feel we have learned a great deal from the youth of this province themselves.

The information obtained from all sources in this major study of youth has resulted in 276 recommendations being made by the committee.

We have been impressed with the genuine interest that has been shown by so many people and by the dedication of the many volunteers, who are doing such a tremendous job now to help the youth of this province. In many cases these organizations appear to be understaffed and they do not have enough money and trained personnel to do the work they would like to do. But despite these handicaps, they are still making a fine contribution to the welfare of our young people.

The most important recommendation submitted in the final report to the Legislature is the first one of the 276 which states:

> A separate provincial department of youth, with its own Cabinet Minister, should be formed at the earliest convenience of the Legislature.

The committee further recommends that:

> An advisory committee of Ontario youth (under 25) be selected on a regional basis by a department of youth. This committee would be of assistance to the department in dealing with certain areas of youth needs.

In recommendation 5 the committee recommends that the permanent committee of senior officials from all government departments providing youth services be established within the department of youth, and this would help achieve the much needed coordination and cooperation of youth services in government departments dealing with youth matters.

The eighth recommendation outlines the major functions of a proposed department of youth and how it could accomplish its functions:

> (a) Administration of grants pertaining to youth under:
>
> i. Physical fitness agreements with the federal government;
>
> ii. Department of Agriculture and Food grants for swimming pools, arenas, and community centres (Community Centres Act;)
>
> iii. Athletic commission (Department of Labour) grants for sports equipment to athletic organizations in the province.

(b) Provide assistance for the establishment of local youth agency councils for all communities requesting such a facility.

(c) Establish close advisory and liaison connections with such councils, and assist them financially when youth needs have been definitely established.

(d) Assist in promoting youth participation in community and provincial service projects under guidance of local youth agency councils.

(e) The collecting and dissemination of youth and youth service information to social agencies and the public on a province-wide basis.

(f) Promoting and financially assisting research in all youth-oriented areas—locally and provincially.

(g) The encouragement of amateur sports through financial assistance and advisory service throughout Ontario.

(h) Recreation for people of any age through a more positive use of neighbourhood resources, notably public and secondary school buildings and facilities supervised and organized by recreational personnel in collaboration with school authorities.

(i) Youth services, presently being administered by other government departments:

1. Athletic commission,
2. Community programmes branch,
3. Youth branch,
4. Ontario council for the arts,
5. Training schools.

(j) A fully integrated research programme dealing with youth. Many areas now cross several departmental lines of responsibility and require a coordinated and "total youth" directed inquiry into several areas such as delinquency, multi-handicapped children, rehabilitation of children with a variety of social and health problems, the "drop-out", and so-called unreached or alienated youth.

(k) Stimulation of cultural arts in the province by providing imaginative and practical programmes relating to art and music appreciation, and encouragement of creative artists, in all art forms, by annual awards for literature (best works in all literary forms, poetry, short stories, plays), music (best orchestral, solo instrumental, and choral works), sculpture, visual art and other art forms.

(l) The promotion of Canadian cultural arts, financially and culturally, through a broader programme by the Ontario council for the arts.

It must be stated at this time that the section and recommendations of this report dealing with the inclusion of training schools in Ontario within the jurisdiction of a proposed Ontario department of youth, is not to be construed in any way as a criticism of the presently constituted Department of Reform Institutions or their existing programmes for those in training schools.

It has been recognized that many positive changes have been instituted by this department in the areas of differential training and extension of physical plant facilities to the advantage of children committed during recent years. However, in principle, it has been felt that to avoid the stigma and disadvantages attached to institutions which are associated with a department dealing with criminals as a primary responsibility, such disadvantages could be reduced if such youth institutions were under a department of youth, specially designed to meet youth needs.

Under education, the committee recommends that courses in sex education, alcohol, tobacco, government and law, driver education, and guidance and counselling be given high priority in curriculum planning.

It is recommended that there be a general upgrading of elementary teachers' training for those teachers who, at the present time, have not had the benefit of a liberal arts degree. It is further recommended that as soon as it is practical no one may enter the teaching professions at the elementary school level without holding a university degree.

In the area of health the committee's report shows concern re the need for "grants to encourage the training of clinical personnel—psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers." Further, it is felt that "approved residential treatment centres for children undergoing mental health care should be covered by the Ontario hospital services insurance."

The committee recommends that in the area of the use of school buildings for recreational purposes—"All school boards make their facilities available after school hours on a neighbourhood basis. The boards should enter into operating cost agreements with local recreational councils to reduce the charges to extra-curricular organizations in the recreation field".

Under the welfare section of the report, the committee recommends day-care for children

of mothers who require such services for social, economic or emotional reasons and be made available by area municipalities in the province. Priority according to need should be the criterion of admission. Day-care should be viewed in terms of nursery school and play-group facilities essentially educational in content.

In order to encourage municipalities to establish such centres as soon as possible, the department of welfare pay 80 per cent of the net cost of the operation of these services. This should be reviewed from time to time in the light of such services being provided by the various municipalities.

The committee also recommends that:

All children's aid societies in the province provide family counselling to their services and budget accordingly. Under the provisions of the new Child Welfare Act, 1965, the prevention sections would permit the children's aid societies to include family counselling on a much broader scope than formerly.

Every municipality should have an agency council consisting of representatives of all youth and family servicing agencies. This council should be a liaison body with a provincial department of youth in matters requiring provincial assistance either financial or advisory, respecting youth.

Regarding employment opportunities, the committee recommends:

A provincial department of youth undertake to negotiate with the Canada manpower centre to encourage to a great extent local youth employment boards to help young people get seasonal and permanent employment.

It is felt that penal institutions make more use of the apprenticeship programmes and encourage employers to employ ex-inmates through subsidizing their wages for a definite period of time.

Under sports, the committee recommends the following:

Too few of our secondary schools have access to year-round swimming pools, tracks or arenas for skating, etc. These important activities should be incorporated in school board building and planning programmes, in cooperation with local recreation personnel.

All moneys made available to the province of Ontario through the physical fitness agreements between federal and provincial governments should be taken up and used in the interest of the physical fitness needs of Ontario youth.

It has been recommended that:

Leadership training camps, similar to Bark Lake and Couchiching, be located regionally, that is, northwestern Ontario (Lakehead), southwestern Ontario (Huron shore area), and eastern Ontario (Rideau district). These camps should be completely winterized for year-round use.

Neighbourhood sports programmes should be incorporated as part of recreational programmes, using the school buildings, grounds and equipment.

Athletic scholarships have been recommended to be accepted by our universities for outstanding athletes who have the academic qualifications for university entrance.

An expanded programme of sports activities should be encouraged and assisted by a department of youth. The province should sponsor "junior Olympic provincial championships" and in cooperation with local organizations these competitions could be instituted on an annual basis, rotating the location each year.

Special recognition be given to outstanding athletes in all major sports. A province of Ontario athletic award should stimulate more interest and competition among participants in such sports.

Under the counselling section of the report, the committee recommended that a sufficient number of universities throughout the province be encouraged to provide undergraduate degree courses in social work and psychology so that the expected manpower requirements for these special services will be adequately filled.

There is a need for more guidance personnel in elementary, secondary and post-secondary educational institutions. Ratio of full-time guidance personnel to students should not exceed 350-500 students per counsellor.

It is also recommended that school teachers should receive more training in the behavioural sciences to equip them to be more competent in detecting children with various types of learning disabilities and behaviour problems. Thus, their ability to refer and confer with professional diagnostic services would be enhanced.

The committee further recommends that:

The province of Ontario council for the arts should be responsible to the Minister of the department of youth.

The Department of Education take immediate steps to improve the number and quality of elementary school teachers of the cultural arts. More curriculum time should be allocated to the cultural subjects of art and music to give students a better appreciation of these subjects.

All communities in Ontario that do not have facilities for the performing arts should examine their present and future school building programmes with a view to incorporating these much needed facilities (auditorium complete with staging accommodations, recreation needs, for example) within their educational building projects present and future.

Music camps be included in an expanded Department of Lands and Forests' planned camp sites programme. Camps in strategic sections of the province should be made available to musical organizations prepared to give musical instruction in a summer camp setting, at a nominal charge.

Grants should be made to approved schools and conservatories of music for scholarships to encourage talented students.

Research on Canadian mass media be undertaken to assess the effects on various-age viewers, special groups, such as delinquents, mental patients, immigrant youth, and institutionalized persons of all types.

The Ontario council for the arts should have a greater budget to promote the cultural arts in Ontario.

The committee also recommends that:

Physical education teachers in elementary schools be encouraged to upgrade their qualifications through special physical training, summer, extension and workshop courses.

Every elementary and secondary school, planned by boards of education in the province of Ontario, provide for gymnasiums and play areas. Such facilities should be planned in cooperation with specialized recreational personnel to coordinate, not only physical education in the school system, but physical fitness and recreation programmes in the community.

There should be a minimum of at least 120 minutes a week of physical education taught each week from grades 7 to 12. All secondary schools should make available physical education courses for grade 13 students and every effort be made to encourage students to participate in these courses. Physical training courses throughout secondary schools should concentrate on the carry-over sports activities that will assist students to maintain good physical condition long after school leaving age.

Regular physical check-ups be made of all elementary, secondary and university students—especially their eyes, ears, throat, heart, lungs and teeth.

Under the delinquency section the committee made these recommendations:

Small group homes (8 to 10 children to a home) are urgently needed for children who may or may not be in conflict with the law, but cannot remain in their own homes for a variety of reasons. Such homes could best be supervised by the child welfare division of the provincial department of welfare and should be subsidized on a per capita arrangement by the provincial government and local municipalities, on an agreed cost-sharing formula.

The Attorney General's Department endeavour to institute legislation as soon as possible to establish the juvenile age at 17 years (under) in the province. This to assist in achieving uniformity across the country and to achieve the highest rehabilitation rate possible of young people before the courts, at a time when they may benefit most.

The Deserted Wives and Children's Maintenance Act be amended to provide for adequate enforcement of court maintenance orders under this statute. All moneys assessed against the husband should be paid into the court and penalties imposed by the court for failure to do so without the deserted wife being bound by needless procedures on her own to obtain what the court has already ordered.

Juvenile records be expunged after five years of delinquent-free behaviour.

No person under the age of 16 should be permitted to purchase a motor vehicle and register the motor licence in his or her name in Ontario. Parents today are not even consulted in such transactions in many cases today with serious results.

The legal age for consuming alcoholic beverages remains at 21 years.

Stricter enforcement of The Liquor Control Act be conducted as it affects purveyors of spirits, wine and beer to minors.

The voting age in Ontario be reduced to 19 years.

There should be no age restrictions for young people to play billiards in a licensed establishment.

Young offenders in reformatories should be placed in vocational shops and activities that are designed to assist the inmate in his ultimate rehabilitation and not necessarily be a work contribution to an institutional industry.

Youth bureau officers have special training over and above the usual police courses. Such training should be in the areas of child psychology, child and teenage physical and mental development, community resources for juveniles, knowledge of the laws affecting juveniles as well as the usual police knowledge respecting apprehension, court procedures and charging of young people.

A government sponsored public education programme be undertaken respecting the role of the policeman in all areas of his difficult job, with a view to improving the police image.

A greater expansion of the detached worker programme be undertaken by more social agencies in Ontario. Provincial funds should be made available to assist detached worker programmes undertaken by approved agencies.

It has been recommended that:

All training schools come under the jurisdiction of a provincial department of youth.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I wonder Mr. Speaker, if that report is going to be called the "Apps report" following the new custom that we established the other day?

Mr. Speaker: Motion.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): May I ask that that report, too, be listed on the order paper under my name.

Mr. Singer: What is the name of that report?

Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, I might mention here that this report was the work of at least 15 very hard-working people and I would have no part of it being named after any one of them, including myself.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this amendment to The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, to adopt the Ontario medical association's revised schedule of fees as a basis of paying claims, taking effect on April 1, 1967, I would like to note the events which led up to government proposing this amendment.

You will be aware that the health committee of this House had three sessions at which the Ontario medical services insurance plan was discussed. Members of that committee voiced concern with the OMA's expressed intention to introduce a new fee schedule which would be effective on April 1, 1967.

Your committee, therefore, requested the OMA to appear before it and this matter was frankly discussed. It appeared to be the concensus of the members of the health committee that the Ontario medical association should be prepared to delay any increase in rates.

It was reasoned by certain members that the advent of OMSIP had increased the remuneration to medical practitioners in this province by a substantial amount. Furthermore, it was stated that the OMA was well aware that the present Act allowed for payments at the 1965 level of fees, for the first two years of the programme.

For these reasons, several members of the committee suggested delay in any increase in rates. I might say that it has been stated that the proposed increase averages out at 8 per cent whereas our analysts believe that the figure is about 15 per cent.

Furthermore, I feel that I should point out that while the emphasis has been placed on the need for an increase in fees for general practitioners — and government agrees that every encouragement should be given to family practice—that the new schedule also makes a substantial number of changes with regard to payment for specialists. These changes result in increases to certain specialists in amounts which equate to as much as 30 per cent.

However, despite these factors, the government is determined to ensure that the public will not be penalized by having to pay extra amounts for medical services. In the light of these circumstances I am tabling this amendment which will adopt the OMA's revised schedule of fees as from April 1, 1967, as a

basis for which payments will be made by OMSIP.

In order to ensure that this situation does not occur in the future, I recently wrote again to the OMA and to the Ontario college of physicians and surgeons, inviting them to participate in an arrangement which should offer prior consultation and joint agreement on these matters.

It seems to us that this is one of the most hopeful ways to avoid repeated confrontations on this matter.

THE HOSPITAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this amendment will permit the commission to make grants, or provide loans for schools, for the education of nurses, technicians, and other related hospital and health facility personnel, without having to make the payments through a hospital, as now obtains. Many of these schools are being established physically apart from hospitals and, under the direction of their own boards, they are eligible for the grants and this will simplify the machinery by which those grants can be made to them.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1965

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to strengthen the rules concerning the type of pension plan that will be registered, and to ensure that pension benefits will not be assigned or seized.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways.

Is it the intention of The Department of Highways to build a four-lane highway through Victoria park in the Niagara parks commission area?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I will have to accept this question as notice and bring in the answer later.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister has accepted it as notice, perhaps he might also, at the same time, inquire into the reason that a former member of the Ministry, Mr. "Todd" Daley, indicated in a press release today, that the building of this highway was the reason he had resigned from the Niagara parks commission.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister have an answer for the member for Hamilton Centre (Mrs. Pritchard)?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member for Hamilton Centre, "Would the Minister explain why the Centennial project for the city of Hamilton specifically known as Dundurn castle, has been omitted from the list of historic sites and museums on the map of Ontario Roads to Recreation – Centennial issue?"

The answer is: The title block of the brochure, Roads to Recreation, indicates that only a portion of the historic sites and museums are shown. It is not the intention of the department to list every Centennial project in our province. It is recognized that Dundurn castle in Hamilton forms a part of the historical heritage of the province and my department will give it the recognition it deserves on the 1968 brochure.

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

I am a little concerned, not only with Dundurn castle, but with the fact that in the Minister's picnic area, there is no mention of Confederation park or any mention of the Royal botanical gardens, particularly the rock garden, which is located in Hamilton and is a great tourist attraction.

I understand that Hamilton has not been on this map for some four years and I think, being Centennial year—we are very well aware of the potential of the tourist trade—

Mr. Nixon: It takes the Liberals to put it on the map.

Mrs. Pritchard: Yes—it will take more than the Liberals, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the Minister if he could tell me: how is the information which goes into the map compiled? Who is responsible for informing the department, should it be the city; how is it correlated?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, I will have to get the answer to that.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport, notice of which was given.

In view of the statement made by Mr. J. T. Manley, president of the motorcycle distributors' association of Ontario, that motorcycle fatalities in the province could be cut by as much as 50 per cent if crash helmets were made compulsory, does the Minister intend to take any action on this matter during this session?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the wearing of crash helmets by motorcyclists is recommended by our department.

We feel that a prerequisite to making the wearing of crash helmets mandatory is a definition of the type of helmet to be worn. No adequate standard is now available but work is currently under way by the Canadian standards association to set a minimum standard of safety for crash helmets. When this problem has been resolved, consideration will be given to formulating regulations concerning their use.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question, two questions in fact, for the Attorney General.

The first one is this: In cases where the supervising coroner of the province of Ontario has indicated that he will conduct an inquest, can the chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto call such an inquest on his own authority to be conducted by a coroner of his own choosing?

Part two of that question: Has the supervising coroner's authority been challenged by the chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto with respect to the inquest that the chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto is now conducting into the fire at the workmen's compensation board hospital?

And a third question: If the answer to the second question is "yes", what action does the Attorney General intend to take in this regard?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the supervising coroner for Ontario has supervision over all coroners in Ontario, including the coroner for Metropolitan Toronto. The coroner who issues the warrant summoning an inquest has charge of that inquest. That is the answer to the first part.

The answer to the second part of the question is "yes", and as to the action being taken, the third part of the question, the chief coroner for Metropolitan Toronto is being informed that the supervising coroner for Ontario has supervision and control over all coroners and that he must respect the advice and supervision given by the supervising coroner for Ontario.

Mr. Singer: I have another question on a different subject—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I have a question I wish to direct to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He advised me that he has an engagement and, that he wishes to leave, so with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I will ask my question now.

Actually, it amounts to two questions, the first of which is: When will regulations respecting supplementary benefits be issued under The Ontario Municipal Employees' Retirement System Act, 1961-1962, as authorized by the amending statute of last year?

Second; will the Minister honour the commitment made to the Legislature some weeks ago that the board envisaged in the OMERS Act will be appointed this spring?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question, I would hope that the regulations respecting the supplementary benefits under the OMERS Act will be published within the next four to six weeks.

In saying that, I should explain that I must depend on certain staff officials who may find that they have other responsibilities thrown upon them and the work with respect to this might be retarded. But I am quite confident that within the next four to six weeks—

Mr. Bryden: That will be about a year after they get the authority.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, that is all right. This is a very complex subject and it is being examined very carefully.

Insofar as the second part of the question is concerned, I am sure that the hon. member realizes that I always keep my commitments and in due course of time—

Mr. Bryden: This has been hanging fire for five years.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh yes, but there are reasons why it has been hanging fire for five years. In due course of time the board will be appointed.

Mr. Bryden: Well, no one will ever accuse the Minister of moving at breakneck speed.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Sometimes well thought out plans take a bit more time but they are much more successful.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General.

In view of the Attorney General's comments as quote in this morning's Toronto *Globe and Mail* that there may be no place for injunctions in the labour field, does he intend to introduce legislation this session to abolish injunctions in labour matters?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: What a silly question. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: It is not a silly question, I cannot help it if the Attorney General made a silly statement.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member is quite well aware the remark which was quoted in the *Globe and Mail* was part of a much wider discussion and it was in the general context of a discussion with the Ontario federation of labour regarding labour matters generally.

In that discussion, having occasion to refer to the study being carried on by the Royal commission and Mr. Justice Rand, I referred to the question of the injunction and that the study was directed to its place, whether it had a place, what place it had, and the procedures relating to injunctions; this was all a part of that large and general context.

And I think in that discussion it was indicated that such a study being carried on we would naturally wait to receive the report, which should be completed this year.

I think that answers the hon. member's question as to whether legislation will be brought in, or not, this session.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why did the Attorney General not act on the select committee report of eight years ago?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was not here eight years ago.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the government has been here, or has it?

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information.

Have hotel and motel rates in the Cornwall area of the province increased and if so, what is the percentage increase over last year? Secondly, does the Minister intend to take any action to control motel rates which are being increased because of Expo '67?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, may I first say that the department, as hon. members will recall, obtained authority last year to require the filing of rates from those establishments which we license.

I cannot tell my hon. friend whether or not rates are being increased this summer in the Cornwall area over last year, but I can tell him from the information we have that the winter rates are being increased by about 12 per cent in the Cornwall area this year.

I can also tell him it is our understanding that this is the normal differentiation in that summer resort area from their winter rates, which I think has been their policy for some time. We are gaining information with the legislative authority we now have to see what variations there are in rates around the province as between seasons and between periods, and in answer to the second question, we have no legislative authority at the present time to set rates.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have three questions. The first to the Minister of University Affairs.

What explanation is there for the fact that some students have not yet received the final payment from the student awards for the academic year just concluded?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as of this date the department has issued 19,244 cheques, a total sum of $4,937,643. Each cheque is requisitioned and issued upon receipt of the required information from the post-secondary institution which the student attends. After a relatively small number of cheques have been issued today and tomorrow, all students will have received their awards with the exception of those who applied within the last two or three weeks, or where the required documents have yet to be received from the institution concerned.

Mr. MacDonald: I assume then, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to the question is that they did not get the information from the post-secondary institution in time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Speaker, I am not sure without going into each individual situation, whether this would be the case in all instances or not.

Mr. MacDonald: My second and third questions, Mr. Speaker, are to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Is the government aware that the federal energy Minister, Jean-Luc Pépin, has given Trans Canada Natural Gas until May 1 to get FPC clearing for its southern route, otherwise work must be begun on the northern route through Canada?

Secondly, since an FPC decision cannot be expected before July 1, and is likely to be appealed to the courts, what action is the provincial government taking to back up the federal warning that work must begin May 1, in order to ensure adequate gas for southern Ontario this coming winter?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is yes. The government is aware that the federal energy Minister has given Trans-Canada Natural Gas until May 1 to get federal power commission clearance for its southern route.

In answer to the second part of the question, I might state that I have had meetings with all the gas suppliers in the province of Ontario and I have been assured by them that everything possible is being done to eliminate any possibility of a gas shortage in the winter of 1967-68.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Minister a supplementary question?

Is the building of another line from western Canada, whether by a southern route or a northern route, necessary to assure adequate gas for this coming winter?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, not necessarily. I understand, with the additional storage that will be put into use this year, that they have been able to buy additional supplies from some of the American gas companies so that they can get by and there will be no shortage during this coming winter.

Mr. MacDonald: My second question to the Minister is, has the government received complaints regarding pollution, arising from raw sewage drainage into the Catfish creek on lot 14, concession 7, township of Malahide, Elgin county, and affected housing developments in Aylmer? If so, what action is being taken and when will the problem be cleared up?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, complaints were received in 1965 regarding overflow from a sewage pumping station operated by the Ontario water resources commission. Overflow was due to mechanical problems which have been cleared up. No overflow is occurring now.

The municipality is also progressing in its sewer construction programme to eliminate sources of pollution, as noted in our April 27, 1964 pollution survey report. Any complaints received are referred to the Ontario water resources commission, which takes the necessary steps to correct them.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

In view of the recent statements by the chairman of the Ontario water resources commission, how does the Minister intend to limit subdivision development in Hamilton if the city does not build a secondary sewage treatment plant?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the statement in the press by the chairman of the Ontario water resources commission to which the hon. member makes reference.

The Ontario water resources commission does have a policy that subdivision development should not proceed without the provision of adequate sewage treatment facilities. Subdivisions in Hamilton may be limited by recommendations of the OWRC, through The Department of Municipal Affairs, if sewage treatment facilities in the city of Hamilton are inadequate.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways. In view of the fact that six persons have died in Halton county in the past two years, when their cars were speared by guardrails, what steps, if any, does the Minister intend to take to rectify the situation?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, as we are conducting research on this particular matter at the present time, I will have to take this as notice and I will have an answer for the member.

Just to show that it is not a total loss, I have the answer for the question from the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman): "Is the Minister aware of the inconvenience to the inhabitants of Amherst Island because of the unsatisfactory nature of the ferry service? What steps, if any, does he intend to take to rectify this situation?"

The department is aware that certain inconvenience to travellers to Amherst Island exists in the winter months because of heavy ice conditions. It is not always possible to operate the vessel due to ice and the vessel has experienced, on occasion, certain damage due to navigating the channel when it is frozen over.

The Department of Highways does everything possible to assist the township in the operation of this ferry service but we do not believe it is possible to improve the service in the winter time.

Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a very short announcement I think would interest the members.

I thought that the members would be interested to learn that a 60-second colour television spot announcement, produced for my department, has recently won the top award in the public service category, Hollywood international broadcasting awards, held in Los Angeles, California.

This, we believe, is quite an honour as we are competing against submissions from across the United States, Canada and other countries.

The content of this announcement is a warning to all drivers to approach Department of Highways winter maintenance vehicles with caution and to be on the lookout for flashing blue lights. Distribution is free of charge to all TV stations in Ontario, and to stations in the United States that border on our province.

In turn, this TV spot is shown by these stations as a public service at no charge to the sponsor. The production and distribution cost was $4,800 and an estimate of viewers exceeds two million in the last three months. We believe this is the most practical and inexpensive part of our safety programme to reduce accidents, both to motorists and the department's equipment operators, many of whom have suffered severe injuries while performing their duties.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The eleventh order; House in committee of supply; Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(Continued)

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes which were available to me yesterday afternoon, I think I dealt with the only significant achievement of the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) during the past year.

However, he, in his ebullient way, in his own statement, indicated that, in his own opinion, he had a substantial number of additional achievements. For that reason, I find it necessary to make what may be fairly extended comments on some aspects of the work of this department, which as we know, has quite a varied roster of responsibilities.

I plan, first of all, to make a few general comments on the introductory portion of the Minister's statement of yesterday. Then I hope to proceed to deal with two specific issues which appear to me to be of particular importance at the present time.

One of these relates to the auto trade pacts and the other is, as I imagine anyone could foresee, the current housing crisis.

There are, of course, a great many other matters dealt with by the Minister's statement and covered in the estimates which he has presented to the House. These, however, can be dealt with when we come to the individual votes.

In his statement yesterday, the Minister made some comment on the success, as he saw it, which has been achieved to date in achieving goals or targets that were set a few years ago by the previous Minister of Economics and Development.

With respect to those targets I would like to remind the House of this point, Mr. Chairman. I stated at the time, and I think we should now be reminded, that when the department, through its previous Minister set targets for economic growth, growth in employment, and so on, in the province of Ontario, a few years ago, what it really did was to undertake quite a simple arithmetical exercise.

It took the targets which the economic council of Canada set in its first annual review and then it converted those to Ontario simply on a *pro rata* basis.

It took the ratio of Ontario's population to the population of Canada and then said "Ontario's responsibility for growth in employment, for economic growth generally, growth in the GMP, is in the same ratio as its population bears to the population of Canada". I stated at the time, and I think it is still valid that Canada cannot possibly achieve the targets envisaged in the first annual review of the economic council if Ontario does not set itself any greater objective than the mere average.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Oh, of course they can.

Mr. Bryden: I do not know where my hon. friend has been but it has been customary for gentlemen opposite to make quite a noise about the fact that this is the manufacturing centre of Canada. This is also a province with very large natural resources. There are other areas of Canada which unfortunately continue to lag in economic development and there will always be some below the average. I may have a little bit to say about underdeveloped areas in other parts of Canada but there are underdeveloped areas right here in Ontario which are not moving ahead at all.

Mr. MacDonald: London South for example.

Mr. Bryden: Let me get back to what was really quite a simple point which ought to be obvious even to some of the intellectually underdeveloped areas on the other side of the House.

It is not likely that everybody will achieve the average. That is the most unexpected consequence that I could think of. Therefore if not all provinces or regions are going to be dead on the average then it follows, as night follows day, that some will be below the average. From this it follows that others will be above.

We, I think, should properly regard Ontario as a province which will make more than an average contribution to economic development and to growth of employment in this country. My only complaint is, and continues to be, that the government seems to be satisfied if it barely achieves targets which the economic council set as an average for the whole of Canada, and I do not think that is good enough.

There is another point that I would like to mention with regard to the targets set by the economic council of Canada—a point that was not carried over into the thinking of the government of Ontario. The economic council, quite properly, laid considerable stress on the point that in achieving the growth targets that it envisaged it was essential to maintain a reasonable measure of price stability; that in other words, a great deal of the benefit of growth and increased employment would be dissipated if there were serious inflationary pressures.

Now this is a point that has never been mentioned as far as I can remember by spokesmen for the government on economic policy and unless I missed something—and I do not think I did—it was not mentioned yesterday by the Minister in his review of activities in the province. Yet it is a most important point, Mr. Chairman, because we have, during the past year, been subjected to quite severe inflationary pressures. The consumer price index has been going up at an alarming rate and there are a number of signs that these pressures are continuing to operate even though in some fields there has been a falling-off of economic activity. This is a matter to which I would have thought the Minister and his department would have been paying some attention.

Mr. White: Why do you not talk about inflation in socialist Sweden?

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not stay with Ontario?

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): And the court house.

Mr. Bryden: I know one place the member for London South does not want to discuss is Ontario, because this place is a mess and getting to be a worse mess all the time. But we are in the Ontario Legislature—the member can talk about Sweden if he wishes—I will talk about Ontario.

Mr. White: There is great inflation where you socialists are in power, and you know it.

Mr. Bryden: Well we will let you give a lecture in economics one of these days, I am just—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): He can do it better than you can.

Mr. Bryden: Oh I am quite sure of his capacity.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: I am quite sure the hon. member's lecture on economics would be the world's greatest cure for insomnia. But I wish to get back to the point, Mr. Chairman, that there are quite a few inflationary pressures right here and we see certain classic symptoms.

There are signs that these inflationary pressures may get worse. In fact the economic council not very long ago went out of its way to call attention to the economic dangers, I am not speaking of social problems at all, inherent in the acute housing crisis in which we now find ourselves. It pointed out quite appropriately that unless something is done, and it has not been done yet, the growing housing crisis could set off a new inflationary spiral, and a more dangerous one than we have now.

I am going to deal with housing at somewhat greater length a little later, so I will not proceed any further with that point at the moment. But it is remarkable that the Minister in his statement yesterday had nothing to say about this problem at all except one Pollyanna sort of statement about housing, which of course, will not stand up under any analysis at all.

It was rather noteworthy that in the Minister's statement under the heading, I think, of achievements, there was a liberal use of the pronoun "we". It was not entirely clear, Mr. Chairman, if that pronoun was used in the sense of the Royal "we" or the departmental "we", which I suppose in this day and age is a great deal more formidable than a Royal "we", or merely as an editorial "we". But whichever way it was used it indicated that the Minister and/or his department and/or the government were arrogating to themselves credit for certain events to which they have really contributed little or nothing.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that we at the moment are on the upswing of the cycle. I am not going to try to indicate how long one might expect the cycle to continue upwards but we are on the upturn. There are inflationary pressures of a critical kind developing which are usually characteristic of the late phase in the upturn of the cycle.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How does the member condone his proposal for economic stimulus on the one hand and the curb on inflation on the other?

Mr. White: Sure, it is doubletalk.

Mr. Bryden: You know, one of the troubles with the hon. Provincial Treasurer is that he reads the speech that I gave three years ago and now tries to say that I should stand by that speech today.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am talking about six weeks ago.

Mr. Bryden: Of course, we are in a somewhat different situation now. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, in the speech of a few weeks ago, that he referred to, I commended the Provincial Treasurer for taking an expansionary approach.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, the member did!

Mr. Bryden: Yes, I did.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is exactly why I cannot understand him now.

Mr. Bryden: Well, perhaps we could deal —I would not want to take a great deal of time on this point.

Mr. MacDonald: Anything but commendation.

Mr. Bryden: I do not think, Mr. Chairman, it is inconsistent to say on the one hand that the approach of the government should be expansionary and on the other hand that we should be concerned about inflationary pressures that are developing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is a fine line.

Mr. Bryden: There are better ways in my opinion, of offsetting inflationary pressures than the old-fashioned Mitchell Sharp way of deflating the whole economy. I think there are better ways of doing it. I am sorry that the hon. Provincial Treasurer does not think so, but apparently he does not.

If we are going to control inflationary pressures and still maintain expansion, we have to eliminate bottlenecks. There is an acute bottleneck in the acute housing shortage. But as I said a moment ago, I am going to deal with housing a little later, so I do not want to get into it now.

All I am saying now is that these fellows are really just drifting along; they are taking credit to themselves for events to which they have really contributed very little. Unfortunately, they are failing in the areas where they could contribute something. They are not eliminating the bottlenecks and they are not doing anything significant towards eliminating them.

They have no plans in mind. As a matter of fact, if you want to look at the basic dynamic involved in our current expansion, I think you could attribute it to two main phenomena: one is the escalating war in Vietnam and the other is the critical and growing shortage of food throughout the world.

Those are the phenomena which basically are maintaining a high level of economic activity in North America, including Canada and Ontario. In short, Mr. Chairman, we are profiting out of the misery of tens of millions, indeed hundreds of millions of people throughout the world. This is basically what is happening.

I certainly am not going to suggest that we should try to limit our own growth because there is misery in the rest of the world; that obviously would not be a sensible policy. But on the other hand, I think we should be

taking a far more responsible attitude than we have to date towards peoples in the rest of the world. We should for one thing be doing something about assisting in their economic development. This is so largely a federal responsibility that I will not go into it, but it is time that we substituted action for words in the whole area of assistance to underdeveloped countries.

We should also—and now I come right down to the policy of this government and the Minister's statement of yesterday—we should also avoid doing things that are going to compound the difficulties of people less fortunately situated than ourselves. This brings me to the statement the Minister made yesterday about immigration.

I would say it is a lamentable statement, although it unfortunately provided a fair summary of immigration as practised both by the federal government at Ottawa and the provincial government in Ontario. The Minister in his statement boasted about the success of manufacturing companies in this province in luring skilled people away from other countries where they are much more desperately needed than they are here.

What our immigration policy in this country and province boils down to is that we are compensating for our failures in the education field to provide the trained people we need by raiding countries which need them far worse than we do. Then in our mealymouthed hypocrisy, we send them a few used school books or a few used hospital supplies and stand up and say "See what fine and noble people we are". But basically we disrupt their economies.

I am not suggesting that it is feasible or desirable to prevent trained people from these other countries coming to Canada of their own volition. I think it is unfortunate when they do it, but there it is; what can we do about it? What I do object to is the basic thrust of our immigration policy, which is to steal these people from the other countries, and then when it comes to the unskilled people, our immigration policy is to put the barrier up and say "No, you can't come in". We take the trained people, already in desperate short supply, and leave the untrained people in the countries of origin, thereby compounding their economic difficulties.

Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting to the Minister and to the House that that is a most shortsighted policy. The Minister yesterday saw fit to resurrect Lord Keynes' famous aphorism that in the long run we are all dead. I am saying to the Minister that if we continue to take our present irresponsible attitude to the rest of the world, the kind of attitude we have taken up till now, we may very well all be dead in something less than the long run. We are contributing to international strife and discord by the type of self-centred policies we have been following. I regret to have noted yesterday that the Minister boasted about his success in pursuing such policy.

Let us bear in mind that we are not even top man on the totem pole in this game of stealing skills from other countries. We steal them from countries that are somewhat lower down the scale in economic development than us. But then our great neighbour to the south steals them from us and from other countries at roughly the same level of development as we are.

So here we have in progress a great international game of beggar your neighbour; take the best trained people away from your poorer neighbour. Finally, down at the bottom of the totem pole, are the countries which represent the overwhelming majority of the people of the world and contain the overwhelming majority. There they are falling deeper and deeper into economic sloughs; no way of escaping at all. This is our contribution to their development and through that to a rising standard of living and peace throughout the world.

However, we should also look at the Minister's statement in terms of Ontario itself. I have looked at some of the international implications involved in what he said and I think now we should also look, as the hon. leader of the Opposition did to a considerable extent yesterday, at just what is happening in Ontario. The Minister himself noted that averages can be extremely misleading. I would say that nothing can be more misleading than average figures about growth in Ontario. When you get right down to it, Mr. Chairman, the growth which is quite phenomenal is taking place in a very restricted part of the province; mainly in the golden horseshoe area.

In that area we are having an excessively rapid growth. We are creating serious problems as a result while in large areas throughout the province there is stagnation. In fact, there are some areas of this province that are among the most underdeveloped of the whole country. We do not have to go to other regions to find underdevelopment. We can find it in abundance right here in Ontario, and the government has never developed any sort of policy to deal with that.

Its policy is sort of the council-committee policy. It sets up a committee. Then, so the

committee may have something to do, it sets up another committee that it can consult with, and then it sets up councils that the committee can consult with and the councils consult with the committee. The result is a closed circle with various concentric rings within it, which manages to expand to take up whatever money is available, but which produces nothing in the way of economic development.

We have actually produced so little in some of these regions that it is hardly worth talking about. The programmes that we now have have obviously failed. I am not saying that alternative programmes are easy to devise, but at least we might as well face the fact that anything that has been attempted up till now has failed. One of the regrettable features, Mr. Chairman, is that the government and the Ministers are so intent in chasing these various councils and committees around the various circles in which they are rotating, that it misses plain, obvious opportunities that are right in front of its nose.

I cannot think of anything that would have contributed more to the economic development of the two northern regions of Ontario—I think, for the purposes of development, they are treated as two regions, although northern Ontario could very well be classified into more regions, but let us call it two—I could not think of anything that would have contributed more to the development of those two regions than to build the second pipeline through northern Ontario.

Councils are fine—development councils of this, that and the other—and so are advertising programmes, but here was a basic project that would have had both immediate, and long term, benefits in terms of growth and development for northern Ontario.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): That is why it is going to be built through northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: And what did the government do when this project was under consideration at Ottawa? Mr. Chairman, the most charitable description one could make of what the government did is that it went sound asleep. It slept through the whole proceedings in Ottawa. It did nothing.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I will agree with that, but it is going to be built through northwestern Ontario despite what the federal government does.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister of Mines should have listened to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. Bryden: Well, here is Rip Van Winkle. He has come to life long enough to foresee the future.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I signed your first union petition, if you want to know.

Mr. Bryden: Well we are glad to have his signature, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: What is he doing about government policy?

Mr. Bryden: We are glad to have the Minister's signature, but what we would have liked to have had was his voice in the Cabinet, because it is quite obvious that the Minister of Energy and Resources Management—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): I listened to your leader three years ago—

Mr. Bryden: —is going right along with the idea of a U.S. route. In fact, the only conclusion I can arrive at from the answer he gave here this afternoon to a question from the leader of this party, is that he is now playing along with these guys to stall things off for a year, so that they can get everything cleared in the United States and so that the line can go through the United States.

I am extremely fearful that the Minister of Mines is living in a fool's paradise. We cannot rely on U.S. agencies—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): We are waiting for you fellows to make up your minds.

Mr. MacDonald: We have made up our minds whatever you think.

Mr. Bryden: They cannot rely on U.S. agencies to do their job for them.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, this government is not stalling—

Mr. Chairman: What is your point of order?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am going to give you my point of order. This government is not stalling on anything. This is a matter before the national energy board and it has nothing to do with the Ontario government whatsoever, so I think the member should

retract that statement that this government is stalling.

Mr. White: Withdraw that.

Mr. MacDonald: The point of order is completely irrelevant.

Mr. Bryden: It is about on the usual level, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: You had better resolve your course, which way do you want it, north or south?

Mr. Bryden: If the matter is before the national energy board that is quite true, and I said, and I repeat, that the only reasonable inference that I can draw from the answer the Minister gave this afternoon, is that the government is stalling along with the gas companies—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What has my stalling got to do with it?

Mr. Bryden: —so that the national energy board in the United States can finally dispose of this matter and the line will, in fact, be built through the United States.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We will see how wrong you are.

Mr. Bryden: But our objection is—

An hon. member: Is the national energy board in the United States?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There is not one.

Mr. MacDonald: FPC. He has it in small letters. National energy board in small letters.

Mr. Bryden: Okay. I apologize for having confused the Provincial Treasurer. I must say in defence, that the energy Minister's statement somewhat confused me.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It should not if you listen to the facts. It was your own leader who recommended the southern route three years ago.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, go on.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, it is there in *Hansard*.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there obviously is a split in the Cabinet.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure you have a split in the Cabinet.

Mr. Bryden: The Minister of Mines, to give him credit, believes that this line should go through northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Absolutely.

Mr. Bryden: The matter should never have gone down to the United States at all to be hung up down there.

Mr. Singer: That is what your leader said.

Mr. Bryden: The United States should have nothing to do with it. But the federal government forgot all about nothern Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I know they did, but the provincial government did not.

Mr. Bryden: It just listened to whatever Trans-Canada had to say, then let the question get thrown into the mill down in the United States, and there it stays all tangled up in the machinery—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They evidently listened to your leader's representations.

Mr. Singer: That is what he said.

Mr. Bryden: —when we could have a line all ready to proceed through northern Ontario. I will say that a great many voluntary associations in northern Ontario, and I am proud to say that included among those voluntary associations were a substantial number of NDP associations, made representations to Ottawa to have the line go through northern Ontario and a great many municipalities in northern Ontario did the same thing.

But bodies of that kind simply cannot present briefs that can stand up against all the facilities that Trans-Canada has available to it.

Mr. Singer: That is pretty obvious. It was obvious to the member for York South.

Mr. Bryden: There is very little chance that they could win in such a conflict, especially with a Liberal government that is ready to kow-tow to the U.S. on any occasion, or to any U.S. corporation.

Mr. Chairman: Order. I wonder if the member for Woodbine would try to stay a little more closely to Economics and Development. I think—

Mr. Bryden: I am dead on it. I am talking about regional development.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: I am talking about regional development and I would like to say to you with respect, sir, that I believe that I am dead on the point.

I am talking, at the moment, about regional development and I want to get it out of the Minister's realm of airy generality, down into concrete particulars.

I am saying that this was a way to contribute to the development of northern Ontario and that it was a responsibility of this government to go and argue the case for northern Ontario—not to leave it to NDP associations, other voluntary associations and to municipalities, but to present Trans-Canada with a battery of experts which would be at least the equal of the Trans-Canada battery of experts. When the Minister talks about regional development, this is an outstanding example that in fact the government is not concerned about the problems of development of areas which are not at the present time achieving sufficient development.

It goes sound asleep instead of moving in and doing something that could genuinely benefit regions such as the two regions of northern Ontario. The only contribution that the government has made to date has been the signature of two Ministers, both from northern Ontario constituencies, on petitions that other people prepared. That is the sum total of its contribution to date.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Were they satisfactory —the two signatures?

Mr. Bryden: The petitions were a noble effort by private citizens. That is about the most that a private citizen can do. But a government can do a great deal, and this government could have got that line through northern Ontario if it had approached the matter with energy.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: When it comes through northern Ontario you will see that we had everything to do with it. That is what you are going to see.

Mr. MacDonald: Your Minister has gone out because he cannot defend it any more.

Mr. Bryden: Some day, Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the Minister of Mines explain that statement. Did the government have everything to do with this line going to the United States?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh, the member misunderstood. This government has done everything possible to keep this line in Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: Well, what did the Minister have everything to do with?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I said we are still insisting on keeping the line in Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: That is not Cabinet policy.

Mr. Bryden: I give the Minister full credit for being able to write his name and being willing to write it on a petition, but I really do not think that is much of a Ministerial contribution when this government, I am certain, had sufficient influence that it could have—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I just love you, the way you talk out of both sides of your mouth at the same time.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, I know you do. I have always noticed that, but I do not think that sufficient when this government could have, I am certain, made the difference between getting that line through northern Ontario and having it go to the United States, and in doing so could have provided a real basis for development in northern Ontario. However, Mr. Chairman, with these interjections I am afraid I am repeating myself on that point, so I will move on—

An hon. member: That is nothing new.

Mr. Bryden: I must say that the interjections, inane and otherwise, from gentlemen opposite are nothing new and I will confess that occasionally they make one lose one's place, so to speak, one's mental place, and one tends to go back. So if you want to get this over with quickly, just stay silent for a little while.

Mr. Chairman, I said that there were two specific issues I would like to deal with and I will now turn to the first of these, namely the auto trade pacts. I realize that the auto trade pacts were negotiated between governments internationally. They involve basically the federal government and they represent federal policy. At the same time, since the overwhelming majority of car manufacturing and car-parts manufacturing in Canada is done in Ontario, we here cannot be indifferent to federal policies which are developed in relation to an industry of that kind.

I think the Minister himself agrees with my position on that. He has usually been willing to answer questions about the pacts when they have been raised in the House. He has, on a number of occasions, expressed his opinion about them. To any questions that I have asked him about the difficulties that

have been arising in connection with the pacts, his answer has always been of the Pollyanna type: that these pacts are a wonderful idea and in the long run—notwithstanding J. M. Keynes—they are going to work out wonderfully well for Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I agree. I think they are a constructive contribution to the development of Canada. In fact, I cannot see in our branch-plant economy how our automobile manufacturing industry could survive for very much longer without some sort of an arrangement similar to that provided in the auto trade pacts, whereby our manufacturing plants can enjoy the benefits of sales in the United States for at least certain models and, therefore, gain the efficiency of long production runs.

In terms of principle I do not think one can reasonably object to the pacts. The problem is that the implementation has been, shall we say, somewhat less than perfect. As I see it, these pacts could be beneficial to three broad categories of people. First, to the manufacturers of automobiles; second, to the consumers—the people who buy automobiles and automobile parts; and third, to the workers who work in the automobile manufacturing and parts manufacturing industry. As administered to date, these pacts have been of benefit only to the first group—the manufacturers of automobiles. The consumers have been left out in the cold. They have achieved no benefit at all, or certainly no significant benefit, from these pacts. As for the workers, they are suffering positive hardship as a result.

Mr. White: I am sorry to interrupt you.

Mr. Bryden: Sorry.

Mr. White: I thought you would be interested to know that your leader said on January 30, 1964—

Mr. Bryden: Oh, Mr. Chairman, let us—

Mr. White: —that there is no sense in moving the old line; rather there will be a greater sense—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order, order.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, it is not that I do not want to hear it but I just object to a total rape of the rules of this House. There is no point of order at all. I do not hold the chair in any sense responsible, but I think some of these gentlemen over here should begin to develop some sort of awareness of their responsibilities as members and avoid these totally facetious and meaningless points of order. Admittedly, their case is so poor that they have to use every juvenile trick in the books to distract attention from their pitiful performance.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is the record of your own leader—was he childish and juvenile?

Mr. Bryden: Does the Minister of Mines not know after all these years that it is out of order, and an abuse of the rules of this House for a member to get up on an alleged point of order and read to me something that somebody else said on some other occasion? Now, what point of order is involved there? If the Minister does not know that, then he does not know anything and all his time in this House has been the total waste that it appears to be.

Mr. White: I have a point of order.

Mr. Bryden: He has no point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest to you that after his previous performance he should not receive the courtesy of the chair.

Mr. Chairman: May I say that the chair can quite agree that the last point was not a point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Hear, Hear.

Mr. Chairman: And I might also say that we will be here indefinitely on this particular speech unless the barracking cuts down.

Mr. White: On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: A true point of order?

Mr. White: Yes, I thought I had the hon. member's consent.

Mr. MacDonald: What a hypocrite. Put it on the record.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, to flatter the member to the extent that he merits, I did not even know he was asking my consent. I did not even see him.

An hon. member: You cannot verify that.

Mr. Bryden: No, and I would not have granted it if I had known he was asking for it.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Bryden: However, Mr. Chairman, I was beginning to state that in terms of performance, the auto trade pacts have been something less than perfect to date, in that the only benefit has gone to manufacturers.

They have undoubtedly greatly increased their profits because there has been, I am told, a saving of approximately $50 million in tariffs. They have been able to use their plants in our country to increase their runs and sell cars in the United States. But why can the consumer not get some benefit of this?

The government at Ottawa does nothing to protect the consumer and I regret to say that this government here does nothing to bring these points to the attention of the government at Ottawa. Whenever we have referred any of these problems to the Minister of Economics and Development, his attitude has always been that everything is just fine. At the present time cars manufactured in Canada are selling in the United States at anywhere from $150 to $600 less than they are selling for in Canada, depending on the model and make of the car concerned.

Last fall, I think it was in September, the Minister of Finance warned the companies that they should not contemplate a price increase in Canada such as they had just put through in the United States. So about two weeks later the motor car companies put it through, or nearly all of it. I think they narrowed the gap fractionally.

We continue in this country to pay substantially higher prices for cars in order merely that four companies can profiteer. And the fact of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is that the price of cars is too high even in the United States. This is a heavily monopolized industry. There are actually four producers in the field and one of them appears to be on the way out. There is one major producer who keeps a couple of others around so that he will not get into trouble with the trust busters down in the United States, and prices are entirely administered prices.

The profits of these companies in the United States run about one and one-half times those for manufacturing generally. Walter Reuther pointed out some time ago that if the automobile manufacturers were willing to accept the same return on investment as the average for manufacturing in the United States, they could decrease the price of cars at retail in the U.S. on average by $350. So cars are already over-priced in the United States, and yet we here in Canada have to pay still higher prices, even for cars manufactured here.

I say to the Minister that it is time this government put some sort of pressure on the federal government, which apparently will never stand up to any large corporation with an international pedigree, to do something about the prices that Canadian consumers continue to pay for cars, notwithstanding the auto trade pacts.

When we move from the consumers to the workers, Mr. Chairman, we come to an even more serious problem. A great many statistics can be produced to indicate that the effect of the auto trade pact will be an overall increase in employement in Canada. These statistics are very difficult to interpret, but I am not personally inclined to disagree with the basic point that is being made. I think it is true that in time the effect of the agreement will be to expand employment in Canada.

The point again, to refer back to the Minister's authority, Lord Keynes, is that some people cannot wait that long, and there are a great many people who are suffering acutely right now because of the dislocations caused by the auto trade pact.

Here again it is difficult to get statistics. One does not know how many people have been laid off because of the pact and how many have been laid off for other reasons, but there is no question at all that it numbers in the thousands. There are a couple of thousand at least in the city of Oshawa and surrounding territory who have been dislocated because of the auto trade pacts. They are receiving practically no assistance in re-establishing themselves.

We have had noble statements from the manpower Minister at Ottawa. We have had even nobler statements, joint statements, from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales), the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), and the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), about what they were going to do; but what they are doing is nothing. The training facilities in Oshawa simply are a joke in relation to the problem. I think that recently they took on 60 people for training. That is all they had room for, when hundreds had applied. As for tiding these people over a period of economic adversity, how is this being done? They are paying for it themselves. Essentially that is the policy.

The federal government has what it calls the transitional assistance benefit which is supposed to provide them with income if they are dislocated as a result of the trade pact. But whatever payments are being made, and there are mighty few of them being made, they are not coming out of that fund at all. There is no policy that payments should in the first instance come out of that.

They are coming out of the supplementary unemployment benefits of the workers themselves, benefits which they negotiated in lieu of wage increases. Now they have to carry

themselves over this period of dislocation, which was no fault of theirs, by using their own SUB and the transitional assistance benefits become payable only when a worker's supplementary unemployment benefits have been totally used up. This is the way the government treats workers who are affected by this programme.

Companies can increase their prices whenever they feel like it. But workers who have been thrown out of work almost certainly because of the dislocating effects of the agreement have to use their own savings. That is what the SUBs are, in effect; they are savings of the workers, savings for a rainy day. They have to use their own savings. This notwithstanding the very strong case the economic council of Canada has made for an imaginative programme of labour mobility.

I hate to have to say it, Mr. Chairman, but the economic council in dealing with that point cited Sweden at great length. Now do not let it be said that I brought Sweden into the debate. It was the economic council of Canada that suggested we should develop programmes similar in principle to those that have been in effect in Sweden for a very long time. Unfortunately practically nothing is done along these lines. The TAB is next to useless.

As far as I know, I do not know a case where it has been admitted, where it has been accepted that unemployment is caused by dislocation. But even if there have been approvals, the worker has to use up his SUBs anyway. So you can say the TAB is pretty close to useless.

Then the training facilities are totally inadequate and nothing is done to retrain these people. General Motors flatly refuses to consider any in-plant training for them, although I understand new paint processes are being introduced.

Some of these people could be trained to carry out the painting processes, but General Motors flatly refuses to consider the proposition at all. And the governments, both at Ottawa and Queen's Park, sit supinely by; the great god General Motors has decreed it so there is nothing more to be said about it. It appears this is their basic attitude. And there are no allowances, or no adequate allowances available to compensate these workers for moves where they have to move and for losses they may suffer in having to dispose of their houses.

We have not got a programme for labour mobility and yet the dislocations caused by the auto trade pact indicate the imperative necessity of a full scale programme for labour mobility. This sort of thing is going to become more common in the future. I have no doubt at all that in the future, dislocations of the kind created by the auto trade pact will become more rather than less frequent.

The world is moving too fast for us to be able to carry on with old methods. We will be constantly changing our methods. Changing methods naturally cause dislocation and the cost of dislocation should be borne by the community at large and not just by the people who are immediately affected.

Mr. Chairman, the last matter I wish to deal with is probably the most important. It is one which has been discussed at some length already in this House and no doubt will be discussed at considerable length in the future, to the extent that this Legislature has a future at all. That is the housing crisis.

I have forgotten what the—well, I think it is even worth looking up what the Minister said about the housing problem in the one sentence that he devoted to it in his statement of yesterday. I should say in fairness that of course he has made other statements, and as a result he deliberately omitted any full description of his programme from his statement of yesterday. But I am quoting from page 12 of his mimeographed statement where he said:

> Our broad and imaginative housing programme will help remove a major economic bottleneck, aid mobility to high productivity sectors and ensure that immigration is not curtailed. I have already given hon. members full details of the Ontario housing programme.

The tragedy of it, Mr. Chairman, is that I think that the Minister honestly believes that statement. If I thought he believed that he was just pulling the wool over the eyes of us humble peasants I would say: okay, at least he knows what is going on. But when he said that I think he believed that it is true, that he has a broad and imaginative housing programme, that it will help remove a major economic bottleneck and so on.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): That is positive thinking.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for Grey North says it is positive thinking. Well, unfortunately, the government opposite has had no policy with regard to housing except one based on the power of positive thinking, for the last 20 years. That is why we have the mess we now have.

And it is a disastrous mess. In fact, it is worth reviewing some of the past record of this government. I will not go into it at any great length, but I think it is worth looking at one or two of the highlights.

The problem, Mr. Chairman, is not one that, at any stage, caught the government unaware because the nature of the housing problem, at least as far as Toronto is concerned, was outlined as long ago as 1934, by Dr. Herbert Bruce, who was a leading Conservative of his day, in what I would say was a masterful report on the housing conditions obtaining in Toronto at that time, and I regret to say they are very similar to the conditions obtaining now.

The Conservative Party has been in office in Ontario since 1943 and all that time it has had before it, a report from one of its own leading members, not to mention a great many other detailed studies in addition to Dr. Bruce's study.

Its answer has been nothing but a series of false starts and outright hoaxes, and I am going to list one or two of them.

First of all, in the late 1940's, we had the programme that is so dear to the heart of the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Drew's second mortgage programme.

Now I would not say, sir, that it was totally useless, it did help a small number of families in a small way, but it did not tackle the real housing problem at all and it was phased out.

Mr. Singer: Eight thousand people, that is a substantial number.

Mr. Bryden: It helped some people, yes, I agree it helped some people, but it did not tackle the real problem at all and it was phased out, let me repeat.

Then following that, I can still remember it—I happened at the time to be sitting in those chairs over there to the left and behind the Speaker—when this announcement was made.

It was not an announcement, it was more of an *obiter dictum* in the middle of a debate, when the then Prime Minister of the province, Leslie Frost, stated that he favoured a no down-payment, pay-as-you-go form of home ownership.

This grabbed banner headlines all across the country. "No down payment" says Frost, "pay as you go". "Everybody can own a home".

That one, Mr. Chairman, did not have to be phased out, because it was never started. But it served its purpose, it got the headlines for that election.

An hon. member: It never got off the ground.

Mr. Bryden: No, it never got off the ground, it was never started. Then, of course, we had to get another one, we had the famous Malvern project. I am not sure if that one was first announced in 1952 or 1953—

Mr. Singer: It was anounced seven times, I think, the Malvern one.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I was just trying to remember when the first announcement was and one has to have a very long memory. At any rate, whenever the heat is on about housing, you can always count on it that Malvern will be pulled out of the mothballs and we will be told about the great project up in Malvern there.

Of course, this is what happened again last fall; the heat was really on and—one could have predicted it, I guess—the Minister announced a great project in Malvern, real news. I do not pretend to be a news man but I often wonder what is news—something that has been announced about seven times in a matter of a decade or so, regarding which absolutely nothing has happened, is big news, apparently.

I would say it is no news, it is nothing, because that is the sort of thing that in the past—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Would the hon. member permit me one statement? I have never made an announcement about Malvern. In fact, when that announcement was made, I was not even in the country.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I do not blame the Minister for running.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I just want to put the record straight. However, since the announcement was made, we were to meet yesterday with Scarborough council. We had to put it off on account of the estimates, but we are meeting next week.

Mr. Bryden: I do not know if the Minister's exodus from the country was related to the fact that he knew the Malvern announcement was going to be made, or whether it was just a matter of the mice playing when the cat was away. Or is he repudiating the thing,

is he agreeing with me that it was just another big hoax that got a big headline?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not say so. I did not make the announcement at all.

Mr. Singer: Is the Minister not responsible?

Mr. Bryden: Well, somebody made the announcement on the Minister's behalf.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know who made it.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister does not know who made it? Really?

Mr. Singer: Oh, is that not terrible!

Mr. Bryden: It is no wonder, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister was able to make the statement that I quoted a moment ago about housing in his speech of yesterday, because it is quite obvious he does not know what is going on. That explains his statement, he does not know what is going on, so he thinks there is truth in the statement he made.

However, I guess there is not much point going further with Malvern, the Minister has now repudiated his stepchild and I can understand why—there is not going to be any Malvern. They have not even got started on the feasibility studies.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I just said I did not make the announcement.

Mr. Bryden: Well, the feasibility study has not even been started on. This announcement was made some time last fall and we were told, in answer to a question in the House some time ago when the Minister was ill, but it was made presumably with his authority, by the Provincial Treasurer, that the Minister and his officials were going to meet with the Scarborough people yesterday, and now we find that it has been put off once more.

The way we were led to believe it last fall, was that the thing was all ready to go, but it has not even been started. You could not say that that project is an abortion, because any biologist will tell you that abortion before conception is impossible.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Careful now, there are ladies in the House.

Mr. Bryden: Well, okay, I will restrain myself. But that is a plain biological fact. This is a zero.

Mr. Singer: What is the Minister going to consult with Scarborough about?

Mr. Bryden: They are going to consult and see if there actually is any land up there.

An hon. member: They are going to consult about what conception is.

Mr. Singer: Maybe they will find out where Scarborough is.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was just giving a review, and I do not want to make it too lengthy, of the government's performance on housing. After the first go at Malvern, there followed a long period when the government did absolutely nothing about housing.

We had the then member for Kingston as Minister, and his attitude towards housing was that the less of it there was, the better it would be for him—he would not be bothered.

The only policy of the government at the time was to throw as many obstructions as possible in the way of the few municipalities that wanted to do something.

That was the period during which the city of Toronto—which, I suppose, has made a more significant contribution to solving housing problems than any other government unit at any level in the whole of Canada—had its heart broken, in trying to get projects approved and waiting two and three years with nothing happening.

But anyway, that period ended and then came the brash and bold Macaulay on the scene with his rent certificate scheme and eleven other points. Of course we always get the same old points. Every new programme has all the old worn out points, about which the government has done nothing, but they always have a new one in it.

Macaulay's new one related to rent certificates and that one was phased out even faster than Drew's second mortgage plan, because it did not meet the real problem either. It helped a few people, I have no doubt—mainly landlords—but it did help a few people, even some tenants. But it did not tackle the real problem at all.

Then, in 1964, we came to the establishment of the Ontario housing corporation which, of course, was the occasion for another spate of headlines. After fumbling around for quite a while, the government announced with a great flourish that, through the OHC, it was going to enter the market to buy existing housing units.

Here we had a critical housing shortage and the government's programme was to enter the market to buy existing units. How in heaven's name that would contribute anything to the relief of the housing shortage, I do not know, but that was the main thrust of the OHC's programme for the first two years of its operation.

I get the impression that this purchase policy is now being phased out. I hope so, because it is contributing nothing to the solution of the problem.

We have seen the pitiful figures on the performance of the OHC, to date.

In the whole province—I think I have the precise figures somewhere here—in the whole province, in the two and a half years of its existence, it constructed 1,793 units. That is its total contribution to relieving the desperate housing shortage.

In the municipality of Metropoliton Toronto, where the shortage is naturally most acute, it has constructed a total of 638 units.

One of the difficulties is that the housing corporation has mastered the art of befogging issues with statistics. They are always coming out with statistics that add up to great totals, but nobody can ever figure out what the statistics mean.

As far as I can make out though, when they arrived some of these grand totals, they are talking about what they think they might think about ten years hence. When we get right down to the brass tacks, and find out what they in fact have done, there it is: 638 units in Metro Toronto, 1,793 in the whole of Ontario. And the Minister's answer to that is the new HOME programme.

The new HOME programme is something like Macaulay's twelve point programme. It has outlined, at great length and with great repetition—Mr. Chairman, if you ever think that any of us in this House repeat ourselves, you should look at this thing—it repeats pages and pages.

In fact, as I read it, and I talked to some of the men in the gallery and they had the same sensation when they read it, I kept thinking I must have lost my place, because here I was reading at great length something that I had just finished reading. This happens, I do not know how many times, but several.

That is how to get a substantial-looking book, to make it look like something is being done. They say the same thing over and over again. They not only say it there, but of course it is the same thing they have been saying for 20 years, over and over and over again.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Good merchandising.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but you have got to have a product. And that is what you lose sight of. You have not got a product.

Mr. Bryden: If you are talking about merchandising, I would say here is a place where the shaving end of it would have come in very well, Mr. Chairman. But there really is only one new element and that is the land assembly programme, to which is tied up a land rental programme, although it is very hard I must say, after reading this statement to know how much land rental there will be. There may be some, but apparently there is also going to be sale of land and so on. That is really the sum total of HOME which is new. That plus the bill on condominium housing, which I will not deal with now because we will have an opportunity to deal with it on some other occasion, but the—

Mr. Singer: It is about as irrelevant to housing as anything.

Mr. Bryden: Well, it will be of some minor benefit I would think. You see, this is basically the approach of the government to housing and has been for 20 years. It would be unfair to say that the things it does, do no good. They do a little bit of good.

But they merely nibble at the fringes of a very desperate problem, and one that is getting worse all the time. That is the basic problem and that is what HOME does, it nibbles at the fringes with its idea of land assembly and land rental.

Now the Minister was reported as having said, outside the House, that he anticipated that in the first year there would be, in the province as a whole about 6,000 to 7,000 lots available as a result of the HOME land assembly programme, 4,000 of them in Metro Toronto.

I note that he has never said that in the House to the best of my recollection, and I do not think those figures will stand up under any sort of scrutiny at all. The Minister, of course, has always been extremely coy about where he has lots and where he expects to get them, but I do not think he has really got anything at all, or any serious prospect of getting anything.

That is why, sir, he would not give those figures in the House, but he got another big

headline by telling them to the boys outside the House. But where are they?

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the tragedy of it is that even if he had them, they really would not contribute very much to a solution of the housing problem, because to begin with, if all he has is lots, serviced lots, he is not going to have any houses on those very soon.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Not serviced yet.

Mr. Bryden: Well, whether they are serviced, we do not know. Everything is in very vague general terms, figures pulled out of the air as an invention to suit the exigency of the moment. But let us say he has 6,000—

Mr. Singer: He is about to talk to the municipal councils soon.

Mr. Bryden: After we have about two or three per cent of the population of Metro Toronto without any houses of any kind, not even rat infested slums, then he might get around to talking to some of the municipal councils.

But let us assume that he has got 6,000 or 7,000 serviced lots. Most of those will not have habitable houses on them for at least a year. But we have got a desperate crisis right now and what is the Minister doing about this desperate crisis?

You see, even his serviced lots, even if he has them, and even if he gets houses on them, are not going to meet the needs of the people whose needs are greatest. As a matter of fact, I do not have to ask the Minister in the House to rely on me as authority for the statements I have just made. I will make two statements with regard to the HOME land assembly and land rental project.

First, it is of absolutely no benefit at all to the people who are in the greatest need, namely low income families and pensioners, of absolutely no value to them at all.

Secondly, it will contribute nothing, or next to nothing to anybody, even those in higher income groups for about a year.

And as authority for my statements I am going to quote from a couple of people who I think are in a position to speak reasonably authoritatively. I think that one should not have to cite an authority because I think that what I said should be self-evident from an analysis of the programme. But I will quote authorities in any case.

Here is one on my first point. I would like to quote from Mr. Patrick Brady, deputy managing director of the Ontario housing corporation as reported in the Toronto *Daily Star* of February 10:

> The government's home-ownership-made-easy plan will do little to ease the pressure for public housing in Metro this year, Ontario housing corporation deputy director Patrick Brady, said yesterday. The family earning less than $5,000 a year and qualifying for public housing, will be still unable to afford down payments on new houses under HOME, he said. He said the plan is directed at families wanting to buy a $25,000 house but unable to produce $8,000 or $9,000 down payment.

Now, that is a very fair statement. HOME is of no benefit at all to people in the lower income groups whose need is greatest, and this is quite clear from the tables that the Minister himself produced.

Now, as to my claim that it will not benefit anybody, even people in higher income groups, this year, I would like to quote a statement by Mr. H. W. Suters, managing director of the Ontario housing corporation, as reported in the Weston *Times* of March 23, 1967:

> There won't be an immediate start here in Metro, Suters said, but we do expect to start rolling during the early part of summer in some other parts of Ontario.

That is how much the Ontario housing corporation is alive to the desperate housing crisis that exists in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

The OHC hopes to get started on something in some other parts of the province later, but they do not hope to get started on anything here, where there are over 11,000 people currently on the waiting list for public housing or senior citizens' housing. And there are thousands more who would not even bother putting their names on the waiting list.

The basic trouble as I see it, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister and the government are psychologically incapable of dealing with a major 20th century problem by 20th century methods. I think that is quite apparent in the stress put, for example, on land assembly—making lots available for single-family dwellings, on second mortgage plans and that sort of thing—this has always been the stress.

And it is evidence, in my opinion, of a psychological incapacity to comprehend a 20th century problem.

They, the government and the Minister, are mesmerized by the Jeffersonian notion that the only respectable and reliable citizen is the yeoman farmer, and anyone who does

not have legal title to a little piece of land is somehow *infra dig*—he is not really a proper citizen in the community.

That is the basic assumption in all the thinking of the government on this point, and it seems to be the basic assumption behind the statement that the hon. leader of the Opposition made yesterday.

The idea may very well have had a certain validity in Jefferson's day, but Jefferson's day was 150 years ago.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member means he is dead.

Mr. Bryden: I am glad that the Minister has now discovered that. Maybe he will change his attitude.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not even know he was sick.

Mr. Bryden: Should we wonder why he does not understand the housing problem?

Mr. MacDonald: The houses are further away than I thought.

Mr. Bryden: I will let the Minister in on another secret. Jefferson has been dead for so long that the face of North America has been completely transformed since his day, and it is time the Minister's thinking was transformed.

Hon. Mr. Randall: This year will tell a story.

Mr. Bryden: The Minister is still suffering from the delusion that, even in the vast conurbation of today, it is somehow possible to make everybody into a pseudo-yeoman farmer with his own little plot around him, on which he grows a few blades of grass and a few radishes.

That is the essence of his HOME programme. He thinks everybody is going to be a yeoman farmer, even we benighted city dwellers. The impossibility of the objective surely should be patent to everyone—there just is not enough land.

It is a strange thing, Mr. Chairman, that one has to state to a private enterprise government, that the reason for the sky-rocketing price of land in Metro Toronto is an imbalance between supply and demand. They do not seem to have noticed that.

Our first problem in relation to solving the housing problem, is to discover ways of making more efficient use of land. It is just impossible to meet the housing needs of the vast majority of the people in a conurbation such as Toronto and area, through single family dwelling units—it is impossible.

They are a very nice idea for some idyllic society, but they do not work in these great urban concentrations, except for a small number of people. If the thrust of your policy is to make possible the construction of more single family dwelling units, you then meet the needs of only a very small minority of people. Moreover, you put the municipalities in a terrible mess. There are municipal representatives who have been saying, over and over again, that, in fact, a house that is worth less than $35,000 at current prices, does not pay its way in taxes.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Is the member suggesting that row houses or town houses should not be built in major cities?

Mr. Bryden: I am suggesting that the thrust of government policy is still towards the antiquated notion of the single family dwelling unit and it is completely out of date.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member has not read the report.

Mr. Bryden: I have read the Minister's report. I have read the report and I am going to come on to a few other points. Sure, I know you have included all the old stuff that you have had in for years about what you now call geared-to-income housing. You are not producing it; that is the only trouble.

You buy a few existing units and say you are doing something about it, but that policy not only intensifies the housing crisis for other people who are not in the lower income group, but it does not do much good even for the lower income group. You cannot turf out the people who are already in these units. So you do not really solve any problem.

You are not constructing anything new and now you are going off talking about land rental so that we can have more single family dwelling units. If we are going to try to house the people of Toronto in single-family dwelling units, the urban sprawl is going to go all the way from here to Lake Simcoe and the problem of municipal services will be completely impossible. As I was trying to say, we have to find more efficient ways of using land. The private enterprises, to give them credit, know that. They are not off on this will-o'-the-wisp, at least a declining number of them are, about the yeoman farmer with his plot of land. They are building multiple dwelling units.

The only trouble is that the multiple-dwelling units they are building are not necessarily

those which are socially desirable. A private developer necessarily has to be concerned about his profits; he probably would not be in business very long if he were not. So when he builds the multiple-dwelling units, what he has in mind is to maximize revenue per square foot of floor space; that is his basic motivation.

The result is row upon row of high-rise apartments, identical except that the next one is higher than the one before. These do not provide homes for people, Mr. Chairman. These are human filing cabinets, sir, in which harassed urban workers are filed away for the night until they are once again needed for the industrial and commercial machine tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I ask a question? I cannot quite understand the member. A few minutes ago he was telling me that we are trying to create yeoman farmers and now he is giving the private builder trouble, because he is trying to build a high-rise apartment.

Mr. Bryden: I said, Mr. Chairman, that the private builder is aware of the problem as the Minister appears not to be. But I then went on to say that the private developer's solution is not necessarily the socially desirable solution.

I was indicating to the Minister the nature of the solution as far as the private developer is concerned. Or, shall I say, as far as most of them are concerned. One should not say that this is true of all private developers, they are not all going in for the high-rise. But the high-rise is their trademark, the human filing cabinet, as I called it. It is not a home, it does not provide a home. And of course it is totally unsuitable for children and children are not even allowed in.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Would the cost of the land not have something to do with it?

Mr. Bryden: That is what I said. Yes, I said all that. The Chairman does not like me to repeat myself; now for heaven's sake do not make me go back all over it again.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I just do not want to be confused.

Mr. Bryden: I said, when the Minister was having his little snooze there, that the high price of land was due to an imbalance between supply and demand and that we have to find more efficient ways of using land. And I said the private developer has devised his method which is valid within his light which is to maximize revenue per square foot of floor space. But that is not necessarily socially desirable and I gave my reasons.

I would like to complete them by saying that probably the most undesirable feature of our heavy concentration now on the high-rise apartment is that the units in it are totally unsuitable for children. The managers of these developments will not even let children in. In a sense, I am not sure that they are wrong, because these units are not suitable for children. If there were other places for them to go, it would be far better for them to go to some other type of accommodation. Unfortunately, families who can afford it want to get into the high-rise even with children because they have nowhere else to go; this is how critical the crisis has become.

It is a sad commentary on a society, Mr. Chairman, that it thinks so little of the leaders of tomorrow that it cannot tolerate them today. And that is exactly what we are doing to our children. When I use the word "our", I am using it collectively in the sense of society's children, since I do not have any myself. But I can certainly—

Mr. Sargent: It is not too late.

Mr. Bryden: That is quite true, but at any rate I do not want to create any misimpressions, you know. So I clarified this; my constituents might begin to wonder what was going on if I made a statement that could be interpreted as—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Whatever happens, name the first one after me.

Mr. Bryden: Any poor child who has to be brought up in this city with its terrible housing conditions should not have to carry any additional liabilities, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: You asked for it.

Mr. Bryden: At any rate, it certainly is a sad commentary on society that it cannot provide for its own future and for its own future population, and that it rejects its own children. That is what we are doing in Toronto right now and this is basically the result of the failure of government policy. There is no use trying to blame developers or apartment owners or anybody else. The situation arises because of the total failure of this government to deal with the housing situation.

The point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the more efficient use of land, is that a government does not have to govern itself by the same tests as a private developer. We can devise ways

of using land efficiently without necessarily maximizing revenue per square foot of floor space.

A government can afford to consider other values besides the purely commercial value. This has been demonstrated many times in many different contexts in European countries where all sorts of imaginative ideas have been developed with regard to the multiple unit type of housing; not only row housing and fourplexes and sixplexes, but complexes of various kinds combining various types of housing that are suitable for families—providing the privacy that they require when they require it and providing them with facilities for their children to play, necessary household services and so on.

This has been done in many places in an imaginative way, but in this country governments have contributed practically nothing. Even when we talk of Canada though, there is quite an exciting demonstration project down in Expo; Habitat '67, which we should be looking at for ideas for multiple dwelling housing units. This is the way the housing problem will have to be solved in the future.

The government should be giving leadership. It should be combing Europe for ideas, getting the best architectural brains and the best sociological brains available, to devise multiple dwelling units that are suitable for family living and can provide people with a proper home without making the totally uneconomic use of land which we have been making up until now. This is the first area in which government policy has totally failed, and it is basic; if you have a failure there you have a failure throughout the whole piece.

Then the other area which is equally basic is in the area of meeting the needs of people in, shall we say, approximately the lower half of the income scale. I think one could almost draw a line across the income scale and say the people below that line cannot afford commercial housing at any price or under any circumstance. It does not matter what sort of a deal you make about land rental or second mortgages or third mortgages or anything else, they just cannot afford it. On the other hand above that line are people who can afford commercial housing.

The line is not quite that easy to draw but it is certainly true that at least half, and probably more than half, of our population cannot afford commercial housing. And I am saying to the government—I tried to say it many times in the past, but without any response that I could ever notice—that it is that segment of the community for which the government should be responsible.

The government does not have to concern itself to any significant degree with those people who can afford to get on the housing market by themselves. Yet that has been the thrust of government housing policy both in Canada and Ontario from the first time that The National Housing Act was enacted. That Act has always been a scheme designed to help the upper section of the income scale, based again on the antiquated yeoman farmer conception of Jefferson.

Mr. Chairman, government policy has been, and continues to be directed to the very area where it is least needed, and there is practically nothing in the area where the government should be concerned. The figures I cited a few moments ago about the construction record of the OHC surely provide eloquent proof of what I have said. Six hundred and eighty units, I think it was in Toronto in over two years. Now we have the HOME programme. Sure it includes, you always have to include, a reference to what the Minister now calls geared-to-income housing.

I used to call it low rental housing, or sometimes subsidized housing, but we all know what we are talking about; it is housing for people who cannot afford to go out into the market. The Minister naturally includes that point, it has been in every programme for as long as I can remember, but never do any significant number of houses result from it. Once again we see in this phase of housing that the municipalities are still going to be saddled with 7.5 per cent of the cost of administration—not, admittedly, of development costs.

They have not had any capital for quite some time, but as far as operating costs are concerned, 7.5 per cent still falls on the municipality. I do not know if this was deliberate, but if the Minister wanted to find a way of making sure that nothing would happen, he could not have devised a better way.

At this time when the municipalities are simply unable to deal with the most basic responsibilities saddled on them, when Metro Toronto, for example, just a couple of days ago, had to cut out fundamental safety measures because it cannot finance its responsibilities, the Minister seriously suggests to us that we are going to have geared-to-income rental houses built, with the municipalities having to pay 7.5 per cent of the cost.

It is not going to happen, Mr. Chairman. The Minister ought to know that it is not going to happen and that is why I wonder if he does not know that it is going to happen, and that that provision is in there to make sure that it does not happen.

I do not know.

But at any rate, nothing has happened in this field in the past, or, at least, nothing significant has happened, and it is quite clear, even on the basis of statements made by leading representatives of the OHC itself, that nothing is going to happen in the foreseeable future. Yet this is the area of fundamental responsibility for the government.

My friend from Yorkview, on the basis of figures presented in that excellent book, "Good Housing for Canadians," prepared a number of years ago for the Ontario association of housing authorities, suggested that we need to construct 20,000 low-rental, geared-to-income units per year, in Ontario, for the next decade. That is no exaggeration, Mr. Chairman—to meet current needs, to meet anticipated future needs, and above all to catch up with the backlog of the past.

We need approximately 20,000 units a year and the government's performance, to date, has been less than 1,000.

It is time that it started to face up to this basic problem. The Minister shows a neurotic fear of getting in the way of private enterprise. Almost every statement he makes on the housing problem contains a reference to the fact that he would never, under any circumstances, interfere with private enterprise.

I would say to him, Mr. Chairman, that he does not need to worry. He does not need to have any fear at all, because public enterprise and private enterprise can both go full speed ahead for at least a decade, without doing any more than catching up with the problem.

So do not worry about private enterprise. But do not keep monkeying around with the area that belongs to them, get on with the job which belongs to you, which is to develop housing for the lower income groups and the senior citizens.

Let us get on with the programme, not fiddle around on the fringes, but get on with the real programme.

Of course, this is going to involve a considerable degree of urban redevelopment and there are difficulties in the way of that, as we know. But some of the difficulties which arise from the displacement of people in redevelopment projects would be overcome if we had an adequate stock of public housing.

If when we were developing a new unit, we had a place, an acceptable and desirable place where the people being dispossessed could go, then we would not run into the same sort of critical problems that we have run into recently in Toronto.

With all these years of neglect we are starting from scratch; we do not have a stock of public housing that amounts to anything, or is close to meeting the need.

But we have got to break out of the vicious circle—in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, we have got to start. Obviously we could not build 20,000 low rent units in the coming year.

These things take time to plan and develop, but we have got to get started. If the OHC, when it was set up two or three years ago, had seriously got down to business on this problem, we might be getting to the position now where we could build 10,000 or 15,000 a year at least.

Of course, they fiddled around with the problem as every previous administration fiddled around, and we are no closer to getting on with it than we were in the past.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come to stop fiddling, stop seeking headlines and really get down to the basic task. I want to make just one last comment on the subject.

I want to make a comment, perhaps for the benefit of the Provincial Treasurer, because even in expansion, this Provincial Treasurer is naturally somewhat concerned about costs. But I do not think we have got to be too greatly concerned about costs in a housing programme, not merely because I place the social objectives concerned at the top of the priority scale—I do that—but that is not the reason I say we should not be concerned about the cost. I say it mainly because the costs are not all that great.

Housing units are revenue producing assets and in the main, not entirely, but in the main, they pay for themselves. So we do not increase the net debt of the province to any significant degree by embarking on a large scale public housing programme.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Is the member suggesting there are not ample funds available?

Mr. Bryden: I still cannot hear you.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I said there are ample funds provided.

Mr. Bryden: Well, there may be ample funds, that has been another problem. The government is always ready to provide funds but it is never ready to provide houses. At any rate I do not need to reassure the Provincial Treasurer. He is not worried about it from his end, so why does the Minister of Economics and Development not get on with the job?

Actually, most of the money comes from Ottawa anyway, so it is not of immediate concern to us in this House, although, naturally, spending in Ottawa is of concern to us.

But in any case, the net spending is not all that great. The only development cost is subsidization and administration. Basically the units will pay for themselves.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Why do you say we should not be worried about the cost then?

Mr. Bryden: I will say that we have a more enlightened Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Chairman. I have many times been greeted with choruses of cries from over on that side when I advocated public housing programmes, cries to the effect of where are you going to get the money from? So I am hapy to know that is not a factor at all in the thinking of the Provincial Treasurer.

If it is a factor in the thinking of anyone else, I hope they will be reassured that the money is not the problem. The problem is the will to get on with the job. The will to get on with the job has been lacking. This, in my opinion, is the most serious criticism one can make of this government, of all the serious criticisms that can be made—that it has failed the people of Ontario in relation to the most important of all their necessities, namely the need for a proper home in which to rear and nurture their families.

There has been a total failure by the government and that failure alone is sufficient grounds for throwing this government out of office. It would be criminal indeed if it should under any circumstances be confirmed in office, after having failed the people of the province in so vital a matter.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I have, as the hon. member will notice, listened with great interest in the last hour and a half to his comments and I must say he is well prepared. He has done his homework and I understand this is his swan song in the House this year. He is going back to school to get a Ph.D. I can only say that the professor is going to have one very bright pupil, because he is a fellow that will do his homework; he will not have to be prodded.

Mr. MacDonald: After that condescension, what is your point?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I frankly cannot cover in my comments all the points brought out by the hon. member, but I am sure we will as we go through the estimates. It is obvious to me that the member has closed his eyes to many things, and of course I can understand that. Being in Opposition, why should he say the government has done anything? Perhaps if I was sitting over there—

Mr. Bryden: I did say you did something.

Hon. Mr. Randall: —that is the attitude I would take. We say, "what has the Opposition done lately for me? Nothing."

I think one of the most important things in this Ontario economy that the hon. member touched on this afternoon, and which I am prepared to talk about between now and the closing hour, is the auto pact, because it does have a very great impact on not only the economy of this province but on the country as a whole.

I have listened very patiently to not only the hon. leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Nixon) but to the hon. member for Woodbine, so perhaps you would grant me the same courtesy, because I think this is what your party would be very much interested in. If any time is left I will finish making my comments on some of the things you brought up this afternoon and I hope that the leader of the Liberal Party will forgive me if I cover his points when he is back in the House, I hope, at 8 o'clock.

The first point I want to make is that there have been some accusations made this afternoon, perhaps through lack of knowledge, about what our government is doing about certain facets of the economy. I want to assure the hon. member in relation to the auto pact that this is not true, and I am sure when I get through here we will not be in agreement. But I am sure he will agree we have taken a very unbiased view of what has happened—we did not make the auto pact; —we inherited it, as he recognizes.

We set up a committee to work with the automobile manufacturers, the parts manufacturers, and the union members, and Ottawa early in the game, and as you know the pact in its ramifications are directed by Mr. Drury's department in Ottawa. We do not always agree with Mr. Drury but I think on

this occasion you can see that while we do not entirely disagree with him, there are some reasons why I think we should all know what the facts are insofar as this province is concerned. Because as you say, the future of many people will depend on not only what happens to the auto pact, but there is talk that they are going to move into some other areas.

We in this province recognize that if they move into these areas without consultation with us, manufacturing 52 per cent of all the manufactured goods in this country, we can be seriously affected. So I would like, Mr. Chairman, to deliver to the members my comments with reference to the auto pact, the Canada-United States automotive free trade agreement, and I am sure as we go through the estimates if there are any points the members want to discuss I will have the opportunity of doing it. On January 18, 1965, the automotive free trade agreement between Canada and the United States was initiated. In Canada, an order-in-council at that time made it immediately effective. In the United States, the Senate ratified the agreement on October 8, 1965, making it retroactive to January 18, 1965, as well.

Under the terms of the agreement, the United States was permitted to import duty-free those motor vehicles and original equipment parts produced by Canadian motor vehicle manufacturers. Canada, for its part, permitted automotive producers in Canada—who qualify under the tariff provision—to import duty-free from all countries motor vehicles and parts used in their manufacture.

Duty-free entry to Canada was made available only to motor vehicle producers and to parts makers producing components on order from vehicle producers. Components for the replacement market were specifically excluded; in their case, the existing tariffs still applied.

In order to qualify as a motor vehicle manufacturer under the new agreement, a producer had to continue producing vehicles in Canada in the same ratio to his vehicles sales in Canada as he had achieved during the period August 1, 1963, to July 31, 1964.

The motor vehicle manufacturer was also required to maintain the proportion of Canadian value added in his Canadian vehicle production at least equal to that attained during the same base period. In calculating the Canadian value added content, only those elements of cost which were actually expended for Canadian goods and services were to be included, both in the base year and in subsequent years.

Behind the agreement have been firm but private assurances by the Canadian subsidiaries of the parent United States motor vehicle producers that they would not only maintain their existing share of an expanding North American market, but by the 1968 model year—and each year thereafter—they would expand their total production from 4 per cent of the North American total to 7.5 per cent. It was estimated that by 1968 the value of the expansion in production of motor vehicles would be about $260 million.

A: Total effect in Canada—to date: Before any consideration is given to the effects in Canada of the automotive free trade agreement between Canada and the United States, we should look at the whole industry in perspective and see what Canada's position was prior to the initiation of the agreement on January 18, 1965.

In the years preceding the signing of the agreement, Canada's deficit trading position in automotive vehicles and parts was deteriorating rapidly, despite efforts by the federal government to offset this trend. It was particularly marked in automotive parts trade with the United States. Although automotive parts exports rose to $36.3 million in 1963 from $3.7 million in 1960, imports during the same period rose from $316.8 million to $554.7 million.

For 1964, just prior to the signing of the agreement, Canada's trade deficit with the United States on all automotive products was about $600 million. This deficit had become one of the major problems in Canada's international trading picture. At its rate of deterioration, the deficit balance on automotive products alone could have reached $1 billion in a few years. Clearly, something had to be done to stem this tide. With the foregoing in mind, we will now turn to the total effects of the automotive free trade agreement in Canada to date.

Briefly the record is very impressive:

1. Motor vehicle production has risen by 34 per cent.

2. The price differential on comparable cars sold in the United States and Canada has narrowed from 8 per cent to between 3 per cent and 5 per cent and I checked these figures with Ottawa yesterday. If they are wrong that is where I got my figures.

3. The expanding deficit balance of trade on automotive products has, in 1966, begun to improve.

4. New capital investment, resulting from the automotive free trade agreement, has been valued at $506 million.

5. New employment generated from the automotive expansions amounts to 20,860 persons.

Returning to number 1. Total automobile production in 1964 just prior to the signing of the pact was 670,000 units. In 1966, total motor vehicle production had climbed to 895,000 units—an increase of 34 per cent. Only 14 per cent of this increase is due to an expansion of domestic sales. The remainder is the result of increased exports arising from the free trade agreement. Exports rose by more than 230 per cent.

2. In the fall of 1964, when the 1965 model year had commenced, the price differential between comparable cars sold in the United States and Canada, measured in terms of factory wholesale prices in Canada and the United States, less all federal and provincial or state taxes, transportation costs, and adjusted for the exchange rate, was about 8 per cent—the Canadian cars being the more expensive. For the 1966 model year, the differential had narrowed to between 3 per cent and 5 per cent.

The reason why Canadian produced cars are sold across the border for less is because, until both the automobile and parts manufacturers in Canada can produce at the same costs as their counterparts in the United States, the manufacturers are going to have to absorb the difference in cost on all cars exported to the United States under the terms of the agreement. Conversely, imported cars of the kind made here will have to be sold at the Canadian prices, otherwise no Canadian-made cars would be sold. Under the terms of the agreement, the Canadian producer must continue producing vehicles in Canada in the same ratio to his vehicle sales in Canada as he did during the period August 1, 1963, to July 31, 1964.

3. At the end of 1965 the Canadian imbalance in trade with the United States for all automotive products had risen to about $770 million. For the first 11 months of 1966—latest period available—the deficit in these products with the United States was $593 million and compares with a deficit of $701 million with the United States for the same period a year earlier—an improvement of $108 million.

4. and 5. The federal government, in estimating new investment and employment resulting from the free trade agreement, have included part of that which was generated in 1964. They felt that the time of initiation could not be traced accurately to January 18, 1965. Notwithstanding, total new investment earmarked for the industry resulting from the agreement to date amounts to $506.5 million, with a resultant additional employment generation of 20,860 persons.

From this vantage point, it should be evident that the overall impact of the free trade agreement has been beneficial to Canada.

I will now trace the effects of the pact on the Ontario economy and point up any weaknesses and benefits as we see them. I think we have to be fair about the pact.

B. Effect on Ontario's economy: Since approximately 95 per cent of the automotive industry is in Ontario, it has been in our interest to follow closely its progress since the signing of the agreement, as I pointed out before I started this statement.

I would be negligent if I pretended that there have been no problems. But first let me say that, from an overall viewpoint, the pact has, in my opinion, created far more benefits than problems in Ontario to this time:

On the positive side, we have estimated that 202 automotive plants and expansions, valued at $468 million, have taken place in Ontario since the signing of the pact. This new investment in Ontario has given rise directly to 15,000 new jobs.

In total, 53 communities throughout Ontario have benefited through either a new automotive manufacturing operation or an automotive manufacturing expansion since the signing of the free trade agreement and when we talk about spreading our industry I think these areas will be of interest to the members. Eight communities benefited in the Lake St. Clair region, six in the Lake Erie region, eight in the Niagara region, six in the midwestern Ontario region, ten in the central region, six in the Lake Ontario region, eight in the Georgian Bay region and one in the eastern Ontario region.

C. Ontario government action: In an effort to understand and offset any problems arising from the free trade agreement in Ontario, my department has:

1. Made a complete study of the regional equipment parts manufacturers in Ontario;

2. Issued two bulletins listing Michigan-based companies which were seeking Canadian sources for automotive parts;

3. Took a sales mission to Detroit of auto parts manufacturers to establish contact for these vendors;

4. Organized an export forum for March 15, 1967, to bring together United States manufacturers' agents and Ontario automotive parts producers;

5. Maintained close liaison with many informed officials, to keep abreast of the latest development in the automotive industry which I have already discussed earlier.

One of the major fears expressed since the signing of the pact has been that small parts manufacturers would suffer drastically from re-organizations resulting from the agreement. To ascertain the validity of this concern, my department undertook a survey of the original equipment parts manufacturers in the province and I can assure hon. members the results were far from disheartening.

Members of my trade and industry branch interviewed 403 companies in Ontario that were related in any way to the automotive parts business. Out of these, 296 companies were deemed to be bona fide original equipment parts manufacturers for the purpose of our survey.

Of the 296 companies surveyed, 195, or 60 per cent, reported to us that they had benefited from the auto pact. Another 35 companies either did not wish to express an opinion or else felt that the agreement had no effect on them to date. Sixty-six companies reported they had experienced some adverse effects.

Of those companies which reported adverse effects, however, only 26 appeared to have been seriously hampered. In many cases, only a small portion of the total output of those companies which were adversely affected was devoted to the original equipment business. In other cases, companies which claimed to have suffered, substituted after-market or non-automotive business for their original equipment business.

It was estimated that about 42,000 employees represented the automotive parts industry we surveyed. To the best of our knowledge, 1,074 of these employees or 2.6 per cent of the total are out of work at the present time. The Department of Manpower and Immigration, in conjunction with the Ontario Departments of Labour and Education, are attempting to find new jobs, retrain, and upgrade their skills and education.

The overall impression gained during our survey was that some Canadian companies, due to smallness in size, lack of experience in the broader market, and inadequate capital and equipment, were at some disadvantages compared with their United States counterparts. Nevertheless, despite this handicap, we learned that if a Canadian company had active and aggressive management, it obtained all the busines it could handle. We actually have examples of some companies doubling and even, in one case, quadrupling business, since the auto pact went into effect, because management was willing to go after the work offered by the agreement.

Now, for those companies which are having difficulty in accommodating themselves to the free trade agreement, my department has organized four programmes of assistance:

First: In conjunction with the office of the federal Department of Trade and Commerce in Detroit, my department issued two special "Manufacturing Opportunities" bulletins listing Michigan-based companies which were seeking Canadian sources for automotive parts. Also listed were United States manufacturers' agents seeking associations with Canadian automotive parts makers. These bulletins were distributed to Ontario manufacturers who were then able to contact the Michigan company and make arrangements for the sale of their products. The first bulletin was published on November 17, 1966, and has resulted in 150 enquiries from Ontario companies. The second bulletin, published January 25, 1967, resulted in 25 enquiries within the first two weeks of publication.

Second: On January 8, 1967, my trade and industry branch took a sales mission to Detroit in an effort to gain further orders for those companies which had been adversely affected by the free trade agreement. Fifteen manufacturers were taken on this mission. After a full week of business interviews and hard selling, all companies reported an improvement in business potential. Several established arrangements with agents. One company expected to double and another to treble business next year, and at least one company came back with a $75,000 order and has another $1 million worth of business pending.

The most important result of this mission was that Ontario parts manufacturers, who were formely reserved about making contact in Detroit, became aware of the potential, particularly those manufacturers who discovered the importance of manufacturers' agents in selling their products.

Third: On March 15, 1967, my department held an export forum in Toronto. The purpose of this forum was to bring together United

States manufacturers' representatives and Ontario automotive parts producers in an effort to stimulate further sales to the United States. Discussions concentrated on methods of selling in the United States through manufacturers' agents and on how to expedite the movement of Ontario-manufactured products to the United States through customs and/or the use of United States customs brokers. Some 200 Ontario automotive industry officials attended this forum.

As a result of active and interested participation, opportunities of selling in the Detroit area were opened for the first time to many Canadian parts producers. In fact, it was estimated that about 50 companies were capable of selling in the United States under the terms of the agreement, but were not yet doing so. Again, the value of a manufacturers' agent, particularly in the Detroit area, became more apparent to Ontario producers.

Presentations were made by two members of the Michigan society of manufacturers' agents, on the mechanics of doing business through them. As a result, the trade and industry branch will interview 20 more agents in the Detroit area interested in carrying new lines from Ontario companies.

Fourth: In addition, personnel in my department are kept informed through continuous contact with officials of the various automotive parts and automotive manufacturing associations, The Department of Industry in Ottawa, the Detroit office of The Department of Trade and Commerce, and personnel of The Manpower and Immigration Department, particularly in the automotive centres.

D. Controversial issues: Now, I would like to comment on some of the controversial issues that have been the subject of many discussions throughout Canada, and we have read many experts in the press and I think that we would be remiss if we did not look at what they have to say and take it into consideration.

In January 1965, at the commencement of the free trade agreement, there were 68,100 employees in the motor vehicle and parts industry. As of January this year, there were 87,800 in the industry. This is an increase of 19,700 workers and corresponds very closely with the 20,860 new jobs reported by the federal government, created as a result of new investment earmarked for the automotive industry, since the implementation of the agreement. This is further substantiated by the latest published information on auto workers enrolled in the international union, united automobile, aerospace, and agricultural implement workers of America. This membership grew from 63,607 in 1964 to 96,794 in 1966, or by 33,187 during approximately the same period as the pact—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): They are not all in the automobile trade—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not say so.

In Ontario alone, the number of locals of this membership increased from 64 in 1964 to 81 in 1966. Now I realize that much of this increase is also accounted for by workers involved in the agricultural and aerospace industries, but I think that all of these figures prove there has been substantial growth in employment in the automotive industry since the signing of the agreement. I do not think that that can be denied.

Now wage parity is also under discussion today and it is something that I think we should discuss in this House.

The government of Ontario recognizes and supports the principle that wage differentials be consistent with productivity differentials, both within a national economy and between countries, if competitive prices for the commodity or service are to be the ultimate result. Applying this principle to wage comparisons between Canada and the United States, it means that where productivity in the two countries is equal, then wage parity is economically justifiable; where Canadian productivity is higher than that in the United States, then a correspondingly higher Canadian wage is acceptable. Where Canadian productivity is lower than that of the United States, then a correspondingly lower Canadian wage is a reasonable consequence.

At this time, wage rates in the Canadian automotive industry are between 14 per cent and 20 per cent below those in the United States. The question that now arises is whether Canadian productivity in this industry has been raised sufficiently, as a consequence of the Canada-United States agreement, to equal United States productivity and therefore justify wage parity. A judgment as to whether wage parity in this industry is justified will depend upon the ability to assemble and assess evidence as to whether productivity parity has been achieved, and I do not think that anybody has done this as yet.

Mr. Bryden: I admire the statement the hon. Minister has made. It is quite a bit

different from Drury's. He wanted to do it on the basis of average productivity.

Hon. Mr. Randall: What we are doing here is analyzing the situation before we make any statement. I think it had to be analyzed. I do not think anybody is in a position to say whether it can or cannot be achieved.

The government of Ontario welcomes any discussion of wage differentials in terms of relative productivity between Canada and the United States. The United States is the highest productivity country in the world, and an ambition to achieve equality with the United States, through equality of productivity, is, to our mind the only realistic way of achieving a competitive standard of living.

This position is fully in accord with the principles enunciated by the economic council of Canada in its third annual report. May I, however, point out that, with 97 per cent of all Canadian automotive production located in this province, any premature conclusions reached on wage and productivity matters by those responsible for union and management relations, could jeopardize many thousands of jobs in this largest of all Canadian industries. The impact could also initiate a severe cut-back in many of the supplier industries, with the inevitable loss of job opportunities.

If these two factors, however, can be accurately obtained by calm and intelligent reasoning which would indicate that wage parity is justified on the basis of productivity and not simply arrived at in order to justify equality of pay between automotive workers in Canada and the United States, regardless of the consequences involved, then this government would welcome any move that would assure higher incomes for the employee, with continuity of employment, and increase sales for the employer, with a higher return on capital invested.

I should like to touch for a moment on the lay-offs. In September 1966, the Ontario economic council recently published a report on "The Impact of Lay-Off and Recall at Ford-Windsor."

The report was prepared for the council by professors C. M. Birch and J. A. Gertz, of the University of Windsor. In it they stated that:

> While only 83 per cent of those laid off went back to their old jobs, the highly automated plants by June of 1966 were employing 654 more than they did prior to the line simplification resulting from the Canada - United States automotive agreement.

The lay-off, made at a time of expanding industrial activity in Windsor, was in two stages, 493 men in June 1965, and 809 in August 1965. Ninety per cent of the first group obtained temporary jobs, and 15 per cent of the second group.

By February 1966, all workers who returned to Ford were back at work, and the company hired several hundred new men in March and April. The lay-off period was short for the second group and probably all who sought temporary work obtained it.

Now the situation in Oshawa is different and I think we have an interest in outlining our thoughts with reference to Oshawa. The impact of the present lay-offs has been concentrated at General Motors in Oshawa. More than 2,400 employees during the past year have received separation notices from the company and this can be traced to a drop in production resulting from a decline in sales and their inability to export cars to the United States under the advantages of the agreement so far.

As you know, there has been a drop in motor vehicle sales during the past year in both the United States and Canada, with a resultant cut-back in production. In 1966, total passenger car production in Canada dropped 11,606 units or 1.7 per cent of the total for 1965.

The impact of the decline in demand has hit General Motors in Ontario more than it has other Canadian auto producers. New car registrations in Canada were up for Ford and Chrysler but down for new General Motors' cars in 1966. One must also remember that General Motors is the largest producer and, as a consequence, any reduction in sales means that a greater number of workers will automatically be affected. The Pontiac and Chev - Chevy - Corvair lines suffered the most severe declines and these were the lines produced at Oshawa.

Also, owing to the difference between the enamel used on cars produced in Oshawa and the lacquer used on those produced in the United States, none of the Oshawa cars have been exported under the terms of the free trade agreement. Furthermore, General Motors was hit hardest by recent safety feature criticisms. Consequently, according to the dominion bureau of statistics, in 1966 the production of passenger cars at General Motors was down 18.6 per cent from the previous year, while Ford, Chrysler, and American Motors all recorded increases in their passenger car production.

Now, I also think that there are some general factors resulting in declining automobile sales in recent months, both in the United States and Canada. In both countries during the past year there has been a disruption in the rate of economic growth. As incomes were affected, so were the purchases of heavy consumer items, such as housing and automobiles, which are always affected first. In recent years the high level of new automobiles purchased has delayed customary replacement in the face of present uncertainties. In addition, the demand for more safety features on all cars, domestic and foreign, has undoubtedly had a depressing effect on the sale of 1966 and 1967 models. Many people have delayed purchasing, anticipating more safety improvements in the 1968 model car.

If the drop in demand is related to the safety hazards and the subsequent recall of many cars in recent months for engineering or assembly adjustments, then management and workers must, in their mutual interest, move more quickly to restore public confidence in the automobile industry by adopting new safety measures and better workmanship. Jobs can only be sustained if car production can be sold. The consumer is not particularly interested in the employer or the employees' welfare. He wants the best product at the best price and the highest quality.

One year ago, it was feared at that time we would be faced with the shut-down of many small parts producers in Ontario. So far we are aware of only three companies going out of business. One shut-down definitely was not the result of the auto pact and the other two, we believe, were only partially affected by it.

In conclusion, let me say again that although the free trade agreement has created some problems of adjustment, I believe that the benefits have far outweighed the problems in Canada and particularly in the province of Ontario.

The agreement is of unlimited duration, but there is a provision that the entire programme will be reviewed in 1968. At this time, I think that if there are any strong criticisms they will come from the United States rather than from us.

I am sure that I am not going to get everybody to agree with me on this statement. We all have an opinion as to what the auto pact has done, but I want to assure the hon. member who spoke this afternoon that we take this auto pact arrangement and how it affects this province very seriously and certainly, as you can see from the work that we have done here, we have up to date information. If anybody wants the list of companies or the people we talked to I would be glad to make them available on a confidential basis.

I am just saying here we are not walking the fence; we simply say that until this problem is resolved at the federal level and with the auto parts manufacturers, and the economy moves up for more automobile sales we are going to have these problems. I know from my past experience in the appliance business, if we get a bad rating on an appliance in the *Consumer Report*, I can show you how quickly sales went down even though perhaps they just took one off a dealer's shelf and it happened to be one that was damaged in transit.

That kind of publicity does not do anything for jobs, and certainly does not do anything for the manufacturer. However, let us recognize the fact that if the product is not right it certainly has to be made right because people are not going to take a product that is not up to standard.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member brought up some points and in the few minutes left I will try to cover a few of them.

I would like to touch first on the comment the hon. member made on immigration. I do not feel that we are stealing skills and brains from other countries when I see the number of people that leave here. I look at the newspapers every day—*The Financial Post* once a week, and the three daily papers —and see the ads appearing here from almost every country in the world inviting our people to go there.

This is a competitive business—trying to buy brains, and capture brains, the same as it is trying to sell and capture products. I may not share the same opinion as the hon. member for Woodbine, but I think that what we have to do is recognize, as the hon. member said, that we have to do perhaps a better job of training the people who can do the job here without going abroad for them, and this is being done with our educational institutions, our new technical colleges, and the many other things that we are doing. One of the major problems we have, and we might as well face it, is that we are going to have sponsored immigration.

In sponsored immigration, a man can come here with no skill, as you well know, and he brings a family with him. Recently, I have taken issue, not publicly, but certainly we, perhaps, will, with an edict that was

issued out of Ottawa that anybody not earning seven or eight thousand dollars a year, should not come to Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor, or Vancouver.

I think if those kind of people are barred from coming, it is certainly going to slow down the people who do not have those qualifications, and if we are ever going to populate this vast country of ours, we are not going to do it on the basis of discouraging immigration. I believe the immigration should be wide open and we have indicated so in our policy on immigration. We have had no—

Mr. MacDonald: Those Liberals are awfully reactionary up in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, as I say we have worked with them in the immigration departments, we have had no difficulty. The men overseas are quite prepared to direct people here and we will talk about immigration when we get into that vote, because we put on a very extensive programme last year and it paid off handsomely for this province.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): There are no houses to live in when they get here.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not see anybody living in pup tents in Riverdale park or High park. People are finding—

Mr. Bryden: Have you ever seen the armouries?

Hon. Mr. Randall: You talk about 16 families in the armouries. You are not going to stop people from coming because you cannot find them a mansion almost overnight. People still want to do something for themselves.

Perhaps you watched the movie on channel 6 last night—"Cathy Come Home." Now we have heard about all the building going on in Great Britain, and the housing. If you saw that picture last night, I just suggest to you that while we have some problems, these other countries that have been building public housing and housing for more years than we have, are in great difficulty.

Mr. Trotter: They had a war.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There are other countries that did not have a war. Sweden did not have a war and Sweden has 70,000 people on a waiting list to get housing, and they have done an excellent job of building housing.

Mr. Singer: I thought we were the greatest in the world.

Hon. Mr. Randall: So we are in many things.

Mr. Singer: Except with housing.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): You do not have to wait 13 years to get into a house like you do in Scandinavia —13 years you are on the waiting list.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member also brought up the matter of what were we doing about the pipeline situation. Again I want to assure him that in The Department of Economics and Development we do a lot of internal work for other departments. We are a service department to the other departments of government, and we are doing a great deal towards looking into matters which come up that have an economic impact on this province. But we do not come out publicly, we are not prepared to come out publicly and say what the situation is until we have assessed it like the automotive pact.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, but you lost it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it has not been lost yet. The matter is still under very serious discussion at the federal and the United States level. But let me give you two factors in which I think you may be interested. I do not have the complete report here but I know I have in my office a half a dozen updated reports on the pipeline situation; we keep ourselves abreast of it.

It has been suggested and it has been proven, I think, by mathematics that the cost of gas to southern Ontario users would be approximately $28 per million cubic feet less than it would be if the alternative northern route was given preference. Now, this is one thing we checked out and this is a fact. I do not know whether it is true or not; we are still checking it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, there is a lot of doubt.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I know there is. That is what I say, why make a hasty decision?

Mr. MacDonald: There are a lot of factors that have to be taken into consideration.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The second one is that construction of additional pipelines through northern Ontario would probably create local employment opportunities for unskilled labour, since specialized labour is not available locally. These men are specialists, like steelworkers, and when the job was done, these

people would drift back. There is no employment attached to this, it is only temporary employment.

Mr. Bryden: Surely there is an infrastructure.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me continue. The infrastructure is the thing we are studying now. What is the impact? Can you take a branch line off at one point and build a chemical factory? We do not believe we should shoot our natural gas down to the southern states and build a chemical factory down there. We would like to say, the gas is up here, bring the chemical factory right next to the gasline. These are the things that we are studying and I want to assure you that we are aware of the fact—

Mr. Bryden: The only reason we have not lost the thing completely is that they are taking so long to make up their minds in the United States and there are so many conflicting interests there. But for anything you have done it has been lost.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It could be, but as you know, at some of these levels things move a little slower than we would like to see, but if it is a national policy we can make our views known, which we are doing. But we cannot do any more than that. But I think you will see, as I have pointed out here this afternoon, we have taken an interest in the development of this pipeline and other matters affecting the economy of this province.

Now, the hon. member touched on the economic goals as outlined in my presentation the other day and when I get into his field, this is where you have an amateur playing with a professional because I know his academic background. But I would just suggest to him, however, that I have a few professionals on the bench who advise me. Sometimes I have a hard job understanding because I am just a washing machine peddler so I have to say, "Now explain it so I understand it."

Mr. MacDonald: Sometimes the Minister does not take their advice.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sometimes it does not pay to take their advice, and they will agree. When you look at the forecasts every year, 50 per cent of the economists have to be wrong.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, more than that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Only 50 per cent can be right.

Mr. Bryden: No; not that many.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let us not kid ourselves.

The economic council of Canada arrived at their averages that the member talked about this afternoon, and I am quite sure that they arrived at those averages, taking into consideration the contribution that this province could make, in looking at the overall averages for Canada.

We recognize that this province must contribute, perhaps the greater share of the economic wealth of this country in the position in which we sit.

We are setting up a statistical department, which we hope will give us figures faster than we get them out of DBS. We will get figures that we can use internally, which are difficult to get at the present time because, as you know DBS is at least a year, and perhaps longer than that behind, and by the time you get the figures they are ancient history. And I do not think that you can run an economy today on ancient history and that is the reason why we set up our statistical branch in The Department of Economics. We will talk about this in a few minutes.

I might say that when it comes to the matter of pricing and price stability, this again is a very fluid area and one in which I think that all of us have different opinions. I recall commenting not too long ago about the pricing on food here and at the time I commented there were suggestions in Ottawa that they were going to bring down some restrictive measures. I pointed out that the budget that Mr. Sharp had brought in, had not been brought into effect as yet and would not take effect until October, which was two or three months away, and I was referring then primarily to the cut-back in construction as Expo was slackening off and a lot of construction workers would be available for other jobs across Canada.

We also pointed out that in the previous year, in the United States, a great many of their cattle were killed off as well as a great many of their hogs, and they ran into a shortage. The Vietnam war was on and imports increased into the United States so naturally the farmers here took advantage of the higher export prices and away went the things that we were banking on to hold price stability in some of the food lines.

The same situation occurred in copper, as you will recall. Copper reached almost $1 a pound and I think we can sit here and blame ourselves for a lot of things, but I do

not think that you can blame us for the $1 a pound on copper; it happened when Rhodesia got into difficulties. So these are the things that have created some of the fluctuations in price stability and things affecting the average consumer.

Then at this same time, Canada Packers had been out on strike for three, four or five months, and you are aware what happens when the most efficient producer is out of business; the fellows who are not so efficient take advantage of the situation to get better prices and this certainly was what took place on many of the food items at the time that we discussed price stability a few months ago.

Now those comments of mine were made public and again I say to you that we have watched these matters very carefully. In some areas, perhaps we are in a position to control them, but I think that when it comes to price controls and price stability this has to be done at the federal level because each and every province has to cooperate.

If we have restrictions here and they are not in force in Quebec—or vice versa—I do not have to tell you what happens, but you know that we certainly cannot maintain them.

I would think that the information that the hon. member has suggested should be available and will be available in the coming year when the statistical department gets under way. Already we have done a great deal of ground work to supply Ontario's own statistical figures in the coming months.

Now I am not going to dwell on the matter of housing any longer—I have said my piece on housing and I have issued the HOME report. I simply look at what has been achieved since I took on housing and I am going to speak for the dead engineer of 15, 10 or 12 years ago any more than I think you are going to take responsibility for the 500 houses that your party built in Saskatchewan in the 20 years it was in power. I know we do not like to be reminded of what the people did not do in the past; I simply say that when I came into the housing picture and was given the responsibility—

Mr. Bryden: There is some lack of comparability—

Hon. Mr. Randall: My record in the housing field indicates that I have a sincere wish and a sincere desire to solve the housing problem and, as I said the other day if somebody can come up and give me a better programme, I am quite prepared to accept it; I am quite prepared to listen to him.

Mr. Sargent: You have known about this for three years now—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just a minute—I took on the job in 1964. The Ontario housing corporation was formed in the Legislature here in the latter part of 1964; it was proclaimed in August and started operating in the early part of 1965 and I do not care what you want to say about it, if you look at what has been achieved in 25 months, you will see that there is no jurisdiction in Canada that has done as much.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me assure you that we have no need to fear the wrath of the voter on election day. In fact, they know that you cannot argue with success. The success is there. The hon. member himself said this afternoon, I know you cannot build a house overnight and he knows you cannot build even a modest priced bungalow in less than six to eight months and perhaps a year.

Mr. Bryden: I know, but you have not laid the ground work.

Hon. Mr. Randall: He also knows you cannot build an apartment house in less than 18 months to two years.

Mr. Bryden: That is the tragedy of the thing.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, maybe it will. Let us not kid ourselves. There is one point that I think we miss. Comments have been made about this Ontario housing corporation going and buying a stock of houses. I do not see anything wrong with that. If a man says, "I have got 20 houses to sell, or 100 houses to sell; who wants to buy," and it appears in the paper, why should not the Ontario housing corporation walk up and say, "I would like to buy them?"

Mr. Bryden: Because we should be building them.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are building. This is why we are getting into the building. This was an emergency stock measure and we never said it was anything else.

Mr. Bryden: The emergency has got worse.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it is not worse.

Mr. Bryden: It is.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, listen. Let me tell you this.

Mr. Singer: More people need houses.

Hon. Mr. Randall: More people are encouraged by the fact that housing is moving in their direction so they are making application. They are no longer discouraged.

Mr. Bryden: You should get out among the people.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have been out among the people.

Mr. Bryden: Up in some wealthy area.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will stake my reputation in my riding on my housing programme any day in the week. I would simply say to the hon. members that we do not say we can do the impossible; we just say we can do it but it just takes a little longer, and housing—

Mr. Bryden: If it takes longer than 20 years!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now, we could back and say the same thing in Saskatchewan today. I see that in Saskatchewan—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Did you notice in the *Globe and Mail* the other day, they had a housing comment right on the editorial page from every province, and in Saskatchewan, Mr. Thatcher said: "We will build 75 homes for the poor people in 1967".

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would permit me to make just one comment? These gentlemen over here of course are obsessed about Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well you had your experience—

Mr. Bryden: I am never the one who raises Saskatchewan. I think that the record of the Saskatchewan government is an outstanding record of achievment in the social field. I would be happy to debate it. It pioneered medicare. It pioneered hospital insurance. It pioneered advanced labour legislation. It was the first province to enact 75 per cent workmen's compensation. I could go on for an hour listing the achievements. But, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: —to deal with the specific point that the Minister has raised, in my opinion the Saskatchewan CCF government did not do a good job in the housing field. Admittedly the situation there is substantially different from here. It is to a greater extent a problem of rural housing but they did not do a satisfactory job. I will be quite happy to state that if it makes the Minister happy. But that in my opinion does not justify the total failure in the province of Ontario, and total failure is all one can describe it as. Here our problem is infinitely more acute than they ever thought of in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, Mr. Chairman, following that short comment, all I have to say is that if housing in this province is a failure, then we have something like 22,655 units either bought, built, under construction, in the design stage, so somebody has been getting paid for doing nothing.

Mr. Singer: Those figures are meaningless.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, no, no, they are not meaningless.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just because you are in the Opposition! Agree with us once in a while and admit it is a good programme. Do not run everything down. Admit we have a good programme.

Mr. Bryden: It is a phoney statistic.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do not forget, my hon. friends, you cannot argue with success. The facts and the figures are there.

Mr. Bryden: We are not trying to.

It being 6:00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 55

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 6, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 6, 1967

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 1837

Motion to adjourn, Mr. MacNaughton, agreed to 1875

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1967

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT
(Continued)

On vote 401:

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I looked at the estimates this year—the Minister has increased the aid to regional development councils by $100,000—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): May I make an interjection here? I wonder if we could discuss regional development on vote 402? I think that will cover all the items there. Do you mind? That is where the branch is.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Well, the Minister may say that, but I wish he would write it down because he says, under heading 5 in vote 401, "to aid to regional development councils $100,000." Under vote 402 I do not see any mention of that. If that is what the Minister means why does he not say it when he prepares his estimates?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The grants come under vote 401, out of head office, but the work of regional development is being done under the chief economist in vote 402. I just suggested that, instead of discussing it in both places, let us discuss it under vote 402.

Mr. Singer: If it will make you happy we will do it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will be delirious.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Could we determine where the Expo project of—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Vote 401!

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401 carried?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Chairman: Well, let us have some speakers then.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, last year I think we made our point quite clear in the Opposition here, that we took exception to the fact that the government was spending a capital grant of some $3 million to establish the research foundation when we had already established that we had—I am talking about the Ontario research foundation in section 6, of vote 401—that industry itself had full write-offs for research. This government is asking the hard-pressed taxpayer of Ontario to pay the freight for industry to acquire new technology with which they would make great profits. You are asking the taxpayers of Ontario to pay the freight; and, knowing that the government will not retract or change their position, I want to make my voice clear that there is no area in my thinking where, if the taxpayer of Ontario had his say about this matter, he would agree to pay in the extent of $1 million per year to infinity, or in perpetuity, in support of big industry.

The Minister has tried repeatedly to justify his position by continuing this pay-out and I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is time that the government faced squarely the ability of the average homeowner in Ontario to pay such million dollar grants as this on top of capital grants of $3 million. Again I make my position clear. I think that the position of the Opposition insofar as the research for industry—we have no right to be paying $1 million per year for research for big industry which will result in new technology through which they will get a great deal of profits when they have a full layoff in their taxes from the federal government.

In this vote this year you are asking for $925 thousand—in vote 401, item 6—and I do not think there would be any point in making a motion that we vote this to be one dollar because you have your machinery set up to put this in continuity for industry. But somewhere along the line if the Opposition were in power I think there would be a great chance that we would take this million dollars a year and levy this against industry and not the homeowner of Ontario.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, if we are to the Ontario research foundation I had a few comments that I

wanted to make. Perhaps I should most appropriately follow what the hon. member for Grey North has just said.

I would be the first to state that the main burden for industrial research ideally should fall on industry because they are the people who are going to benefit from it in the first instance. The tragedy in Canada, however, is that industry has not done an adequate job on research, and not only industry, but the whole of the economy is suffering. The conclusion that I come to—I think I said this last year, and I will say it again—is a very different one from what the hon. member for Grey North has just reached. As a matter of fact, I do not know of anywhere where a million dollars can be more usefully spent than on encouraging research—priming the pump, if you will—with industry, in the hope they can be drawn together as they have been in Sheridan Park, and start to lay something of that basis upon which our future economic development is going to rest. And, indeed, in the final analysis it may well assist the homeowner and everybody else who is going to benefit from the economy. However, with those introductory remarks, let me go back to Sheridan Park itself, Mr. Chairman, because I had prepared a few comments and I can perhaps deal with them in a more orderly fashion in the sequence that I originally had planned.

Last year I raised with the Minister the whole question as to the role the government envisaged for research in laying the necessary foundation for economic development in the province of Ontario.

I asked, for example, what was the relationship between what is happening in Sheridan Park and our universities, or what it should be, bearing in mind, as I reminded the House, the kind of development that has taken place around MIT in Boston, around a similar kind of complex in California and in Texas, in which universities have become the locale for research that led to a related industrial development. I wondered what the pattern of the development was going to be in Ontario now that we have headed off in the direction which appears to have been established by Sheridan Park.

During the last few months, having had my interest aroused by the debate last year in the House on this estimate, I took the opportunity to discuss the whole question of industrial research with groups in about half a dozen universities in various parts of the province, in many instances involving the deans of the faculties of applied arts and other scientists who were involved in some of the various fields. I was rather interested in the kind of varied reaction that I got, and I would like to pass on briefly some reflections arising from these discussions, which sometimes lasted for a full evening or for a full Saturday morning, with people who are intensely interested in this whole field.

I was interested, for example, Mr. Chairman, to discover in the first instance that some of these people regretted the government's move in establishing Sheridan Park as a magnet, so to speak, to attract industrial research outside the confines of the university itself. In other words, some of them felt that the grants that were coming from the national research council, and that might go in other instances to universities, might be more effectively channeled into the universities where research could take place, and, indeed where it is to some extent taking place. In other words, they questioned the wisdom of establishing a separate research complex away from both the universities, and away from the industry itself.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the longer I talked through this problem, particularly in discussing it with later groups, the more my own doubts about the wisdom of the government's move in establishing Sheridan Park disappeared. I think there are obvious advantages, apart from the physical site, of a research complex which is within easy access to the majority of the Ontario universities, close to the great industrial complex of the golden horseshoe, close to airport facilities and everything else. Yet it also seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there are advantages—and I just want to allude to these because I think it is well to dispel any doubts that there may be about the wisdom of the direction in which we are moving—that there is a value in having an industrial complex removed from the industry itself, so that the research people will not run the risk of being caught up in trouble-shooting jobs in relation to what is going on in the industrial process rather than in genuine research work.

The more I talk to these people the more I am impressed with the extent to which there is a danger of the research people being caught up in trouble-shooting jobs as they emerge in the industrial process.

Secondly, I think there is value in having the research people removed from the university because there is at least theoretically a danger that if you have industrial research in the university you begin to debase the original purpose of the university. The origi-

nal purpose of the university—I think it is generally viewed, and certainly it is my view—is pure research for the extension of knowledge and teaching. If there is too close a relationship with industrial research there is a possibility that that basic function of the university is somehow or other going to get lost sight of.

Mr. Singer: Why?

Mr. MacDonald: Through competing interest. All I am saying is that this is the view of many people who feel that if you take industrial research into the universities there is a danger that it becomes too much of an applied research, that there is too great an influence in the practical field, that you are taking away from (a) the teaching and (b) the basic pure research and the extension of knowledge. I am not going to press the point as being a black and white one. I think it is a case of maintaining an adequate balance, but the argument here is that if you have got a research complex out of the university, and out of the industry itself, you perhaps have an atmosphere in which you can best maintain that balance. This is an argument that I heard advanced and, frankly, it was the kind of conclusion that I tended to come to myself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me remind the House, if I may, just briefly, of the role that is played by the Ontario research foundation itself at the moment. Last year when the leadership of the ORF came before the standing committee, we had an extremely useful morning, at least in my view, in terms of getting a picture of their overall function. It was interesting to note that they informed us that 50 per cent of the work of the Ontario research foundation is devoted to what really is not research at all. It is channeling existing information—which is readily available to anybody who happens to know where the information is—to those people involved in industry who require that particular information. In other words, if industry comes to the Ontario research foundation with a certain problem—they need a certain product, they do not know exactly how to come to grips with that problem—the Ontario research foundation without any particular research can channel to these people the information or the expertise that is required, and 50 per cent of their time is apparently in this field.

Sorry, maybe I am using that figure of 50 per cent a little inaccurately, it is 50 per cent of the smaller industries who come to the Ontario research foundation for assistance in this fashion—industry that does not have research itself and does not have a problem for continuing research but is looking for a bit of factual information to come to grips with the problem which they face. Secondly, there is a middle group of some 45 per cent of industry, the middle bracket of industry, that has not really become interested enough in research or does not feel that it is big enough or is not willing to devote enough money to research, which gets the Ontario research foundation to do the research for it. The research foundation function is to marry up the need of this particular industry with the available skills in existing universities, to bring the two groups together so that the problem will be coped with.

Finally, there is about five per cent of the industry in the province of Ontario—the large firms—which is doing its own research and which comes to the Ontario research foundation only when it has a special research job and it does not want to get off into this field. So it comes with an *ad hoc* proposal for the research foundation to tackle or to provide the necessary experts to tackle it, and they pursue their regular research fields as they had done in the past. Now, Mr. Chairman, out of this flows a closer working relationship between universities and industry, with the Ontario research foundation playing the role of the intermediary in bringing the parties together. And the provincial government has provided grants to the research foundation, which were distributed to achieve these various purposes in years gone by. Since they were directed to the universities, it is interesting to note in the sorting out process that has gone on in the government, that these grants are now going to be handled henceforth by the committee on university affairs.

I have spoken with people in universities about Sheridan Park and their attitude towards it. The thing that interested me, Mr. Chairman, was the extent to which I found the number of scientists in universities who really had only the vaguest sort of concept of what Sheridan Park was. In many instances, one had the impression that they had no more than heard about Sheridan Park. When one raised with them the question of the future relationship of this research complex at Sheridan Park with universities in the province of Ontario, particularly those that were close at hand, I found an intense interest.

The question sometimes was raised as to whether university people were excessively

loaded with research work, with consulting work. I found, for example, in talking, sometimes with people in the universities and quite frequently with people in Ontario research foundation, the worry as to whether we were not tending to distract the people in the universities from their real function of pure research and teaching. I must say that upon rather careful querying of people in the universities, I did not find this was regarded as a serious danger. Indeed most of the deans with whom I spoke were quite emphatic in stating that they were anxious to have more of their staff involved in research work, and in closer contact with universities. In fact they had the impression that the teaching process and research within the university would be enlivened and refreshed by greater contact rather than less contact with the university itself. Indeed, I think a very pertinent comment on this whole question of relationship was in an article carried by David Spurgeon in the *Globe and Mail* on July 12 of last year in which he was quoting from Dr. R. M. Dillon, dean of the University of Western Ontario's engineering school. Dr. Dillon had emphasized that:

> There is general acceptance among economists that innovation through technology is fundamental to economic growth.

I go back to a fundamental difference between myself and the hon. member for Grey North, who has apparently lost interest in this topic and gone home already.

Mr. Sopha: The leader of the NDP has been away a good deal this session. We do not know where he has been.

Mr. MacDonald: I quote again from Dr. Dillon:

> In other words, to the three classical factors of production—land, labour and capital—we now add technology and the only way in which a nation can establish and further its technology is through research and development.

Dr. Dillon points out that Canada has short-changed applied research and development in favour of basic research, and he claims that the time has come to redress the balance:

> We need to increase by a factor of two, or two-and-a-half, our effort in development as compared to basic and applied research if we are to achieve a balance of effort approximating that of other advanced nations, he said. It would require a tripling of research performed in industry to bring our level of industrial research up to that of the United Kingdom. This means that the ingrained attitude that the only respectable research is basic research must change, and university engineering schools must cooperate more with industry and government in furthering post-graduate education of applied scientists.

I continue, Mr. Chairman, from this article by David Spurgeon:

> Universities must accept the practical scientist into the academic community for his own sake, is Dr. Dillon's view. The engineer must not be required to emulate the pure scientist to gain academic acceptance, otherwise many a high calibre student will be lost from engineering and go into the more socially approved and glamorous honour science and mathematics courses.
>
> Dr. Dillon says there are a number of ways of bringing about such a change: exchange of key personnel, visiting professors in industry, industrial associates in the university, closer liaison in continuing and post-graduate education and joint use of specialized research facilities for advanced degrees. We need only compare our own efforts with those of other nations to come quickly to the conclusion that we will not achieve our objectives without planning and direction at higher levels.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are two points that emerge from that, one of which I want to emphasize, and one I will come back to later. The one point is that clearly, in the minds of people who are in universities, there is a great role for cross-fertilization, if you will, between the work of Sheridan Park and the universities, of people who are in the academic field, who may be on a part-time basis, involved in Sheridan Park research, and vice versa, people who are in Sheridan Park research who can play a role in the academic field.

Both fields are going to be strengthened and improved by this kind of interrelationship. I am wondering what action, if any, the government is planning in terms of trying to encourage this. Because I go back again, Mr. Chairman, if I may, with the Minister: If one studies the kind of thing that has happened in Boston or out in California, it is significant to note the extent to which research within the universities has resulted in the development of an industrial complex; and because the industrial complex was operating close to the university, in turn it tended to increase and encourage the development of research

in the university. I am wondering how our particular pattern in Ontario can be encouraged to develop as quickly as possible.

The Minister has so far played a role of providing the grounds, of encouraging industry to come in and to establish their research. As I recall his comment last year, we were within reaching distance of occupying most of the area which was originally envisaged in the Sheridan Park complex, and I understand that there is more available if it becomes necessary. But what is the government doing to make certain that the potential of this kind of development—the development of a pattern in Ontario for industrial research—will tie university and industry together for the fullest possible benefit to both? What is the government doing, Mr. Chairman? Is there any role in the Minister's view for the government to play here?

Ontario research foundation is moving out in May, as the Minister indicated, to become part of Sheridan Park. Conceivably it is the role of the Ontario research foundation to do this, but it would seem to me that if so, it is a role that has to be stepped up.

However, there is another aspect of this that I wanted to bring to the attention of the House and to ask the Minister where this fits into the evolving pattern. On January 9 of this year, the *Financial Times* carried a story with regard to grants to the University of Windsor to provide research to help small business. Let me read one or two paragraphs just to put the relevant detail on the record:

> The University of Windsor and the federal Department of Industry are co-operating in a pilot research venture to aid small Canadian business. Ottawa has granted $20,000 a year for three years to Windsor to set up an industrial research institute. The centre will tackle projects and problems brought to it by industry.
>
> It is meant primarily to help the 90 per cent of Canadian companies with sales under $1 million a year and less than 100 employees.
>
> The Windsor institute will concentrate on work for companies in that area, particularly small auto parts manufacturing, but if the experiment is successful The Department of Industry would like to set up similar centres attached to other universities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a lot of questions are raised by this development. Where does it fit in its relation to the Ontario research foundation? The function of the Ontario research foundation is to bring industry and the universities together. Now we have The Department of Industry at Ottawa introducing a pilot project that will have wider application if it seems to catch on, by giving grants that are admittedly small, some $20,000 a year for three years.

This means that all you can do is hire a man who is in effect going to play the role of bringing industry and the brains within the university together. But how does that fit in with the programme of the Ontario research foundation, because it is in fact a duplication of their programme?

Is it going to be complementary? Has the Minister given any consideration to it? Does he view it as the kind of development that perhaps will meet the needs at a greater distance from the Ontario research foundation, situated within the golden horseshoe area?

In other words, the kind of development that might be able to have its greatest potential in Windsor, or up in Laurentian, or up at the Lakehead, or conceivably as far away as Ottawa and Queen's which is some distance from the golden horseshoe and Sheridan Park and the research foundation.

It seems to me that you have duplicated the development. At least theoretically they are duplicating developments, and I am wondering whether any thought has been given at the Ministerial level for coordinating these so that they might make the most effective kind of contribution to the overall objective. Because the overall objective—and I come back to the basic point on which I was having a difference of opinion with the hon. member for Grey North—clearly indicates that we have got to step up research if we are going to have the kind of economic development in the province of Ontario and in the whole dominion of Canada that is required.

Indeed, the problem as far as the province of Ontario is concerned, is of special importance because as the Minister and my colleague from Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) said this afternoon, Ontario's role in the whole Canadian economy is such a large one, that obviously what we do here is going to benefit not only the province of Ontario, but the whole country.

Just to emphasize once again the importance of this, I was interested in noting the representations that were made by the engineering institute of Canada in a brief rather recently, early in February, to the science council in Ottawa. Their comment was:

> Taking the United States and Sweden as its models, the report indicates that Canada is falling behind both these countries in productivity and rate of growth. It lays the blame in great measure on technological weakness in the Canadian economy.

Last year, as I was discussing this, I made a number of quotations from an article that was published in the *Engineering Journal* of July, 1965, by J. H. Chapman of the defence research telecommunications establishment in Ottawa. He points out, for example, that Professor James Tobin, Sterling professor of economics at Yale, has stated that about one-fifth of the gross national product of the United States can be credited to advances in education. Perhaps even more important, 46 per cent of the growth in the GNP has been credited to two factors, education and the advance of knowledge. The contribution from capital was only 15 per cent.

When one pauses just for a moment, Mr. Chairman, to reflect on what a far cry that is from the classical image of industry being the product of the injection of capital and labour—to hear that one-fifth of the growth of the gross national product is from the advances in education and that 46 per cent of the growth has been credited to two factors, education and the advance of knowledge—one gets some picture of just how incredibly important is the advance of technology in the development of a modern economy.

Dr. Chapman also quoted from the British experience. In the United Kingdom, Lord Robbins, who conducted a study into higher education, has said, and I quote:

> In countries such as the Netherlands, Switzerland and Sweden, which owe much of their prosperity to skills and the wise use of limited resources, there is at least one special institution of this kind to about six or seven millions of population.

By "this kind" he was referring to MIT. In other words, that one such institution, which presumably now in our pattern is going to be Sheridan Park in its developed relationships with the universities, is required for approximately the population that we have in the province of Ontario, and ideally for a country that is now in the range of 20 million population, we should have two other comparable kinds of institutions in other parts of the country.

I have raised a number of questions there that I would like the Minister to comment on, with regard to his own thinking and the department's plans in terms of developing all this. But before I give the Minister an opportunity, I wanted to draw attention to another development that has been carried almost to its ultimate in other countries and in which we have had only a small beginning in this country. I was very interested to read a study that was prepared in August, 1965, by C. E. Symonds of the Ontario research foundation, on research associations for industry. Perhaps I can briefly set the background for the role of this kind of an association and its function within an economy by noting the development that is taking place in this connection in Great Britain.

He points out on page 14 of this study that the first British RA—research association—was established in 1918. By 1921 there were 22 RAs and this total remained more or less constant until 1942, after which the number rose steadily to the present total of 50. Throughout the years there has been an amalgamation of those having similar interests and others have terminated. Over the last 10 years, RAs have been formed at about the rate of one a year.

In 1963, the total proportion of British manufacturing, construction or producing industry served by RAs was estimated to be about 68 per cent on a gross turnover basis. The main fields not covered are clothing, fine and heavy chemicals, pharmaceuticals, drink, tobacco, and various branches of mechanical engineering. A large number of other industries are only partially or indirectly served by RAs, such as chemical engineering, electronics and carpet production. It is perceived by The Department of Scientific and Industrial Research that, with the exception of building, electronics and chemical engineering fields, there is little opportunity for the establishment of more RAs.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that interests me in that brief review, is that this development in the British economy was initiated after world war one and, as indicated in that quotation, has now reached a stage where it has practically achieved its greatest potential within the British economy. There are only two or three remaining fields where research associations might be built.

In Canada, our iron and steel industry, I am informed, has the benefit of research associations because of its ties with the United States and Britain. We have research associations in the pulp and paper field. But beyond that, there is very little, if any, and the question that I would like to raise in this whole field of research, is whether or not the Minister does not feel that there is a role for the government, not only in the development of Sheridan Park and its ties with universities,

but to give some leadership and some incentive to this self-help, within groups of industries themselves.

I recognize that ideally this kind of thing should be initiated from the national level. Conceivably, if the government sees its way clear to taking some action in this direction, in the first instance it might move to try to have the federal government cooperate with it and perhaps take the lead, because you cannot separate Ontario out from the rest of the national manufacturing and industrial picture. On the other hand, if you cannot get Ottawa to move, it would seem to me that since we have over half of the manufacturing of this country concentrated in the province of Ontario, there is still a role for initiating research associations here. Inevitably, since they are voluntary associations among groups of industry, they will extend to encompass other parts of the country.

In other words, here is a role where—if I may come back to my friend from Grey North; his point is valid—industry should have been doing something itself. But it has not done the job. Not only are industries suffering the consequences, but the whole of Canada, the whole of Ontario, and all of the Canadian and Ontario people are suffering the consequences because of the vital importance of technological advance in the expansion of modern economy.

In conclusion I would invite the Minister's observations as to what pattern he envisages for Sheridan Park in the future and whether there is not a role for the government in inspiring the development of that pattern, as well as in the field of research associations.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I have difficulty disagreeing with the hon. member for York South, because much of what he has said is the reason why we have put the emphasis on Sheridan Park and the reason why we will put more emphasis on it in the future. I think the facts that he outlined are a good reason why we should put a great deal more effort into our satellite community.

I had some figures gathered for me as to the amount of research and development compared to the percentage of our gross national product—1961 is the latest figure that I have here—and they show that the United States spends 2.8 per cent less 1.15 per cent on defence; the United Kingdom, 2.4 per cent less 1.5 per cent on defence; Sweden, 1.7 per cent; France, 1.7; the Netherlands, 1.4; Switzerland, 1.4; West Germany, 1.3; Japan, 1.3; Canada, .85 less .56 on defence. Most of the defence work is being done, I believe, by the national research council in Ottawa, with some of the Crown corporations involved in that area.

I do not think that we disagree on putting a lot more effort into bringing Sheridan Park into being and getting more research done here. If we do not do that, I cannot help but see that the future of manufacturing in this country is going to become more and more on the basis of being an importer and assembler instead of a manufacturer. Having been in a business where I was involved with my own Canadian operation with no United States research to assist me in getting my products developed, I perhaps can understand the difficulties of a lone Canadian manufacturer, particularly the smaller type, more so than anybody else. The percentages spent on research certainly indicate that we have not gone far enough and that a lot more pressure has to be put on. We think that is what we can do.

I will try and answer, if I can, with a couple of statements that I have prepared, because I was aware of the fact that some of the hon. members are interested in how closely we are working with the universities, and what Sheridan Park is going to do in the future. I simply say to you that there are 1,300 scientists and technicians working out there now. I do not know whether any of you have been out there or not, but I would say that the majority of those people have been out of the university for three, four or five years and have found jobs here, and there will be a lot more we expect—perhaps 6,000—by 1970 when the park is finished.

The major objective of the Ontario research foundation is to contribute to the development of the province, providing a research and development staff and facility for the use and benefit of industry and government within the province. As a corollary to this, the foundation is interested in bringing about increasing industrial participation in research and development.

The universities have an important role in industrial research as consultants and as highly skilled specialists. Indeed, the foundation has on many occasions subcontracted industrial research work to the universities when certain highly specialized skills were required, and has referred industrial companies to appropriate university staff members.

With its connections in the universities and in industry, the foundation has a continuing

role to play in bringing these two bodies together when and where it would be mutually advantageous, so I think you will see that we agree with you that there should be more collaboration between the universities and Sheridan Park and certainly this is the direction toward which we are working. I have a lengthier statement here which I am not going to read, with reference to the Sheridan Park research community and the universities.

Now, we believe that Sheridan Park can become almost a teaching area for the universities if they want to take their students in there and visit the various opportunities that present themselves as we complete Sheridan Park. I do not know how many visitors they have out there in the course of a month but I have been on three or four myself during the last year. We are getting requests from high schools as to whether students can be taken out to Sheridan Park now, and the answer is that we are trying to provide for it so that when the Ontario research foundation is there, students can go as often as they like. Sometimes it is not convenient for them to go into British American Oil or somebody else and upset their operations. However, we have found that they have been very interested in visitors and I think this year, 1967, when we are going to have so many people from overseas, our satellite city certainly is going to be viewed by a good many people.

You asked about the situation in Windsor. I am not too familiar with it, but I am advised that there have been discussions with the industrial research institute of Windsor and our people. We have offered our services to help them get started if that is the place for another research centre down there. Whether it will take away from Ontario research foundation remains to be seen. I do not think so. I do not think that it is going to grow that fast. We know how long it has taken to put the centre together in Sheridan Park. The amount of money you mentioned certainly is not very much. We would like to have some of that money from Mr. Drury's department but we have not been able to get it. We operate, of course, independently of Ottawa and the national research council, although there is certainly close liaison with them because our former president, Dr. Tupper, is now up in the national research council.

Mr. Sopha: You have lost the member for Kent West (Mr. McKeough).

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have? He will be back!

We are watching the development of this research institute in Windsor very closely and if we can assist them, we are quite prepared to do it. I do not think that we are going to worry about losing the $20,000. We can use all the money we can get, but we are not doing too badly at Sheridan Park.

Some of the figures here show that 63 per cent of our income comes from industry—and that is small industry primarily that does not have a research department of its own—and it pays all the overhead. It is not subsidized by the taxpayer—and I want to make that clear to my friend, the hon. member for Grey North. Any work that we do for industry is paid for by them. This is the way the foundation is set up.

Mr. Sargent: You are saying everything you said last year—the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Maybe I will sit down and we will pass the vote.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I was just reminded that the hon. member asked the same question—does he want a different answer?

I also point out that at Sheridan Park we are increasing the balance in favour of applied research out there. We are not doing pure research; we believe that has to go somewhere else. We believe that our interest out there is the development of more of the applied research techniques because this is where we are going to get the immediate results. Pure research can be done, I suppose, in the universities better than anywhere else, and we are cooperating with the universities on this, in spite of the fact that we have taken one or two things out of the research foundation even last year and put them on to the universities.

I might say that this is also the reason why the university grants were taken out of vote 401—I believe it was last year—and given to the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), because he supervises the institutes where this work has now gone.

The role of the research foundation? I have a report in my hand here which has not been discussed with my colleagues in Cabinet yet. It has been prepared for me because when we decided we were going to complete the satellite city and have a new function and a new building and a new physical asset out there that we want to put

into operation, we asked: "What are we going to do with it in the future? What contribution is it going to make?" These are the same questions that you have asked, and I might just read the table of contents. It gives us the information that we want with reference to what we are going to do in research:

1. The aims and objectives—relations with industrial companies, Ontario companies, non-Ontario Canadian companies, foreign companies and foreign government agencies;

2. The confidential nature of industrial contract research;

3. Methods of charging industrial clients;

4. Relations with the federal government;

5. Financing of building and scientific equipment needs;

6. Trends and source of income—percentage of research supported by investment income against earned income;

7. Support of industrial research by provincial governments;

8. The importance of industrial research —the research needs of industry;

9. ORF activities—its usefulness to industry;

10. Major factors governing effective performance;

11. Financing the basic facility for contract research.

And so on, and so on.

I think when we get through with this report the questions in your mind, as well as ours, will be answered and I think we can work more closely with the governors or the directors of the Ontario research foundation to make sure that we are doing the things that we can do best at the Ontario research foundation in Sheridan Park. Certainly it is our intention to utilize the facilities at the universities and the manpower and brainpower that is still there, but I think you would readily agree that Sheridan Park must be completed as soon as possible. I think as we are proceeding now we have about 85 acres to sell on the west end of Sheridan Park. We are about to put in the services, I hope, in the next month or two, and when we do I am quite sure that Sheridan Park will be finished before 1970. That is my objective at least. Now I do not know whether I have answered all your questions. If I have not I will be glad to give you any other information you want.

Mr. MacDonald: What about the research association?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sheridan Park research?

Mr. MacDonald: No, the research associations.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I just received a note here. This activity has never been taken up by industry in Canada.

Mr. MacDonald: That is my point.

Hon. Mr. Randall: ORF has tried to establish research associations in the canning industry, the foundry industry, but they failed because of lack of industry support. Establishment of research associations is essentially a federal government activity on a national basis. Now we have done some work for foundries here and we found, after spending quite a bit of money, that the foundries were no more interested in the research and what we were doing for them than what they were doing for themselves. But at the moment that activity has not been concluded.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, may I just make two or three brief comments? I appreciate the Minister's observations, but I am puzzled as to why research associations have not developed in Canada at all. I am not going to go back and read that brief excerpt from Dr. Symonds' report on research associations in Britain, which indicates that today it has, in effect, occupied most of the field that can be occupied.

All we have is steel and pulp and paper, and nothing else in Canada where there has been initiative taken on a cooperative basis among those industries that do have common research problems. I wonder—maybe I am completely off-base on this—but is it possible that the competitive spirit among industry in the North American continent is such that they cannot come together on a cooperative basis for research purposes? Is it possible that in a more mature economy in Great Britain—this began I remind you after the first world war—they begin to recognize that maybe they have more problems in common than they have in their "dog eat dog" competition? All I am saying is—and this takes me back to agreeing with the basic objection of my hon. friend from Grey North—to the extent that industry has not accepted its responsibility for research. It seems to me that we should do a little research as to why this has not taken place.

It occurs to me, sir, that we may discover that ways and means might be adopted to

encourage industry to play much more of a self-help role on a cooperative basis among those who do share common problems. To the extent that that is done you are going to meet the overall, the broad objective, that we have in mind. I acknowledge with the Minister that this is a national responsibility, but I repeat, that since the province of Ontario has some 52 per cent of the manufacturing right here, it seems to me that if Ottawa will not assume that responsibility, at least it is a field worth our exploring because to the extent that we can get industry to do the job itself on a cooperative basis in the research association, to that extent we do not need to move in and do it some other way.

Now, just two brief observations on other points that I raised and the Minister has covered. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if it would not be useful for the Minister, with his well developed capacities for promoting extravaganzas, to promote some sort of an extravaganza to bring those in the university who have a potential interest in Sheridan Park, to visit the place, to go through a short course or a short introduction to the whole potential of Sheridan Park.

I repeat two things that I said earlier.

One, I was intrigued to discover the number of people who were scientists and who theoretically could not fit in to Sheridan Park in our universities—and I will not bother even naming the universities so that the finger can be pointed in their direction—who had only the vaguest notion of what Sheridan Park was and the role that it might play. In other words, you might speed up this whole development to an incredible degree if some effort were made to bring the two parties together in a great conference of the kind that the Minister is so capable of organizing.

Second, with regard to the research institute in Windsor, I am delighted to hear the Minister say that the attitude of the Ontario research foundation is one to assist them in whatever way it may be done; that you do not regard it as a competing organization, even though you are both in the same field. This is a big province and there is a lot of work to be done. Often if the organization happens to be a local institute, the very fact that it is a local body might arouse an interest now, rather than five years from now, in industry and get them involved in the research process.

It is a development on essentially the same principle as having technological institutes and universities all over the province which automatically develops a greater interest in education and the development of technology because it is closer to home. People do not have to go away to Toronto or some distant place. There are far flung parts of this province close to universities—I think of Laurentian, the Lakehead, Ottawa and Windsor as the four best examples—where if this pattern becomes a feasible, a viable one, the developments of such institutes may assist speeding up the process of research in those areas of the province. Many of them, incidentally, are areas which desperately need development of secondary industry, and where conceivably a closer working relationship with the university will result in the development of technologies which will assist in the diversification of industry in the area. It is all a pilot project but I think it is a worthy one, and certainly helps to develop the broader field that, at least on this, the Minister and I agree is of vital importance.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I just say before we close that I appreciate the fact that you say I can put on a conference. I certainly intend to do that, but we could not take too many people out to Sheridan Park before the services were in and the roads were down and our own Ontario research foundation was open—which we expect it will be. We will be moving in in May of this year.

We are already showing a 15- or 20-minute coloured film to universities and schools—it has been on television on a number of occasions across Ontario—on Sheridan Park as it has been going up. I am quite sure that, as soon as we get Ontario research foundation moved out there, this will be one of the things we can do. We can organize a conference. That is what we hope to do. That is the reason why we are going to put up the high tower building, so we will have conference facilities once Sheridan Park is finished, so we can have this type of conference in Sheridan Park without necessarily having to go to New York, Chicago or somewhere else.

The second point is that I feel that when Sheridan Park is finished we should look elsewhere in the province of Ontario to spread our research facilities around. It does not all have to be in Sheridan Park. When we complete that satellite I would like to see another satellite in eastern Ontario or northern Ontario—some other part of the province—and this will be the objective if we make a success of Sheridan Park, and I think it will encourage development.

Mr. MacDonald: You might even put one in Owen Sound.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right, we would be glad to put one up in Owen Sound.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, listening to the dialogue between my friend from York South and the Minister, there is a danger that a misleading impression be left by the unwary that the government plays the role of being one of the chief promoters of research in this province when such is very far from the truth.

I do not profess to be an expert in this area, but I will want to say at the outset that I have more than a lurking suspicion that the development at Sheridan Park is parading under a misnomer. It proclaims itself to be engaged in research, but probably what goes on there, as I understand it, from the smattering of knowledge about the activity, it is nothing more dramatic than a centre for the improvement of technology. It is not engaged in anything worthy of the name of research at all. Of course, government is a very late infant in the field of research, and particularly this government.

Speaking historically, probably the greatest impetus to the improvement of our technology in almost all fields which are of concern to us in our daily living, emanated from the two great wars of this century, when necessity, in a very real sense, was the mother of invention.

Now singling out just one very important economic activity in this province about which I can speak with some knowledge, is the base metal industry. In that field, I say to my friend from York South, and I hope he will forgive me, I can say something nice about INCO.

Mr. MacDonald: I notice they call you INCO's MPP.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, a few years ago my friend used to designate me. I used to have the appellation before the Attorney General arrived in the House. I used to be called by him INCO's public relations officer here, and INCO would not thank him for that if they were aware that he said it.

The fact is that in the field of nickel mining when Murray came along in 1883 and discovered the ore and identified it at the place that is commemorated by a plaque, from that time down to the 20's when the company that was to be known as the International Nickel Company came into the area, the huge deposit of base metals rested in the ground there and was of little economic value until that company, through its researches in the field of the natural sciences, found some uses for it.

The story of nickel, of course, has been the story of finding and of devising products into which to put it. And then faced with a tremendous ore body, as they are, a truly colossal deposit of the stuff; the encouraging thing about it so far as I am able to say—it leads one to be sanguine—every year INCO ends up with more ore reserves than they had in the preceding year. They find more. This ore body has been likened to something like the conning tower on a submarine, with the conning tower part being the Frood open pit and the Clarabelle open pit. Underneath at some depth it bellies out, and really the amount of ore there, I am happy to relate tonight, is probably unknown.

So, being faced with a tremendous deposit, they face the challenge of increasing production and increasing production has been correlated with finding new uses. So that company has demonstrated remarkable ingenunity in persuading manufacturers, such as in the motor car industry, which is probably the biggest single purchaser, to use the nickel ore in ever-increasing number of appurtenances that go on to manufactured motor cars. Really the people at INCO, when you talk about government's intervention into the field of research, they would smile behind their glass of beer, because this is—

An hon. member: Scotch!

Mr. Sopha: All right, scotch!

Yes, at INCO they drink *ne plus ultra,* I suspect. Really this been the warp and woof of their existence.

And the pity of it is, of course, in respect of them, that they have had these tremendous research projects at Huntington, West Virginia, where they employ—yes it is certainly in the several hundreds and thousands of people engaged in basic research, and the promotion of new uses, such as the nickel-cadmium battery that they proclaimed in recent years, which is going to make a difference in the conquest of outer space.

Probably INCO was persuaded into something of a Canadian spirit to participate in the Sheridan Park project and I recall taking this question up with officials of INCO shortly after I was elected. I often wondered aloud to them why they did not have their research projects in the Sudbury basin. The reply was that the research scientists had now gone white-collar as part of what the

Linnes would call the middle upper or the upper middle. He and his wife feel themselves part of the progressive dynamic community and they like to go to O'Keefe Centre, they do not want to be too far away from it. They like the urban living and they like to be near a big university, especially the big university and the fellowship of people of the same interests and the library, of course, the collection of literature that a big university offers. So it is quite impossible to visualize this as an adjunct to a mining town, such as the Sudbury basin. One quite understands that. But INCO's participation of course, let it be said, whereas it is welcome in the Sheridan Park project, is not very big. It is not a very imposing, a very impressive contribution. Their research in the exploitation of that ore body will remain probably at Huntington, West Virginia, where it is located.

Now Falconbridge, of course, if I may say a word for them, were engaged in this business of research long before the government came along. I do not know that they even participate in the Sheridan Park development, although I stand to be corrected, because they have quite an impressive research laboratory up on Yonge Street, up towards Richmond Hill. That leads me to say of course, to my friend from York South, who is wondering about the cooperative associations in research, that one of the reasons that they have not developed in the base metal industry is because of their fiercely competitive nature. These companies have just not got together, Falconbridge and INCO. I will not offend anybody by saying it. They are like Eaton's and Simpson's. Neither tells the other. They have not got that cosiness, if you will permit the allusion, they have not got the cosiness of the chartered banks, you know, where competition has virtually disappeared. Twenty-five years ago my father told me you would never see two bankers having lunch together, but nowadays they are like brothers and they are discussing everybody's business. There is nothing secret from all the chartered banks. Once you owe $10 to one of them, all the rest of them know about it right away. But the base metal companies are not like that. Business is fiercely competitive and INCO has secured its markets and is not going to lose any of them to Falconbridge and vice versa. So perhaps that is the explanation.

I, as a Canadian, and I am fiercely Walter Gordon Canadian—and the important thing is that those of us who support Walter Gordon do not run and hang our heads in shame and fail to hold our chin up and look the critics in the eye—I would not be averse, let me say here, as a member representing some 80,000 people, I would not be averse to a little government stimulus about this research business. We require it when it is involved in the exploitation of our natural resources that belong to our people. They do not really belong to Wall Street, they belong to Canada and Canadians, but I would be willing in modern democracy to go pretty far about government encouragement with always the sword behind—you know, the government has the sword behind to assist that encouragement—to require these companies to be Canadian, first and foremost. If we can create some jobs here—I state as a general principle in this field or anywhere else—that if we can create some jobs here for what is hoped to be a greatly increased population then we should not hesitate to use the power of the state, or its influence. Its influence first and then its power a little later on to compel the exploitation of our natural resources to be as Canadian as possible. And you, of course, down in Prince Edward-Lennox, Mr. Chairman, the very heartland of united empire loyalist Canadianism, you would agree with that most readily.

I wanted to make those points. Now I want to turn to another matter, and that is this business of our participation in what is called the Canadian universal and international exhibition of 1967, that is Expo. And I will want to start by—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, are we finished with this No. 6?

Mr. Sopha: I did not know we were putting them in slots.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, we went down to No. 6. If the member wants to go ahead on No. 8 it is okay with me, I just wondered if we were all finished with the Ontario research foundation.

Mr. Sopha: Now, if I may proceed. I want to first express my dismay that there has not been any invitation proffered to the members of this House—so far as I am aware but perhaps I have not opened my mail—for us or any group of us, or what is more important, all of us, to attend at any formal opening of that tremendous pavilion that this province is going to have at the exhibition centre in Montreal. It cannot fail but to evoke a little sense of humour.

You know, you have to keep your sense of humour around here or people will think you have lost your marbles. But it titillates—that is a good word, Mr. Chairman—titillates one's sense of humour to remember that when they had a mockup of the pavilion, a plaster of paris thing, they had a big strawberry festival and a toffee pull at one of the leading hotels up here and they invited everybody for the beer and bagels and the skittles, to have a look at the model.

Now that they have the thing built down on that island, that man-made island down the St. Lawrence River, you have not heard a murmur from them that anybody is going to be invited down there at the official opening. I truly believe that all the big wheels in that department will be there. There is no question about it, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) is never anywhere without the member for London South (Mr. White). He is hard on his heels like the hounds were in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* after the fugitive slaves—he will be there.

I saw him recently opening a golf course on the St. Lawrence seaway, there is a big picture of him. They will all be there, and the most we have heard about the place is that the better heeled of the members who have the privilege of renting some apartment for $35 a day, is it—that is too rich for my blood, I will be staying at the YMCA or the Salvation Army myself—but those who can afford it will be there and they are welcome to that.

The other thing about it is—and I hope this whole project does not run into the rapidly soaring cost the way the Centennial museum did—the other thing is that I want to take the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of expressing my sorrow and regret that in the selection of the hostesses at this pavilion, Laurentian University in Sudbury only managed to get one. The people of Sudbury, 40 to 50 per cent French Canadian as they are, are mindful that this exhibition is being held in Montreal, in the sister province, and one would think that because of its location that there are likely to be a good many people come to the Ontario pavilion who speak French.

That is a possibility that has not occurred to this department, of course, but that possibility stares us in the face. One would have thought, without being considered too narrowly selfish, that in looking for their hostesses, they would have sought them first and foremost in the bilingual universities of the province, they would have gone first to Ottawa and to Laurentian. But we discover that one of the reasons that only one girl was selected was that they went to Laurentian last.

So I say to the member for York South when he mentions Laurentian to this Minister, he is telling him about a place he has not even discovered. He has not the faintest idea where it is or what its nature is.

They were going to select 48 girls, and presumably they had 47 selected by the time they got to Laurentian. They had room for one more. They interviewed some 50 and chose one girl. I am not sure whether she speaks French, but she is a very bright and very well thought of in Sudbury. She is of Slavic extraction, which of course is typical of another very large group in our community, and we were delighted that she was chosen.

But let us look at the qualifications that were required. Seven points: An Ontario resident, education grade 13 minimum, age preferably 20-26, languages—note this—an asset but not a requirement. Now, apparently you did not have to speak any language at all—

Mr. Singer: It is helpful if you do.

Mr. Sopha: It is helpful if you do, but you do not have to speak any. It is an asset but not a requirement. Personality, experience either working or traveling, appearance and enthusiasm. Well, all of those students from Laurentian University could come through with flying colours.

Now, having said that and expressed the sorrow of the television station in Sudbury, if nobody else—the television station which normally supports this government—and made a big thing out the fact that only one from Laurentian was selected—I want to turn to a matter that is quite delicate. I have to be careful the way I put this or it will offend the sensitivities of a good many. But I want to stand on my own responsibility and say that I was surprised when I learned that one of the chief supervising personnel of those hostesses was a young lady who only recently arrived from the United Kingdom.

I do not want to discriminate against her, but I would have thought that one of the essential requirements of any person who is to have any contact with the visitors to Canada, and indeed, from the other provinces of Canada, it would have been a basic requirement that the person holding a position of responsibility would be the son or daughter of a long-time resident, if not native of the province of Ontario.

I say that for this reason, that one can infer that knowledge of this province—and

after all, is that not the basic requirement of anyone in a supervisory position—is most likely to reside in a person who has his or her roots here.

It would have been quite a nice thing, for example, if the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) or of public welfare, the great defender and promoter of the so-called ethnic groups—an adjective that I detest—had been commissioned to find some young lady of Slavic or east European extraction who was born in this country and who was perhaps the daughter of some family that fled the terrors of Europe at an early time, and we promoted such a person as that.

But no, that does not happen. As a Canadian, as a resident of this province, it really takes my breath away to see how rapidly those who lately got off the boat in Montreal from over there, how rapidly they progress with this government in this country. Of course they have the superb advantage of coming from a land of common cultural background, a parliamentary system and the common law.

But I would prefer that before they get ahead quite so rapidly that they are here at least as long as the Minister of Health, who you will remember, that in the boat on which he came across, he passed R. B. Bennett going the other way.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Very proud of it, too. Too bad you did not take more time to study him.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, R. B. Bennett who thought so little of his Canadianism that he gave it up and moved over there. Well, we got the Minister of Health in return and we were the better off.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I felt that should be said and I take the opportunity to express my regret to this Minister. I say it in the light of what happened to the people at Laurentian University who only managed to get one person into this apparently very prestige laden atmosphere of representing this province at that pavilion, at that great exposition which I have no doubt in my own mind is going to be one of the significant events of the 20th century. Our children who visit there, if they are of an age of understanding, will remember it all their lives.

Now, the other thing I want to say is to turn to the McNamaras and I do so without hesitation. The Prime Minister got up in great dudgeon yesterday about the $100 plate dinner—

Mr. Chairman: This has nothing to do with the vote under discussion.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, Expo!

He got up in great dudgeon about the $100 plate dinner and my friend from Woodbine very aptly said, and I do not know whether *Hansard* caught it, that there were few of the poor there at that dinner, where they paid $20 a plate for the food. It must certainly have been pheasant under glass or Alaska king crab, one claw—

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): I hope *Hansard* gets what you say tonight when you refer to the—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I am sure. Well, that was the one aspect of it and the other was about the hockey game, where he dropped the puck.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: What has this to do with the vote?

Mr. Sopha: I think the record discloses that the Leafs lost that night. There may be some connection.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Let us get back to the vote.

Mr. Sopha: But the Prime Minister of course, nowhere in his remarks—and I wish he were here—nowhere in his remarks did he deny that Paul McNamara is a personal friend of his.

Several hon. members: Why should he?

Mr. Sopha: Why should he? Then we are entitled to say over here and repeat—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Now I will stand here until 12 o'clock to finish what I have to say about this contract at Expo for this restaurant and of course—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes. And of course I am prepared to say and to repeat that the granting of the contract to Paul McNamara was nothing short of a brazen act of political patronage. So it was, and one looked with interest at the explanations given in the press by these two other companies that had been invited. One would like to hear who they are and why they were invited. One needs only

look at their explanation to see that the whole thing was camouflaged and the intent from the outset was to select McNamara and put him on the gravy train. There is no doubt about it. People I talked to in the trade say that it is a wonderful bonanza, almost like winning the Irish sweepstakes, for the government to pick up the tab for the expenses, what they call in the carnival trade, "the nut". The government is picking up the nut and McNamara, for the promotion of business, he takes home six per cent of the gross; and people downtown, in and about this city, have been trying to calculate ever since those startling figures were published, just how much the gross is going to be. You hear estimates from $40,000 a day to up to $100,000 a day in the five restaurants. We are going to have a restaurant for every taste, apparently from hamburgers right through to pheasant under glass, as much as the pocket book can afford, five restaurants and two bars.

Mr. Sargent: What about the building trade?

Mr. Sopha: And McNamara is assuming none of the risk, be it noted, at all. That is going to be assumed by the Minister for operating this, according to that, with the taxpayers' money, let it be added, and under the terms of that pseudo-elaborate contract. It gave the impression of being elaborate but to the ears of a lawyer the contract that he read yesterday, the terms and conditions were fundamentally simple and it played like music on a lawyer's ear. One could read between the lines the cadences of his voice as he read them, that fundamentally it is a contract whereby this department of government assumes all the risks and pays all the money and McNamara for this, this great friend of the Tory party, is going to be granted by the people of Ontario six per cent of the gross.

Now to put it in its proper light—

Mr. W. B. Lewis: What did the other two companies say that were offered—

Mr. Sopha: —the people of Ontario who are conferring this benefit, when they buy one of those bottles of wine which the paper says is going to be sold at three times its price in the liquor store, one of those bottles of Ontario wine, they will at least have the comfort with whatever sense of euphoria the wine creates, of knowing that with their money they are paying a henchman of the Tory party, by the name of Paul McNamara.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, excuse me for the interruption, I was rather embarrassed by what the Minister said about this member on the floor the other day, but after listening to him tonight, I think the Minister was right.

Mr. Sopha: Well, however that may be, we will just disregard that.

Mr. Sargent: Another Talisman deal!

Mr. Sopha: In the last few years of course, in very many ways the McNamaras keep turning up in the affairs of this province, and its public life. Especially they keep turning up, I say to my colleagiues here, be it noted, they keep turning up whenever there is something good to be had. Whenever the gravy train goes by and toots its whistle you will find McNamara is ready. And let it not be said they are good businessmen.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Walker: Let us get back to the vote.

Mr. Sopha: Yes this hurts to be reminded of these truths.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I hope you make this statement outside the House about the McNamaras—

Mr. Sopha: I am making the statements here where I am entitled to make them.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Make those remarks outside the House.

Mr. Sopha: What kind of a fool is that, that he would say to another member that I make them outside the House?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not a fool. Make them outside the House.

Mr. Sopha: I make them here.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You are making accusations—

Mr. Sopha: I make them here where I—

Mr. Chairman: Stay on the subject, please.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has asked my colleague to make these statements outside the House. In what area of business would any businessman make these kind of deals they have made with public money?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister without Portfolio): That is no point of order.

Mr. Chairman: That is no point of order.

Mr. Sargent: It is all right to me.

Mr. Sopha: Of course nobody in this province is foolish enough, or as foolish as the Prime Minister and the Minister of Economics and Development appear to think they are, or so imbued with naïvete that they do not see the significance to the Tory party of the part played by McNamara in the promotion of the $100 a plate dinner.

Mr. MacDonald: You mean that they are a modern Franciscini?

Mr. Sopha: —and from that point of view—

Mr. MacDonald: Is he a modern Franciscini?

Mr. Sopha: I do not know who Franciscini is.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh he was a millionaire for the Liberal Party—

Mr. Sopha: I do not know. I never knew. No use going back into ancient history if—

Mr. MacDonald: You have to go back into ancient history if you want to examine the Liberals in government.

Mr. Sopha: I do not know anything about—what did he say his name was?

An hon. member: I did not catch it. I could not catch it.

Mr. Sopha: I will not be diverted into that.

You see how patent it is; the government, 24 years in office, and this fellow promotes a dinner at the Ports of Call and then they have the effrontery—these two here, the Prime Minister and the Minister—to say to them, "All right, we think we can get away with it; we will give you a fat and lucrative contract for the provision of catering services at Expo." Nobody in this province is going to be fooled by that.

Mr. MacDonald: He is trying to duplicate the Pearson-Diefenbaker vendetta in Ottawa—

Mr. Sopha: Not at all. These are things—listen, let me say—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sopha: Let me say that if I tried to do that, all I had to do was to sit in this House for eight years and study at your knee—that is all I had to do, study at your knee! Then, of course, the next thing that happened in respect of the McNamaras was the purchase of that building—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Well, he is defending them tonight—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: He will be their biggest ally in the next election, and we tried to find out in this House just what the nature of the deal with the McNamaras was in the purchase of the building on St. Clair avenue, and we were never favoured with that information.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, it cuts them to the raw to hear these things!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: What is bothering you?

Some hon. members: You!

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Your remarks are mere speculation. If one of the McNamaras were here tonight and you saw him, no one could catch you. You would be going from here to Sudbury so fast—

Mr. Sopha: What kind of an inane comment is that? What an asinine comment. I hope that *Hansard* did not do the Minister of Mines the disservice of picking that up. How asinine!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I am going to be in Fort William tomorrow night and I am going to say a word or two about the Minister of Mines in the public area of his responsibility. I am going to say it out of the House and I hope that he is there to hear me. I am going to read that telegram sent from his own area, in case some of the people there have not heard it.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Please get back on the vote.

Mr. Sopha: I will get back to the vote, but it is a lot of fun being away from it, because those birds over there do not faze me at all, not at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I am not lacking in courage—never make that mistake! These things ought

to be put on the record for the public to examine them, and the final thing of significance, of course, is—

Mr. MacDonald: He has no real differences so he has to manufacture this!

Mr. Sopha: Here is the real thing of significance: It is an election year and in a few weeks time we are going to be surfeited in the same way that we were in 1963, with a deluge of advertising on the television and in the newspapers, and here is where the money is going to be raised—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: That has nothing whatever to do with this vote!

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes it has to do with the vote.

Mr. Chairman: You will have ample opportunity on other occasions—

Mr. Sopha: I may go down into your riding and tell the people down there about this.

Mr. Singer: $1,038,000 for advertising!

Mr. Sopha: Yes, for advertising—advertising the Tory party. And one anticipates, of course, that in all this money that is needed for the election campaign of the stupendous size that we will see, McNamara—and I have no doubt about it at all—will be one of the chief bagmen of the Tory party.

An hon. member: No doubt.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I think that the examination of this estimate is quite in order, but I do not think that the McNamaras need to be on trial in this House. I think this is entirely irrelevant. I think you should obtain a little order, Mr. Chairman, if you would.

Mr. Chairman: Order! A little order—

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what vote the bagman comes under?

Mr. Singer: That is what we are trying to find out.

Mr. Sopha: I will inform the member for Humber that what we are talking about is the brazen act of this Minister in granting this contract for catering at Expo to one of the chief friends of the Tory party, and for thinking that we are so naïve as not to have seen it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise on a point of order. Those statements with respect to the catering and everything else are probably in order, but the matter relating to the McNamara building, the matter relating to the McNamara bagmen, and so on, are quite out of order and I think that you should so rule. They have nothing to do with this vote whatsoever.

Mr. Sopha: I will not refer to the building again.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Stick to the estimates!

Mr. Sopha: I would have thought—to put it in its proper light, Mr. Chairman—that there would have been any number of companies in Ontario engaged in this business of running restaurants, people such as Shopsowitz, to name one, or any of the major hotels, who would have thought that the prestige of being associated with one of the important exhibits at Expo would have been sufficient to attract them to put forward a bid to the Minister, if they had been given the opportunity.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the member a question? He mentioned Shopsowitz—are they not connected with Canterbury Foods who refused the contract?

Mr. Sopha: I do not know.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Well, I will tell you they are! They refused it.

Mr. Sopha: I just picked that name out of the air. I looked at the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) and I picked that name out of the air! You could mention any number of people in the province, but the Minister, as far as we are informed by him, did not give them the opportunity to be involved in this important project at Expo.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed. My friend, the member for Grey North, caps it off. The whole intent and purpose of the whole exercise by the Minister—and I have no doubt with the knowledge and full agreement of the Prime Minister of the province—was to select one of the family, to keep it in the family, and to accord to him the unparalleled prestige and honour of representing Ontario and its ability to purvey food to the visitors to that pavilion. Ineed, sir, let it be noted, at no

sacrifice to himself, none at all. Not only no sacrifice, but at summer's end when the leaves fall and Expo is starting to fold up, McNamara will be counting the cash and he will need shovels, no doubt, to put it in the bags in the Brinks truck—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): The barrels—

Mr. Sopha: —in the barrels to bring it back. Let me say to that galaxy over there, that galaxy of mediocrity, that we will take this out on the hustings and I will not have the slightest hesitation in Sudbury in the next election campaign, or in any place else where I speak—and I will say it in Nipigon in a few night's time—I will not have any hesitation at all to say, "After 24 years, that is what you get; that is how bold they are, how brazen, how contemptible they are of the public interest that they embrace one of the family, a friend of the party and say, 'Here unto you is given at the expense of the Ontario taxpayer—here unto you is given the gift—' "

Mr. Sargent: A blank cheque!

Mr Sopha: Yes, that is not too inept—a blank cheque will be given by this Minister. I know that I have to suffer considerable personal abuse about it from the Minister because it got to his gargle; I got him by the gargle with it and he discovered that he had been caught out. He thought that everybody in the province was as dumb as he is, and could not see that we would be able to smell this thing out.

I was gratified, let me say to my colleagues, to get the copy of the letter this morning from the president of local 6500, which supports you. The president wrote me a very comforting letter. He disclosed to me what he thought of the Minister in the whole thing. And as a result of this whole thing, I like to think—maybe it is wishful thinking, you never know what happens when you go to the ballot box—that in the whole business they exposed their Achilles' heel, for the people of Ontario to judge them for it.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, we are talking on this same vote, 401, and—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would like to reply to my hon. friend from Sudbury.

Mr. Sargent: I would be glad to sit down.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Thank you very much.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Charlatan and Mountebank?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right, that means a quack and a purveyor of quack medicines, and all I would like to say is that if I have been a quack most of my life, I have been pretty successful, both in business and politics. I hope the hon. member for Sudbury—

Mr. Sargent: The Minister should make apologies to my colleague for what he said.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have not apologized for anything. I am so sorry for the hon. member for Sudbury that tears are running down all four cheeks, I feel so badly. And you know, when he gets on his feet—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): That quack medicine the Minister is talking about is having a bad effect on him.

Hon. Mr. Randall: —when he gets on his feet for the first five minutes he is really funny, I thoroughly enjoy him and I think the House does. I know the man up in *Hansard*, the editor, puts that in type—the first five minutes—and after that he starts using a pitchfork because that is about what he gets out of it.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of my friends over there in the Liberal Party, I would just like to suggest that I would hope that the hon. member for Sudbury would start this kind of campaign in Fort William tomorrow night. I can tell you that you will come back as the Opposition party, because this same kind of campaign was used in 1963 and if you want to get rid of a new leader, this is a good way to get rid of him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I suggest that if this is what you have to resort to, character assassination without facts, then I feel sorry for you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have a head of steam and I have lots of time, I am in no hurry. Just sit back and relax.

Mr. Singer: I am, from boredom.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Get so relaxed you fall off the chair.

For a man who professes himself to be a Canadian nationalist, a man who believes in all things Canadian, I am appalled that he would pick on a 23-year-old secretary who has been in this country for 23 years, when the only things he has against her is that she speaks with an English accent.

Mr. Sopha: She has been in this country for two and a half years.

Hon. Mr. Randall: All right, two and a half years, what is the difference?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: My friends say that because she speaks English, we should not use her in this junior position down at Expo.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In the province of opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Randall: In the province of opportunity.

Mr. Sargent: What about our own people first?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let us talk about our own people, just sit back a minute and I will talk about our own people. I will be glad to talk about our own people. Just do not be in a hurry, I have lots of time. I would like to comment on a few of the young people we have. We have 50, and if my friend thinks they do not speak two languages, I can assure him they do. There are only three out of the 50 who are not bilingual and some, in fact, have three or four languages. And they are of all ethnic races. Now if the member is right about the young lady he picked on here tonight, then I suggest we should get rid of 50 per cent of the people we did hire. And I might say to my hon. friend that we interviewed well over 2,000 people for 50 jobs and certainly in my estimation Sudbury got a fair shake with the people who were interviewed.

Mr. Sargent: Talk about McNamara.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let us talk about some of these young people that we have on the group. John Goodman, Trinity College, born in St. Catharines, worked on restoration of an abbey in France in return for room and board. What is wrong with this; is there something wrong with him? Lou Milrod, 43 Diana Drive, Downsview, right in the riding of the member over there, worked in research for Metro police and then for Pinkertons.

Mr. Singer: Was he here long enough?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Richard Prociuk, Toronto, of Polish origin, maybe we should get rid of him, according to the hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Nobody is suggesting that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: When he was 18, saved and then hitchhiked around Poland. Maybe that is a crime; we should not hire this young man because he is Polish.

Mr. Sopha: Nobody suggested that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: David Smith, Trinity College, home Oakville—not Toronto this time, Oakville—worked on a CNR gang, ten hours of manual labour a day with Indians, then taught academics at night. Perhaps we should not hire him. He did not come from Sudbury.

Jeremy Smith, insurance college, London, managed an art gallery. Let us take Ronald Veale from Toronto, home is Newmarket, worked as House of Commons guide, also for external aid office in preparation of correspondence and receptionist of trainees. Perhaps he is not qualified according to the member for Sudbury. Now here is the little girl from Sudbury, Marilyn Colgrove, worked for addiction research foundation interviewing re the problems of the Indians. It is too bad we picked these people of ethnic background. Alena Lustig—here is a name you should really throw out according to the member for Sudbury; her name is Lustig, that is not a Canadian name, L-u-s-t-i-g.

Mr. Sopha: Well, what is a Canadian name?

Hon. Mr. Randall: From Downsview, worked in Paris in order to learn French. Now perhaps we should throw her out because she is not a Canadian.

Mr. Sopha: Nobody suggested we throw any of them out.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not through with the member for Sudbury; he can sit down.

Mr. Sopha: I do not have to sit down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Christine Onody—I know this girl, she is of Hungarian background, social worker with Mexicans, she comes from Don Mills, my own riding.

Mr. Singer: My friend, the Minister of Reform Institutions, would be delighted to hear that.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Of course I would.

Mr. Sopha: As I am.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Here is another name, Bridgette Scheitl—I think the young lady is German.

Mr. Sopha: What is wrong with that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not giving up the floor.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I want it to be absolutely clear on the record so that even the most obtuse, like the Minister, will understand without any doubt, that I did not suggest that any of those people be dismissed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What did the member suggest?

Mr. Sopha: I must assume that with the young lady to whom I referred, who has been only very briefly in the country and was preferred to anyone who was born in this province, her dimensional foreground was superior to her Ontario background.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let us look at the background of this young lady in question so we will get the record straight.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister said she was here 23 years.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I said nothing of the kind, I said she has been here two and a half years. You had better get up out of that sewer, you are getting deaf.

Mr. Sopha: That is an old one; that is what the former Prime Minister used to say about my friend, the member for York South. That is an old one.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Pin your ears back for a moment and listen, will you? You might make a fool of yourself, just listen for a minute.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister is the last one to talk about that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Personal history of Miss Osborne: age 23; languages English, French and Spanish; education British equivalent to grade 13; travelled extensively in Europe and Canada; lived in France for a year; resident of Ontario; plans to stay here permanently; work experience secretarial, employment agency, duties in The Department of Economics and Development. Miss Osborne first joined the special project staff May 25, 1965, as a secretary. In October, 1960, the special projects branch initiated a programme to increase the staff for the Ontario pavilion. More than 2,000 applications were received and a recruiting team visited all the universities and most of the technological institutes in the province. Because of her employment agency experience, her thorough knowledge of the pavilion project and her fluency in French and Spanish, Miss Osborne was asked to join this recruiting team. Now that is her crime—she had experience, that is her crime. This was a position of some responsibility assessing candidates, working very hard—

Mr. Sopha: I do not want to call the security council about this.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let us get it on the record.

Mr Sopha: I made my views known.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member hands it out, maybe he can take it.

Mr. Sargent: What stupidity.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The other members of the team were Mr. Robin Randall, no relation to me, a very fine young fellow—I wish I had his youth, it is too bad it is wasted on the young—personal supervisor of the pavilion; Mrs. Patricia Sharp, assistant personal supervisor, and Mrs. Sheila Bradford, chief hostess. Let us take a look at the hiring of Miss Osborne.

This is the dirty tale that my friend would like to tell. In view of the accelerating pace of the preparations for the opening of the pavilion it was imperative to appoint a new supervisor immediately, preferably someone familiar with the project who would assist the staff in training, and establishing procedures and ordering uniforms. Miss Osborne was the natural choice because she was thoroughly familiar with the work and had been involved with recruiting the staff, and the fact of her being originally from England is irrelevant.

Mr. Sopha: God bless Miss Osborne!

Mr. Randall: Now she has very simple duties. He has made it out to be a very senior position—I wish it was, because the girl should come in tomorrow morning and ask for $1,000 a week. Since assuming the supervisor's position, Miss Osborne has worked with Mr. Randall—that is Mr. Robin Randall—and Mrs. Sharp in a very remarkable and responsible capacity.

These are her duties—choosing accessories for hostess uniforms and locating suppliers; supervision of uniform fittings; assisting in the setting up of a staff training programme; writing parts of the staff information manual. Certainly this is not a senior position to have

such a fuss made about one 23-year-old girl who speaks English.

I think, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we should finish the comments on Miss Osborne. She will be at the pavilion on an average of 12 hours a day, seven days a week—the hours will be long and the work is demanding, and the host and hostess will be paid $400 a month and this young lady's salary is $500 a month.

Mr. Sopha: Is this a breach of the Industrial Standards Act?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, it could be, but we will correct that. I just want to indicate to my hon. friend that the job is not a cinch and I also want to indicate to my friend that the survey that we made on the age of the person we should have through the New York World's Fair is 21 or over and not over 26, because if they are younger than that they have a tendency to move off the job after the exhibition is open. Now, Mr. Chairman, I know I have made no impression on my friend from Sudbury because he has a closed mind. As my friend said yesterday perhaps I should not have withdrawn my remark but I did and I will let it go.

I would like to answer his other question. He talked about going to see a model that we had here and why did we not get a big invitation to go to Expo? The invitations sent out this week by the exhibition authorities are sent out by the world authorities. We got six invitations ourselves to go down—that will be probably the Works Minister, the Tourist Minister, the Prime Minister and myself, and this is on the night before the opening. The reason we could not have all the members down is that they will not permit it because the landscaping in the world's fair grounds has not been completed. They claim that if they have visiting parties in there and openings before April 27 they will not be able to get the show open.

Now we have already notified the members that we are prepared to assist them and their families when they get down. I am sorry that I could not have a big binge so that you could criticize that next year but this is the problem. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope that I have not offended my friend again tonight—

Mr. Sopha: You are the greatest entertainer ever invented.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have also here a list of all the people who come in on the restaurant business and I would be glad to give him a copy of this so he can see there is no hanky-panky under the table. I know he is suspicious of anything we do on this side of the House, but I could read five or six pages of how we went through the restaurant facilities and the people we interviewed, and I can assure him that when the show is all over I am quite prepared to stand on the decisions that I made for this government.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, after all that has been said, what assurance can there be that when I go to Expo it will be safe for me to eat?

An hon. member: Miss Osborne will look after you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have just been informed that we have $25 million public liability so get yourself a good case of ptomaine.

Mr. Sargent: I can think of hundreds of people in this province who are in the catering business who would like to have a shot at such a blank cheque as they have given to the McNamara group. Any contract that is offered to anybody in the catering business or in the promotion field where all expenses are paid, everything found, and take six per cent of the gross sales, has really hit the jackpot. I challenge the Minister, who has evaded the whole point tonight. He picked an item that he thought would detract from the main issue in this submission of the member for Sudbury, and it is a sordid fact that a select group of people are invited to tender on a contract which could well net the McNamaras from $500,000 to $1 million with no outlay of moneys of their own—no outlay. I challenge anyone in this House who is in business today who can get a contract with no outlay of funds—a government contract—to take six per cent of the gross. I am in the hotel business myself and I think this is a—

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): You should know.

Mr. Sargent: I certainly should know, and you, George, being in business for yourself would love to have a contract like this offered to you. I think that there are many hundreds of people in this province, Mr. Chairman, who would love to have the chance to bid on this—everything found, no outlay; six per cent of the gross take. It is a shocking thing that this Minister tonight gets up and talks about a statement made about a waitress, or a hostess, and the member for Sudbury very explicitly stated that he did not want to state this improperly. He said this person had—with all respect to the girl—he said that he thought that the people of Ontario should

have had a chance for this job themselves. Now no one to my mind was invited from the Grey-Bruce area or from the Owen Sound area to take part in this. I have a great sympathy for people coming to this province but if we have an Ontario pavilion at Expo it would seem to me that people representative of all parts of Ontario who have lived here all their lives should have had a chance to be there. I think that the Minister has evaded the question of conflict of the public moneys with friends of the government when such a lush contract is offered to how many people, Mr. Chairman? How many people was it offered to? Three people. Now of the many thousands—

Hon. Mr. Randall: We did not offer it to anybody.

Mr. Sargent: Well how did they get it then?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We gave invitations to come in and talk to us.

Mr. Sargent: How many people were invited to talk to you?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do you want me to read the list off to you?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well there was Waller Catering Company; Stoodleigh Restaurants, Toronto; Versafood Services Limited; Winstons Restaurant, Toronto; and Ports of Call International. Five or six.

Mr. Sargent: All right now. Mr. Chairman, how many people in Ottawa, in Kingston, Sudbury, the north country, London, Windsor, Owen Sound, how many people up there were invited to come in on this deal?

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): How many could handle it?

Mr. Sargent: And how many Liberals were invited to come in the deal?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We never asked their political faith.

Mr. Sargent: So I finally get back to the point that you evaded, this point in your reply to the member for Sudbury. You very pointedly evaded this and you talked about a very minor point he made about a waitress or about a hostess.

Hon. Mr. Randall: A minor point? When the man was so bigoted he said we should not hire a girl that speaks English?

Mr. Singer: He did not say that at all.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Minister, you are a basically intelligent person. You heard in the preface of his remarks, he stated very clearly that he wanted to make his remarks very clear that he had nothing against this girl but he felt as I did—

Hon. Mr. Randall: After he had made the charges.

Mr. Sargent: —that people of Ontario should have first call on Expo '67, not newcomers here.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do you believe that?

Mr. Sargent: I certainly do, and I think I am as representative of anybody as you yourself are, sir.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Ask the member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) what he thinks, ask the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) what he thinks, ask the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator) what he thinks.

Mr. Sargent: You are going to speak. I have the floor, but you can have the floor for a minute if you want to.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have come to a point in this House where we have five firms from Toronto who are invited to bid on a $1 million contract net with the government paying all of the outlay and no other part of this province having a chance to bid on it. I wish the press were here tonight because—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh I know you do. You are making an awful damn fool of yourself, I will tell you right now. You should have thought of that a little sooner.

Mr. Singer: He is using unparliamentary language.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on with what I was saying—that the Minister of Economics and Development feels that a person who represents the outlying parts of the province defends the right of these people to bid on a government contract—

Hon. Mr. Randall: What people? How many have you got in Owen Sound that would bid, have you any idea?

Mr. Sargent: Oh, I do not know, three or four people.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Who—to handle a deal like this? Come on now.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Name somebody besides yourself.

Mr. Sargent: I can submit that tomorrow for you. There might be three or four people in Hamilton who could bid for it, maybe four or five people in Ottawa, or London, or Peterborough, or Windsor. But you pick your special friend to give this gravy thing to.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I think this debate is getting entirely out of order, with motives being attributed to the Minister for the manner in which he handled the situation.

Mr. Bryden: No motives were attributed!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes there were. Oh yes there were. But if there is a point here at all it has been well made, if it has been made by the member for Sudbury. This is complete repetition. I suggest it might be sensible to get on with the business of the estimates.

Mr. Chairman: If you have some new point to bring up. This is being repetitious.

Mr. Sargent: We certainly have, Mr. Chairman. But the fact is that the member for Sudbury had brought the point of the Expo '67 contract up and the Minister did not reply to his submissions on McNamara. I am making clear the point that the rest of Ontario did not have a chance to submit bids on this lush contract.

Mr. Chairman: *Hansard* will show how he dealt with this—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I agree *Hansard* will show that the people of Ontario do not know what is going on in this House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister has called me a damn fool in this House because I bring up the fact that the people of Ontario, all parts of Ontario, should have a chance to bid for this contract, and not a select few friends of the government. I think that he should be asked to retract that statement before I continue my remarks.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, last year I said that the member for Grey North seemed to be as confused as a kid who dropped his bubble gum in the hen house and I have not changed my mind.

Mr. Sargent: You have said this before. Three times you have said this. No one laughed at it, only the hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, for this man to make this fantastic sum of money, the $600,000 or $1 million my friend talked about just a minute ago, he would have to have a gross take of $10 million in six months.

Mr. Sopha: Not unlikely, not with five restaurants and two bars.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, come, come. The maximum that we believe the man can make is $60,000 in six months.

Mr. Sopha: He could make far more.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We will only know, when the show is finished and the figures produced, who is right and who is wrong. I simply want to place on the record—and I would also say to my friend from Grey North —that the federal authorities did not put out tenders. They asked three people only on an invitation bid. Many provinces asked two.

We discussed yesterday why we did not give tenders. We are not in a position to know all about the food business. I explained it when I outlined the contract to my friend from Sudbury yesterday and I am not going to go into that again. I simply say we have done what we think is an intelligent job of planning Expo '67 and I am prepared to let our results show after the exposition is over. Then next year you can take me apart if you think I have done the wrong thing.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the Minister so very clearly knows that this will never appear again and he will never tell the House exactly what happened, because I have asked him numbers of times questions on his department which he never even deigns to answer.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Tell me what questions you asked.

Mr. Sargent: I will in a moment. But first of all, you say you have not got the knowledge to know this. You spent $10 million, you set up a capital fund for research for industry and you are spending $1 million a year for research for industry, but you cannot find out

a simple thing like the restaurant business. What goes on in that business over there? Spending $1 million for research and you do not even know the restaurant business.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has asked me about questions he has not answered in his department. The taxpayers of this province had a two-per-cent increase last year in sales tax and last year they had an increase in gas tax and we have a total increase in sales tax of five per cent in the past three years and all these things have hurt the little man. Here we are, we are spending $1 million on research—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! You are making statements. You are not advising the Minister of any questions to be answered. You said he had not answered questions. You are going to—

Mr. Sargent: I am talking grants. Will you read your book; I am talking vote five. Try and call the vote, will you please?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about the regional development councils and research foundations. We are spending here in grants—six of vote 401—$925,000 this year for research. I say, Mr. Chairman, that if you ask the people of Ontario to spend $3 million on capital grants for research foundations and $1 million a year to infinity, and in view of the fact that you are asking the taxpayers of Ontario to pay a five per cent sales tax and an increase in gasoline tax, and then come along and say that $1 million a year is going to be paid toward industry for research, I think it is going to be a tough thing to sell to the people of this province.

Getting on to the next vote—in the same vote of 401, where it is going to spend $1,198,000 on advertising, "Films, conferences, special services and publications arising therefrom," in item seven—I think it is a shocking thing that we can tax people five per cent for sales tax and add a gasoline tax. All these things hurt the little man. On the other hand, we take $1 million and give it to industry for research which will reflect itself in technological advances to give them increased profits.

Mr. MacDonald: The member for Sudbury favours that—he said so.

Mr. Sargent: I do not think he does, really.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the Minister asked me a while ago what questions I had asked him as far as his department was concerned that he did not answer. I asked him about two and a half months ago:

> In view of the recent statement that the department has land set aside for HOME programme that the builders do not know about, would the Minister inform the House where this land is situated, how much land is available and what did it cost, and from whom was it purchased.

I have not had a peep from the Minister and he cannot answer because he does not know. I challenge him to answer any one of these four questions I asked him.

He tells the House what a great programme he has for HOME, and it is a shocking thing that on January 23 of this year—

Mr. MacDonald: It is the wrong vote—

Mr. Sargent: No, it is not the wrong vote. We are talking on economics and development.

Mr. Chairman: Now, there should not be any further discussion because we are not on vote 408.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Minister want to answer the questions?

Mr. Chairman: He does not have to answer them at this time.

Mr. Sargent: Can he answer the questions?

Mr. Chairman: Continue on the vote.

Mr. Sargent: All right, Mr. Chairman. The Minister said that he would answer the questions: is he going to answer the questions?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will deal with the questions in the housing vote.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Mr. Sopha: You see, there is another part of the flimsy explanation given by the Minister to which attention ought to be directed and which has not been referred to tonight.

The press report yesterday—I just want to get this into the record so that I will be able to say on the hustings that I have said it here—quoted the Minister as having said that one of the reasons that people were not invited from a wider area, or that they did not tender the restaurant, was because they did not have time.

I suspect that when we survived the first world war in 1918—that was 49 years ago—that there was a fair chance of anticipation that we would reach our 100th birthday. Then when we were put to the test in the 1939-45 war—that was 22 years ago—and came through that one unscathed and the chances got even greater that we would reach our 100th birthday. So most people in this country, other than the Minister, anticipated that we would have a Centennial celebration. Yes, and the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), too—they were part of a team, and apparently only those two in Ontario and in this country did not anticipate this extravaganza that we are now going through. The Minister wants the people of Ontario to believe that they did not have time to look around to find the best deal they could get.

For all we know, they might have been able to get somebody for 2 per cent. For all we know, there might have been firms that would have been willing to accept the prestige and the advertisement to be willing to go in and pay a fee to do it. We do not know that, but there may well have been. It would have been such a great means of advertising themselves that they would have been willing to accept it as a loss.

Now, the record cannot be complete without referring to the attitudes of our friends of the "new" left here. Here are the people who grieved for months over the patronage in the whisky business—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are the people of the "old" left; you are the "new" left.

Mr. Sopha: The "old" left, yes. They sit there in their very superior way and say, "Let us get on with it." They have occupied the time of the House with this Melcher's distillery thing, but I suspect the reason is that it has recently been disclosed as one of the grossest abuses of patronage in this country since the Beauharnois scandal that was uncovered in the province of Saskatchewan by this very party.

Mr. MacDonald: Nonsense, nonsense! Hazen Argue was among the board of directors.

Mr. Sopha: Now they are so embarrassed by the patronage and the disclosures about them that they do not dare open their mouths. They are so terribly inconsistent that I did not think that the record would be complete without referring to that. That is all I want to say. Let the people decide where the sins lie in respect of this.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I hope we can get on to the next issue. We have listened to the rag-tag and bobtail of the Liberal Party aspiring for power, and we now know why they never will get it. Can we get on with the business?

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the Minister I have been concerned with a statement that he made with regard to the tendering of this food. Do I understand that the buildings are provided, the equipment is provided, and does the firm buy the food and are they guaranteed a 6 per cent margin on it? Or are they actually being paid for management services?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I read the contract yesterday and I would be very glad to give the member a copy of it. We provide the building, the restaurants, and we provide the funds to bring in the food. They get a 6 per cent management fee, which will be audited every month and they have to account for it.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, on 6 and 7 the advertising and films section, I would ask the Minister if this is where they are spending roughly $1,200,000? It is not entirely unrelated to the tourist industry in that their section on advertising, films, conferences and so forth, and they are spending $2,200,000. I have certain confidences in some of the officials of the Minister's department, and I would ask him if he does not feel that if he assumes the total role of that of the tourist industry on advertising and promotion and so forth, that he could not do an equal or better job all around at a greater saving to the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think so. The tourist business, as the member knows, is one of our biggest industries, and I think that the Minister of Tourism and Information and his staff are probably in a better position to know what will attract tourists in the various areas that they advertise than we are.

I might say this though, that in some of the magazines in which we were advertising our programme—in the United States particularly we coordinated our activities with the Minister of Tourism and Information so that our advertisements and his did not appear at the same time. His advertisements were somewhat different from ours. We invited industrial companies to come here and invest and investment companies to put money into this country. We invited manufacturers to come here and make joint arrangements, licence agreements. On the other

hand, our job was to try and pre-sell Ontario-made goods before our trade mission goes into those areas. I think that these are two distinct jobs.

When I came here in 1963, we talked about the joint programme in 1964, but it was felt that we could far better handle our own programme separately and with less cost to get better results and this, I think, has proven itself to us, anyway.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated to me that under vote 401 we could discuss aid to regional development councils. As I understand it, the amount has been increased this year from $150,000 to $250,000, which sum to me still seems a little small.

Yesterday I listened to the Minister outline what his department has done and what they intend to do this year. I also listened to my own leader criticize the Minister's department and to the member for Woodbine this afternoon. I must say the Minister has left the impression with me that industries are locating in the different regions throughout the province of Ontario.

I believe he mentioned the St. Clair region, I believe he mentioned Geogian Bay region and some other regions and that industries were locating in those areas. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have visited many towns and villages in southern Ontario. I have visited villages and towns in northern Ontario and other parts of the province of Ontario, maybe the cities are getting some industries, but the towns are not faring too well.

The towns are educating their future generation and then they have to move away from these towns in order to get their university education. Once they complete their university education, they have to come to the golden horseshoe to get employment that will pay them the salary that they should receive.

Mr. Chairman, the towns and villages and rural Ontario under the Minister's programme or his policy, are being depopulated. Towns and villages are having a tremendous struggle to exist and to educate our future generation. If the policy is not changed, our towns and villages are going to disappear because education is practically all they can do to educate the future generation.

I would like to hear from the Minister how many industries are located here in the great city of Toronto—I must say I envy it. I have no objection to the city of Toronto, but I listened to the member for Woodbine this afternoon outline the need for houses here in the centre of the city of Toronto and also the shortage of land. Even in our towns and villages, Mr. Chairman, the town councils have set aside industrial sites and they would give them to industry if it would locate there. This is unusual.

I have listened before the Minister took office, to Mr. Macaulay, who held this portfolio. He assured us that there was going to be decentralization of industry across this province. It looks like the poor and the rich. We see the cities prospering tremendously, the towns are standing still and being depopulated. I think the Minister will have to change his policy in order to satisfy rural Ontario. Even in northern Ontario, we have towns which have houses boarded up and land that is available for industry and no industries locating there. There is something wrong, that our towns and villages have to struggle the way they are struggling in order to get any industries located in their area.

I would like to hear from the Minister how many industries have established in the province of Ontario, and how many of these industries have established in the towns of our province? There may be small towns, there may be industries located in the St. Clair region but that might be a city in there where the industries locate. It is very confusing to listen to the hon. Minister, to say that he has done a good job in decentralization of industries across the province of Ontario. I do not want to be unkind to him, I know he has a tremendous job, but there has to be some change, there has to be some recognition of rural Ontario, because it is being depopulated.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, Mr. Chairman, I might answer the first question the member posed about the—I am sorry his leader was not in the House today, I intended to reply to him, but I thought we would do it through the estimates. However, I appreciate he has other things to do and this will be on the record. He mentioned the small grants to the councils of $250,000. Of course, he was not aware of the fact that we have, in the regional development branch, allotted $234,000 to work with the regional development councils.

We have also regional economic studies in the amount of $90,000 to assist them with the studies that they are now starting and when we get into that vote we can talk about that. That is $574,000 in services and bodies and research and money available to these research councils, so they are not starved for money. On top of that, The Department of University Affairs has a budget of $150,000 for grants to universities for research; when some of the councils may come to us, we say—the hon.

member for York South was saying today—we may say "That piece of research would be better at Assumption University or Laurentian or up in Ottawa," and that $150,000 is set aside for that. So there is a total this year in the two departments of $724,000 for regional development.

Insofar as the spreading of industry throughout the province is concerned, let me first of all say that in what we call a free economy, where we do not insist on manufacturers going anywhere or that he cannot locate here, our first responsibility is to get him south of the Arctic, east of the Manitoba border and west of the Quebec border. That is the first thing we try to do: to get him into the province.

Now, in the automobile pact alone—and I talked about that today—since 1965, I have a record of where some of these industries in the automobile industry went to. We have one in eastern Ontario, that is at Prescott; we have 15 in Georgian Bay and they are in the towns of Meaford, Orillia, Barrie, Collingwood, Owen Sound, Midland, Orangeville and Nobel; we have ten in the Lake Ontario region, they are in Kingston, Cobourg, Peterborough, Gananoque, Lindsay and Bowmanville; we have 21 in midwestern Ontario, Waterloo, Kitchener, Guelph, Stratford, Preston and Galt; 29 in the Niagara area, Welland, Hamilton, Brantford, St. Catharines, Dundas, Hagersville, Niagara Falls, Brantford township.

In the Lake Erie area there are 20 and they are in Simcoe, St. Thomas, London, Woodstock, Talbotville and Ingersoll. Lake St. Clair —there are 60 there, Chatham, Windsor, Wallaceburg, Walkerville, Amherstburg and Tecumseh. And in Metro Toronto, despite what most people say, we have 46 out of the auto pact, in Metro Toronto, Burlington, Oshawa, Cooksville, Ajax, Acton, Oakville, Uxbridge, Malton, Brampton. They are not right in the city, they are within 60 miles, say, of Toronto. Now of the 179 plants that we accounted for this year, there are 16 in eastern Ontario, four in northwestern Ontario, 23 in the Georgian Bay area, nine in Lake Ontario, two in northeastern Ontario, 14 in midwestern Ontario, 19 in Niagara, 11 in Lake Erie, 21 in St. Clair, and 60 in central—that is within 100 miles of the city of Toronto, for a total of 179.

I think they are pretty well spread but I appreciate the point the member has brought up and I think if the hon. member for Grey North was here and the hon. member for Wiarton, they would recognize there is a problem because here is Wiarton—Wiarton is in the designated area. I cannot tell you why some of the 30 or 40 industries which went up there did not go to Wiarton but they seemed to want to settle in Owen Sound or Collingwood. Meaford is in the same position as Wiarton.

The incentive for these people to settle in any of those small towns along that route was there but they decided to go to the three major big centres. The people from these other towns—of course, 20 miles from Wiarton to Owen Sound is not a long ride, people drive that distance in Toronto here and it takes them about five times as long. The thing I think we have to remember in the decentralization of industry is first of all that it must be profitable for the investor or he is not going to go, unless the government wants to subsidize him. The second thing is that with our communications today and the arrangements for people to get from one location to another, the emphasis is on growth centres, as the federal government said when they put in the designated areas programme; the first one was Windsor, it was set up on unemployment problems. Brantford, Cornwall, and we have been able to see what happened in those areas where they had that incentive.

I think we can do a better job of decentralizing industry, but it is pretty hard for me or for you or for anybody else to decentralize a manufacturer from going to a designated area when he gets a 25 per cent credit in cash or a write-off of taxes and he gets a three-year write-off on his plant. I understand the federal authorities are going to change their designated area programme in May. We asked this time if perhaps we could sit down with them and in their interest as well as our own, decide whether we could do a better job of decentralizing industry. Because you might as well recognize it, the areas the member is talking about, some of your towns—

Mr. Sargent: Because you would not do it on a fair basis.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, I do not know. I would not say that.

Mr. Sargent: We can qualify that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No you cannot.

Mr. Sargent: You play politics with this too.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is an accusation that has no validity. You do not have to make those statements. You are not making any—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I know it is true and—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, you do not know it is true. If you have got proof, bring me the proof.

Mr. Sargent: I will in these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Bring me the proof. That is all I want, the proof. If you have not got the proof, do not make the statements, because you do not need to. You have got—

Mr. Sargent: I have the proof and I will bring it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You can make a lot of intelligent remarks, I assure you, before my estimates are through, but let us get off the smear campaign. It is not going to do you any good.

I think I have answered the hon. member's question. I am interested in decentralization of anything. I said when I took this job that I hope when I leave it I get an industry in every town in Ontario and a payroll going down the street on Friday night. Now perhaps I am not going to live that long, but that is the objective and we are doing our best.

Mr. Spence: I want to say a few remarks on this because I think, Mr. Chairman, that the small towns are just going opposite to the way you want them. I would like to see—I hoped you would come out to some of the small towns and listen to some of the councillors and reeves and mayors and businessmen. Maybe you have. But I have visited your office a number of times. I have received the finest cooperation and surveys, but there is nothing happening in these towns. I know it is very hard for the Minister to designate or to say an industry must go into that town, but it is a concern to us, in rural Ontario, because our population is going down. I would hope the Minister would make a special effort to see some of these towns, from 2,000 to 3,500, receive some industry or some consideration this year.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if I may pursue this, I was interested in the study that was done in eastern Ontario by Spartan Airways, financed in part by this government and the eastern Ontario council. One of the people involved in that study was Dr. Michael Ray, of Spartan Airways Services Limited. On the point that my friend from Kent has just been referring to, he emphasizes that if you cannot get some development or some industry, not necessarily in every small town, because conceivably this is an impossibility, you will have a depletion of all the little villages, because people are going to move away into the urban areas. If you can get a scattering of industry throughout the area in some of the towns, people will travel the five or the ten or perhaps 15 or 20 miles to be able to work in an industry, but they will continue to live back in the little towns. But these little towns are withering away because there is no industrial development.

The thing that rather intrigued me about his study—and I think it will be useful by way of trying to find out what this government is doing in terms of incentives for the decentralization of industry—was his detailed investigation as to why there was no industry in eastern Ontario, why it was not getting its share of the development of industry.

He pointed out, for example, that there were only three areas in the whole of the province of Ontario that have a greater proportion of industry now than back in the immediate postwar period, and those were Metropolitan Toronto area, the Niagara area and the Lake St. Clair region. All other regions have a smaller proportion. He notes that in 1947 eastern Ontario had 12 per cent of southern Ontario's manufacturing. By 1960 it was down to nine per cent. Employment in the manufacturing industries had remained largely unchanged during the decade 1951 to 1961, but as the percentage of the total labour force, manufacturing employment fell from 18 per cent to 15 per cent. So in every instance those statistics are down. Now why?

A study was made by a couple of University of Toronto geographers, Drs. Kerr and Spelt, and the interesting thing is that when you take a look at eastern Ontario, it appears to have the basic requirements for industrial development. Those basic requirements normally include fairly ready access to markets, in this instance the two major markets are Toronto and Montreal and it is within reaching distance of both of them. Good transportation facilities is another requirement, and it has relatively good transportation facilities, and so is a stable labour market with availability of labour for the expansion of industry.

Yet with all these factors you still do not have a development of industry in that area. So his conclusion was that further investigation since the current Spelt study suggests the key point in understanding industrial location is the ownership of so much of our

industry by United States nationals. We get back to this old question of the branch plant economy and where the branch plant is likely to be put. Just let me quote directly, two or three paragraphs in which he details this:

> In the first place, United States branch plants need to maintain close contact with the parent company particularly in the early stages of their organization. The parent company is generally represented by its own board of directors or senior executives at the branch plant board meetings. Among the larger wholly owned United States subsidiaries in Canada, for instance, more directors live in the United States than in Canada. American branch plants tend, therefore, to be located in regions which are near the parent company and the main industrial centres of the northern United States, from which in many cases they can draw complex parts, technical services or management and supervisory advice. The location of those industries which are predominantly United States-controlled is concentrated, therefore, in southern Ontario, the closest and most accessible part of Canada to the United States.
>
> The tendency for United States subsidiaries to be located in Toronto or between the parent company and Toronto is extremely important in understanding eastern Ontario's difficulty in attracting these establishments. Careful examination of the map of North America shows that eastern Ontario is closer than Toronto only to the northeastern United States, but that the Niagara peninsula is always closer to any United States city than some parts of eastern Ontario. Moreover, with the exception of those few northeastern industrial centres, eastern Ontario always lies beyond Toronto. Few American parent companies can be expected to locate in eastern Ontario because Toronto and southwestern Ontario are intervening opportunities.
>
> The relative failure of eastern Ontario in attracting United States subsidiaries may be illustrated by taking three pairs of cities, each pair of about equal population, but one in eastern Ontario and the other in southwestern Ontario. The biggest pair is Ottawa and Hamilton. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce listings, Ottawa has 14 United States subsidiaries, Hamilton has 89. The second pair, Kingston and Sarnia: Kingston has three United States subsidiaries, Sarnia has eight. The third pair, Cornwall and Guelph: Cornwall has eight, Guelph has 18. Aggregated for the 11 eastern Ontario counties and for the 16 counties of southwestern Ontario we find that eastern Ontario has 52 American subsidiaries while southwestern Ontario has 434.

Therefore, he concludes, Mr. Chairman, that the slow growth of manufacturing in eastern Ontario is probably the region's most fundamental economic problem and that the basic reason for it is because of the problem of branch plant economy and the fact that the parent companies do not want to put their subsidiaries beyond Toronto in eastern Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, I give this as one example of the kind of problem, and I submit that instead of just talking in generalities we have got to face up to it. We have got to come to grips with it, if we are going to be able to get some decentralization of industry. What specifically does the Minister think can and is going to be done? When I was in eastern Ontario—I am glad I can say this without the danger of being interrupted by my hon. friend from Frontenac-Addington (Mr. Simonett)—I spoke about the pockets of poverty and the slum conditions in rural Ontario. These I documented before in the Throne Speech debate and I do not want to do it here. These are accurate conditions and there is no point in trying to ignore them and sweep them under the rug and pretend that if you ignore them they are somehow going to solve themselves.

Indeed the thing that fascinated me was that I went into Belleville and happened to be talking about the experience I had in eastern Ontario and immediately had all the local Tories chastise me for suggesting once again that here was an area that might have some slum conditions. But that night the rug was pulled out from under their feet because the local councils of the cities of Belleville and Trenton were so disturbed about the inadequate share of industry they were getting that they passed a motion asking the federal government to designate them as an area with these various tax incentives that might attract more industry. The whole attack just disappeared. When some other local Tory suggested that they had all the amenities of western Ontario even down in Kent county, somebody at my meeting in which I quoted this observation said, "What nonsense. Just across the hall from where you were speaking in the centre of the city of Belleville is a home that has an outhouse—no inside plumbing."

This is the kind of situation, Mr. Chairman, that I think basically can be grappled with by the people themselves only if you do get a fair sharing of the economic development. But how does the Minister propose to get it? I mean there is no point in us just talking about generalities. Kelso Roberts, when he campaigned for the leadership of the party, went around the province talking about the decentralization of industry; the hon. member for Kent East has been talking about it; what are the specific policies which will achieve it? What are the policies that are going to result in some change in the trend so that instead of a relentless dropping in the percentage of industry in Ontario to be found in eastern Ontario you will have at least half that drop? The design for development has nothing in it but flowery words—that is the whole point.

I have been saying for years—and the leader of the Opposition presented the case again this year in the introduction to the estimates – that the regional development department of this government and the regional development councils have been playthings withering on the vine. The government has no real basic policy. There is a specific point that I would like to have the Minister's comment on—if he can proceed from this start to some specifics on how he is going to achieve his objective.

I understand that in the past year you have now requested Waterloo University, in effect, to make a study to indicate what kind of a programme you should have for effective regional development—am I correct? Are you really back at scratch—right at scratch? Are you by implication admitting that you are seeking from this group of academics in Waterloo, who have done a lot of study on this question? As a matter of fact they did the most devastating analysis of the inadequacies of your whole set up, the so-called Krueger report—are you in effect asking them now to present you with a programme that might be an effective regional development programme? I invite the Minister's comments.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me first of all answer the question with reference to the survey by Spartan Air Services. I think you read in the press as we did that Spartan Air Services would be glad to do an aerial survey of eastern Ontario for $750,000. In my book they might have done a sewer survey and it would serve the same purpose. I do not know what an aerial survey will do for eastern Ontario. I do not think it was specific—I do not think it would solve any problems. However, we worked with the eastern Ontario council. We have put up $12,000 to see what Spartan Air Service can do. The money is available. If they can come up with a programme we are quite prepared to use them as part of a consultative research group in eastern Ontario. Now, I do not know which to answer first. You talk about branch plants and what we are going to do. Perhaps I should talk about Carleton Place where we have twice financed Leigh Instruments. This is a good example of what we are doing against the kind of competition we have with designated area concessions.

There is no rhyme or reason why a company will go into an area where they cannot get the same kind of concessions they are going to get in Georgian Bay. But through the Ontario development corporation we have convinced a number, and I will quote you those when we get into the department of trade and industry in the Ontario development corporation. We have used those facilities to encourage industry to go in the areas you are talking about. Now, by financing Leigh Instruments, if you go to Carleton Place today there are four other companies in there that were not there before we financed Leigh Instruments. The others did not require any financing.

Seven miles away is Almonte where our Minister of Highways comes from. They would love industry and I suggested to the mayor there that they would be wise to get industry but I added, "Why do you not make sure that you are not bringing in a lot of problems for yourself? Maybe your people like to live in Almonte without all the costs of putting in the services for industry and your people have jobs seven miles away?" Perhaps we should concentrate in that area first and then move into Almonte, and I think that makes sense as far as the council is concerned.

These are some of the things we have been trying to do. Insofar as regional development is concerned I think this is as good a point as any—we are on the vote—to read into the record what we have been doing, to give you some of the answers that you are asking for.

Here is a statement that I think will cover some of the points that you have some concern about:

In every discussion of regional development inside or outside this Legislature, we are reminded of the difficult challenges involved,

of the obstacles to be overcome, and of the distance we must travel to achieve our goals. We do not imply that we have solved all the problems. We do insist, however, that we recognize clearly what must be done. And we have demonstrated our determination to succeed. We have constructed the necessary machinery, and it is working. It is a lengthy process, of course, but what is important is that we see clearly where we are going and how we will arrive there. Now, maybe you will not agree with that but I can assure you we think we know where we are going. Exactly one year ago, the design for development programme put forward our declaration of policy in the form of nine propositions. Let me list these for the hon. members and spell out what has been done. I do not think you are going anywhere unless you have a road map, so we say this is a road map.

1. We said we would establish a Cabinet committee to interrelate policy, priorities, planning and coordination of government authority, so that regional development could be contained within the the broader spectrum of provincial development.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the Minister forgive me if I interrupt? What has that committee done? For example how many meetings has it had in the past year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Several.

Mr. MacDonald: Seven?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Several.

Mr. MacDonald: Several. How many?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me go ahead and I will tell you.

Mr. Singer: Could I ask the Minister a question on that? Has The Department of Highways been able to tell anyone what it is going to do in the vicinity of the Sherway centre? It is now having the longest session before the Ontario muncipal board in history, mainly because nobody knows what The Department of Highways is going to do in that development.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You can ask that question of the Highways Minister (Mr. Gomme). I do not know; I do not run Highways.

Mr. Singer: You are the vice-president in charge of coordination.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I know, I know.

This committee has been activated. It consists of the Prime Minister as chairman, the Minister of Economics and Development as vice-chairman, and the Ministers of Agriculture and Food, Highways, Lands and Forests, and Municipal Affairs. A representative of the Prime Minister acts as secretary.

2. We said we would form an advisory committee to advise and assist the Cabinet committee, to review plans prior to submission to the Cabinet committee, and to direct and coordinate the regional advisory boards. This committee now meets regularly. It is chaired by the chief economist, and includes the secretary of the Cabinet committee, along with Deputy Ministers or other senior officials from the Departments of Agriculture and Food, Economics and Development, Energy and Resources Management, Highways, Lands and Forests, Municipal Affairs, and Tourism and Information. The committee has already established the terms of reference for the regional advisory boards, discussed the relationships between the regional boards and the regional councils, and reviewed the basic objectives and staging involved in a meaningful regional evaluation/development programme.

3. We said we would reconstitute the regional development associations as regional development councils. This has been done. Bill 89, fourth session of the 27th Legislature, contains such legislation.

4. We said we would enlarge the scope of activities of the Ontario development corporation to assist industrial development through the provision of loans for fixed capital. This has been done. Bill 91, fourth session of the 27th Legislature, contains the legislation. In its first full year of operation, the Ontario development corporation has approved nine long-term capital loans amounting to $1,900,000, and is reviewing another 16 applications involving a further $4,600,000. The corporation is also providing advisory and technical services to industry in the various parts of the province.

5. We said we would carry out comprehensive regional economic research in the regional development branch of The Department of Economics and Development. Since 1959 The Department of Economics and Development has been publishing studies of each of the ten economic regions. As each of these studies is updated, it is being enlarged into a more detailed work. We have already published a study of the Niagara region and work is currently underway on studies of the Lake Ontario region and the northwestern Ontario region. In addition, the department recently published a bibliography of regional research materials in Ontario. All of these are forerunners of a comprehensive

series of regional base studies to be produced by the branch. An established authority on regional development, Dr. Richard S. Thoman, has been appointed director of the regional development branch, and the research staff is now being substantially enlarged.

6. We said we would encourage regionally-related research by Ontario universities and consulting firms. Last November, invitations were issued to Ontario universities—the very thing that you are interested in—

(a) To compile a list of all faculty interested in regional development;

(b) To ask interested faculty to meet on each campus to discuss the regional development movement in Ontario and send to the chief economist their suggestions for the basic ideas to be included in a regional development programme;

(c) As individuals, to submit proposals for specific research projects which may relate to regional development, and I can say that the response has been enthusiastic. To date, 35 important research proposals have been received. Research is being carried on in a number of Ontario universities on topics of vital interest to our regional development programme. In addition, some contracts have been drawn up between regional development councils, acting in liaison with the regional development branch, and consulting firms.

7. We said we would prepare a programme for comprehensive regional research to provide the necessary insight for meaningful development plans. This now is being done. In our view, three stages are involved—inventory, evaluation, and programme. In the inventory stage, we take stock of the human and material resources in a region, such as population, agriculture, manufacturing, and recreation. Through evaluation, we expect to trace the trends, especially economic trends, in the use of these resources, projecting such trends from the past decade into the future decade. In the third or programming stage, we expect to adjust inequities and imbalances of regional growth that have been recognized in the evaluation stage. Throughout the three stages of the entire process, a constant dialogue will be maintained between the regional development councils and the various committees established under the design for development programme.

We now are well into the inventory stage. To avoid duplication, we are examining projects, policies, and information available in all provincial departments and agencies for possible application to regional development. Research gaps are being filled by work done in the research section of the regional development branch, in universities, and in consulting firms. In 1968, we plan a full-scale evaluation study of each region, with special emphasis upon population changes and trends in economic activities. When the results of these studies are available, we shall press ahead with the final stage. At the same time, continuing efforts will be made to coordinate the activities of provincial departments, as outlined in the design for development programme.

8. We said we would establish a regional advisory board in each of the 10 economic regions. These boards are made up of senior civil servants in each region, and are showing a keen interest in their responsibilities. The advisory committee is receiving valuable assistance from them concerning the regional development programme.

9. We said we would work towards the gradual establishment of common administrative and planning regions among operating departments and agencies of the provincial government. The advisory committee is now considering this point. Cooperation among all provincial departments and agencies has been very gratifying. In addition, talks currently are under way between the tourist councils and the regional development councils to arrive at common boundaries for their respective regions. This is one that I think the hon. member had a great deal of interest in.

I believe that we are on the move in regional development. Our programme is rolling, and we are fully confident that the steps we have taken are the right steps, and we indicate our full-scale commitment to the concept of regional development which we outlined a year ago.

Perhaps this does not answer all the questions the member has posed, but I suggest —and he knows better than anybody else— that it is a job of great magnitude and cannot be done overnight. Ontario has different problems from British Columbia and the prairie provinces and the eastern provinces. We have heard today and I am sure we will hear again, about the problems in the different regions of the province. What will fit in one region, the hon. member knows, will not fit in another, so each one has to be evaluated and this cannot be done overnight. But the movement that we have initiated and the plans that we have made and with the impetus we have put behind it, I am quite sure that we are doing all the things that should be done to get a meaningful regional development programme under way.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have a brief comment which brings me back to my basic question. With respect, I suggest that what the Minister has spelled out in full detail is the machinery and the paraphernalia for regional development—

Hon. Mr. Randall: And the work is going on.

Mr. MacDonald: With equal respect, I suggest to him that he has not yet got down to—and I borrow his own phrase—"meaningful development."

He is only now starting the inventories for what he describes—and I use his phrase; it is a good one—"meaningful regional development." Now, am I correct that by implication he concedes all this by his request to the people at Waterloo, to work out a programme that conceivably will be more active in terms of achieving "meaningful" regional development?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, we have not asked anybody to work it out. We are working it out in cooperation with anybody who wants to submit a plan. I said that 35 submissions have been made to us. Now, what more can we do to improve our regional development programme? We are asking for advice. We do not admit that we have all the answers; we never have admitted that we have all the answers. Regional development is a big programme and I hope we can involve all the universities in Ontario.

Let us go back to eastern Ontario. The member asked what we were doing and I pointed out how many industries went there through the automotive move—there are 16 down there that we had something to do with. I go along with the member and think that we should have factories from "wall to wall" between Toronto and Cornwall, the same as we have between Toronto and Windsor. I have always stated that.

Now, if we look along the lakeshore, we have the St. Lawrence seaway, we have two railroads and one of the finest highways in the world. I, like the hon. member, cannot understand why industry will not move into eastern Ontario as rapidly as it does into western Ontario. I simply suggest to him that the designated area programme has had much to do with industry concentrating in a designated area.

Mr. MacDonald: Do you mean that Dr. Ray was correct in his analysis—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I must admit that—

Mr. MacDonald: —that the basic problem stemmed from American subsidiaries tending not to locate east of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I must admit that if I were a manufacturer I would take advantage of the concessions that government was offering. The only thing that we have had to combat in competition for the rest of Ontario has been our trade ministry operation and our Ontario development corporation services which has proven that we are making some headway. Not as much as I would like to see, but I hope that when the federal government implement their designated area programme, as I said before, we will have an opportunity to say, "Let us take these incentives."

If there are going to be no incentives, then all municipalities are in the same competitive position. But as long as you have the situation as it exists today, and you are investing your money in a plant, I can bet my bottom dollar where you would take your investment compared to going in to eastern Ontario. It is just that simple.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would agree that the designated area programme is only one of many weapons, and it certainly is not the best weapon. As a matter of fact, my basic reservation and misgiving with regard to our whole regional development programme is that I think we are toying with the problem where the problem is really a big one.

I think if you get out into the rural parts of eastern Ontario, it is a very big one. I cannot help but go back, if the Minister will not feel affronted once again, to the kind of comments I have made in contrast between what they have been doing in eastern Ontario —an underdeveloped area of this province— and the way they have tackled the problem in the eastern part of Quebec.

That project was started after two or three years of study, and during the time since we last met in this Legislature—in fact, on July 21, 1966—there was a launching in the eastern Quebec area by the federal government and the new government in the province of Quebec, of a five-year plan. They spent $3 million to do the development work and to find out exactly what should be done. It was a massive programme of economists and sociologists and almost any discipline that you could conceive of was brought in to do the inventory and to discover what was necessary.

I will not take the time here to read 10 or 12 major points that are now part of the regional development that is going to become meaningful, but it is only possible after two or three years of detailed study with some—if I recall correctly—75 or 80 people being involved and some $3 million being put into it. Now, if you are going to tackle the uneven distribution of wealth, the uneven economic opportunities in the province of Ontario as found, for example, in eastern Ontario by contrast with other parts—if you are going to tackle that and solve it, I submit you can do it only by that kind of massive action as it was done in the eastern part of the province of Quebec, and as it was done a generation or more ago down in the Tennessee Valley development where they did essentially the same thing.

As for all the rest of this Mr. Chairman, I have the uneasy feeling that we are pouring money down the drain. We are now going out to get an inventory on exactly what they have got—the vital statistics, the people who are in the local government, the population, what industries they have. They did that ten years ago when some of these regional development associations were first established.

All they are now doing is bringing those basic, vital statistics up to date. But why not use, along with an application of all of the modern techniques that we have for tackling the problem, an immediate and meaningful regional development? Otherwise it is so much money down the drain.

If your department is now going to come out with another set of studies of the problems in each of the regional development councils, well I have on my shelves in my office the last set of studies that you did, some of them back 10 years ago. What is the value of the study? If the study is not the first step in the major tackling of the issue, then let us quit kidding ourselves that we are really going to lessen the disparities in income, in wealth, in economic opportunity—in all of the other opportunities that flow from the economic opportunities in those underprivileged parts of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401 carried?

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman. One aspect of the failure of this programme has been touched on, but there is a further aspect that I am not at all satisfied with. That is the coordination that is supposed to exist amongst various departments of government. To my mind it just does not exist.

The Minister told us that he is the vice-chairman and the Prime Minister is the chairman of this committee of the Cabinet council, and when I asked him the very simple question as to what The Department of Highways proposes to do in the vicinity of the proposed Sherway development on the borders of Metropolitan Toronto, the Minister was unable to tell us. I am sure the Minister is aware that presently going on before the Ontario municipal board is the longest hearing that has ever taken place. I was talking to one of the lawyers who is participating in that just yesterday morning and he tells me that the municipal board has set aside another five weeks to continue with these hearings. One of the things that keeps coming back from this hearing is, what is The Department of Highways going to do? If you are coordinating, how can you coordinate, Mr. Chairman, unless this Minister is able to tell us what are the plans?

His colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), has not seemed anxious to participate in this type of discussion since it began. Somebody prepared for the Prime Minister a year ago this design for development. The Prime Minister got up and read very badly a presentation that he did not understand, and it was obvious he did not understand it, because he has never since spoken about it. So you have left the Prime Minister out in the cold. One of your slick writers brought out another pamphlet that was given to the Prime Minister with a fancy title on it and he read it, and that was supposed to solve the problem. What did the Minister tell us? What did he tell the House yesterday?

> I would stress again, however, that in our programme of provincial development we are going to survey all government policy.

Last year the Prime Minister said about the same thing. He was going to be the chairman and the Minister was going to be the vice-chairman and they were going to start surveying it a year ago. Here on April 5, 1967, this Minister tells the House, "We are going to survey all government policies and programmes with a view to their interrelationship." What have you been doing for the last year in this programme? What did design for development mean a year ago and what have you done in that year's period? I suggest, Mr. Chairman, the answer is nothing. There has been nothing done. There is no coordination. "We are going to survey all government policies and programmes with a

view to their inter-relationships and to their effectiveness in assuring the fullest development of our human and physical resources." Mr. Chairman, I have made this point many times in the House and I am afraid as long as the gentlemen who now inhabit the Treasury benches sit there, I am going to have to continue making this point.

How in the name of anything that is practical can you embark on a design for development involving the municipalities unless you begin to involve the Minister of Municipal Affairs? Certainly a most important part of regional development is a reorganization of the municipal system of government in this province.

Mr. Chairman, I just do not understand, I just cannot follow how these specious debates can go on and on and on in this House without any real attention being paid to the sorry state of municipal organization in the province of Ontario, and it cannot be without very substantial significance that as this debate goes on, the Minister of Municipal Affairs is absent from the House. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has washed his hands of this whole programme and he does not want to have anything to do with it.

Mr. Chairman, how can you carry on a design for development in the province of Ontario, and you, Mr. Chairman, know this. You have been in the municipal field and you are an experienced man in this. You know, as I do, as do most members of the House—

Mr. MacDonald: Flattery is going to get you nowhere.

Mr. Singer: —that you cannot carry on any development in the province of Ontario, unless you start with a re-examination, a reconstruction of basic faults that now exist in our municipal organizations.

Mr. Chairman, what can we conclude? We must conclude that we have made no progress in a year. I attended, at the Minister's invitation, a meeting of one of these councils in York county and it was a delightful evening. They had a dinner; I suppose the province paid for it. The municipal officials in the whole of the county of York came together. Great speeches were made.

At that rally, I could just see the Minister's hand coming through this meeting. In his words this afternoon, they were merchandising. The lack was that they were merchandising something that nobody knew. They had no product. You cannot sell unless you have got a product. Although the Minister says, "I have got to sell, sell, sell," and he is a huckster—that is what he is—he is selling without having a product. The product is the development of the province of Ontario and you cannot just sell hot air.

It is my thought, Mr. Chairman, that this programme is nothing more than hot air, and you can design it in fancy books, with nice covers and interesting bindings and good art work, and pay a lot of money for this, and you can have nice dinners at the Royal York hotel and invite in all the assembled municipal officials, and you can sell hot air, but you are not going to develop Ontario in a regional way. You are not going to have a design for development, you are not going to have any other one of these things until you get down to business, and it is my submission, Mr. Chairman, that the province of Ontario has not gotten down to business in this development.

I would like to know why you cannot tell us where The Department of Highways fits in; why the Minister's colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, has eliminated himself from these discussions, since somebody wrote for the Prime Minister this so-called design for development and introduced it last year. The Minister of Municipal Affairs might just as well have not been here and his lack of interest in it is just so obvious. When are you going to start to really sell development instead of hot air?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that if the hon. member wants to match his record of attendance in the House with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I will bet him $10 to a doughnut right now the Minister of Municipal Affairs is here more than he is.

Mr. Singer: Oh, now, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes he is. Yes he is.

Mr. Singer: Let me make a point here. The Minister of Economics and Development is not so obtuse as to have missed the point I made. I am not criticizing the Minister of Municipal Affairs for not being here—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not much you are not.

Mr. Singer: I was criticizing the government for attempting to carry on a programme like this without the participation of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do you not think he has other responsibilities?

Mr. Singer: And the Minister of Economics and Development is not going to surround me or overwhelm me with his words because I have listened to him long enough to know what his tactics are. My criticism is that you are attempting to carry on a programme like this without the participation of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and it is significant that he is not here because he does not want to participate in this because he has no trust or belief in it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I will make this short. I think the figures speak for themselves. I think there are something like 952 municipalities in the province of Ontario. There were 339 in the regional development council as of last year. At the end of 1966 there were 460 and they are coming in every day. I think the municipalities are well aware of what the design for development programme is doing, and insofar as the responsibilities of the Minister of Municipal Affairs I am quite sure my hon. friend on the left is quite prepared to talk about the highway situation as to the Queen E. I am not familiar with it. I have heard all about it; I read it in the press but this is not my responsibility. I do as much as I can but I do not have the responsibility for highways, so in the absence of the Minister of Highways I will be glad to make a comment. Perhaps then you will be able to go home and get a good night's rest.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, again I am convinced that this Minister cannot be as obtuse as he seems to be. I do not know if he bothered to read the report prepared by the select committee on municipal affairs when we talked about regional development. You, Mr. Chairman, were a member of that committee and together with me, signed that report with the other members. There were recommendations in that that called for substantial reorganization of the municipal setup in the province of Ontario. Had the Minister any true understanding of what was in that report, or any true understanding of municipal government you would recognize that you are not going to get any one of these programmes off the ground until you begin to reorganize the basic structure. I hope that is simple enough to get through to the Minister. There is no effort, there is no sign that the basic structure is being reorganized.

The member for York South said about your economic studies that he has a whole book shelf. At the rate you are going he will have another two or three book shelves to fill up with your reports if you are allowed to stay there long enough, and I doubt that very much.

Insofar as municipal reorganization is concerned, the only changes in municipal government since that committee sat have been another series of reports. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has instructed somebody to investigate Ottawa and somebody else to investigate the Niagara peninsula. We could fill up five book shelves on the investigations in the Niagara peninsula without any action. There is another one at the Head of the Lakes, and there is another one—I do not know, there are five or six going.

This is the greatest government for commissioning reports, gathering them in, and then getting groups to study the reports so that they can make further reports. Mr. Chairman, I just cannot understand how a meaningful programme can be talked about in the sense that the Minister has attempted to do it on April 6, 1967, when he cannot report any progress that has been made from the plan announced—this design for development—that was made a year ago.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the principle I am stating is simple enough—that we are going to get some helpful announcement of which direction the government is planning to move in. You are not going to achieve the ends you say you desire, the ends so well pointed out by my friend from Kent East, unless you begin to plan and work on and execute some form of municipal reorganization; unless you, as vice chairman of this committee understand these things. It is obvious to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Economics and Development does not understand. When are you going to get this show on the road? When are you going to stop making speeches and printing new pamphlets?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in one of the matters the hon. member touched on. I have some doubts as to how it is directly associated with what is under discussion here, and that is the matter of the highway plans for Sherway. Would the hon. member tell me precisely what he has in mind, and maybe I can enlighten him a little bit, I do not know. I do not get the connotation.

Mr. Singer: It is a very simple thing. There is a proposal now being examined by the Ontario municipal board—

Hon. Mr. McNaughton: I am aware of that.

Mr. Singer: —to develop a very large shopping centre. There are people who say it is a good thing and there is another group of people who say it is a bad thing. Apparently they have lots of money, and they all have lots of lawyers, and they are arguing *ad infinitum* before the Ontario municipal board.

One of the principal points of argument is whether if this plan is allowed to proceed it is going to interfere with traffic. One of the points of discussion has been about what plans The Department of Highways has in relation to that particular area. Are we going to have a wider highway? A narrower highway? Is The Department of Highways going to readjust its plans to accommodate this or are they not? This has been argued about, as I have observed in the newspapers, for six or eight months and the hearing goes on and on. This would seem to me a part of regional development, and when I directed the question to the Minister of Economics and Development he said: "I do not know".

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have some doubt as to what extent this specific thing involves regional development in the sense that it is being discussed here this evening, but when you say that nobody knows what the plans of The Department of Highways are—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, really!

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have a solution. Give all the lawyers a buck to go out and play in the traffic and they would get a settlement.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I was simply going to make this observation, Mr. Chairman, that the plans of The Department of Highways in that area are well known and were made available to the lawyers on both sides of this case quite some time ago. There is no mystery about what The Department of Highways is going to do out there—absolutely none. I have some doubt about the relationship to this discussion, but there you are.

Vote 401 agreed to.

On vote 402.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few remarks on this because the member for Downsview, I think, was getting to the heart of the matter—this question of coordination of the various departments of government. After all we have to face facts, and I do not think the government has faced up to the fact that commerce and government have changed tremendously in the last 30 years or that government is going to have to take far more activity, literally, in business than it has in the past.

We are going to have to find some method of developing the under-developed areas like Georgian Bay or eastern Ontario, or we are going to have to supply hand-outs. It is far better for the taxpayer and it is far better for government as a whole if we see to it that we develop these these areas and this means far more government activity. It is going to mean government planning on a high level. I know that many of us have been brought up with the idea that any interference from government is bad, that you must not have government planning, but the major planner in Ontario is going to be the government, and the only planner that will supersede the Ontario government in Ontario will be Ottawa.

The hub of your industry in the overall planning of your industry as well as many other activities will be centred in the government of the province and in the government of the country. When I say that I am not saying that government is going to own and control all industry. This is not going to be a socialist state by any means. But certainly it is going to be in cooperation, perhaps what we might call the plural society. We are partway there now and we are evidently going all the way. We will be a plural society of cooperation of government and industry. Where free enterprise, where industry will not do what is necessary, then government is going to have to do it just like during World War II.

The Polymer Corporation was begun by C. D. Howe and is still run by the government and it is run at a profit. Thank heavens Diefenbaker was never able to fulfill his major hope of turning this over to private enterprise. There is an instance where free enterprise could not do the job and the government did it even better. This is one reason that I believe these local development councils may do some good, but in large measure they do not begin to solve the problem. We know perfectly well that much of the money that has been handed out to these local councils has been more or less used trying to drum up memberships in the councils. It is well known that when industry is interested in going into certain communities, they do not go as much to the local councils as they do to Queen's Park. They want to talk to the top people.

It is the duty, particularly of this department, to coordinate the various aspects of commerce and of local affairs that touch the municipalities. Professor Ralph Krueger

pointed this out in the report that he gave on local planning that the municipalities were far too many and were far too scattered, and I think it was he who emphasized that our basic set-up today in municipalities was based on a law passed in 1849. Well, think of the fantastic changes that have taken place since that time, and yet we have a basic set-up of a law of 1849 and now this government is trying to superimpose these regional areas.

Certainly there is going to have to be regional planning, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister brought this out when he talked about the problem of Almonte and Carleton Place. It would seem to be ridiculous when two municipalities are so close together to try to put a plant in each one. It is economically impossible and it simply will not work. Obviously, too, you are going to step on somebody's toes by telling one particular town it is impossible to have an industry in your town, that it is going to be centred in a neighbouring town.

Again, it would seem an easy fact that the second town people will travel back and forth, and yet there is no overall plan for this. I know the Minister, probably, being a good Tory, is afraid of government planning and he may call it socialism, but if he does go in for some thorough business-like planning in government, he is in some good company.

Mr. W. S. Kirkpatrick, who is a past president of the Canadian chamber of commerce—and I believe that he is still the president of Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company—said this, when he was discussing the necessity of government planning and coordination:

> A department of economic coordination would be a separate Ministry.

I interject here—he said this before the present Department of Economics and Development was formed, and I think he was one of those people, as I was, who thought that when this department was formed, it would be far more vigorous and aggressive than it is. To continue:

> In its own right, in consultation with an advisory group, the new department would have the responsibility of developing general economic policies and other government departments would plan their actions within the policies so established.

Now, unless the government, and particularly this department, has an overall policy wherein the other departments are dovetailed into that policy, there will always be the confounded mess they have today.

Surely the present Minister, as a businessman, would not run his business as he is running The Department of Economics and Development, because we have heard nothing except about plans and committees and they have been having plans and committees for years. They started off with a department of planning and development, and I do not think it ever developed a plan or planned development, and we are going through this same process year in and year out; we are getting this façade of a design for development.

For an example, I notice that the member for York South quoted Dr. Ray, who is with Spartan Air Services Limited—and I do not know too much about this company—but what the hon. member said about eastern Ontario is borne out by many other studies, and also studies by this very department. I do not know why more studies are needed, because we know that the gross income of a number of farmers outside Lindsay is $1,600. You do not need more studies to figure out that something is wrong with rural Ontario.

Dr. Ray said this—and I am quoting from the Ottawa *Citizen* of March 3, 1966. He said:

> One-fifth of secondary industry is based on agriculture and there is a social responsibility to put low-income people on a higher level.

And he said this:

> If we pulled out agriculture, it would pull the rug from under all secondary industry, but if we do nothing an even greater poverty will exist.

In eastern Ontario they are still dependent on agriculture and yet we know that there has been a trend going on for years, of leaving the farms, particularly from those in the district of Glengarry, which is in a very serious state. Again, this is a situation which has persisted for years and this government which has been in power for nearly a quarter of a century is still talking about having plans and going to the universities.

Surely we want to encourage the universities and no doubt they will cooperate, but already you have Dr. Ralph Krueger's report, as well as all of his charts and plans; what more is needed? It is an exasperating thing to sit, as I have this evening, and listen to this Minister because he has nothing specific to offer, just as the hon. member for York South has said.

We are heading, in this province, into a major disaster. We will reach a crisis state, just as in housing, in many areas unless the government will take immediate action. As loyal as I am to Toronto and to the Toronto area, it is not a good thing for this country or for this province, to have its major industry

almost entirely centralized around Toronto and Hamilton.

It is not a good thing, and I will give you a practical example: When people leave the farms they are not normally too well trained once they have given up their farming skills. They come to the city, particularly to my riding, as unskilled workers. They may work at Massey-Ferguson. This is the place where they like to congregate because it is a name they know, but as soon as there is any type of a slump these are the first people to be laid off. They are the first people who are on the bread line. So you can have all the local economic councils you like, but the truth of the matter today is that the man who had the happy farm home 50 years ago, his son and grandson are unemployed workers in the large centres of Ontario. This is continued over the years and it is a very major ill; and it is a shocking, disgusting record that this government has here in the way it has treated the economic problems that face so many regions here in the province of Ontario.

The Provincial Treasurer of Ontario rose and asked what the highways have to do with Sherway. The highways—and he should know this better than any of us because he was Minister of Highways for years—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I did not say that the highways had nothing to do with Sherway; I said that I had some doubt as to whether, at that point, it bore any relation to the general discussion.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to ask the hon. member if he is going to be very much longer on this.

Mr. Trotter: I will be a while.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wonder if we may move that the House rise?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume the estimates for The Department of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:35 o'clock, p.m.

No. 56

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, April 7, 1967

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 7, 1967

Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 1879

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Haskett, first reading 1882

Question to Mr. Dymond re price increases for quinidine sulphate, Mr. MacDonald 1884

Question to Mr. Dymond re RNAs, Mr. MacDonald 1884

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 1884

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 1904

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 7, 1967

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the east gallery, Hayden Park vocational school, Toronto. I do not have the names of the students in the west gallery, but we also welcome them to the Legislature.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): It is the same school.

Mr. Speaker: The same school.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this bill is divided into three parts, these amendments affecting three different phases of public health.

The Department of Health for many years has supported the development of strong local public health services through the establishment of health units which, since 1945, have received provincial grants as well as consultative services from members of the department. Because of the needs at the present time for local boards of health to move into new areas of service, we propose the following programme so that the people of this province will receive the benefits of the best possible public health service from their local boards of health.

Since the introduction of health unit grants in 1945, there has been steady growth in the number of health units established, and at the present time over 95 per cent of the people in Ontario are served by full time public health services either in health units or in local municipalities. Experience has shown that such full-time services are absolutely necessary if the public health needs of a community are to be met satisfactorily.

This legislation now before the House will require municipalities not now receiving such services to provide these, either by establishing a health unit, or joining with an existing health unit. In some parts of the territorial districts this would be difficult because of the scattered population. In such cases an alternative will be provided, allowing organized municipalities to contract directly with the department for the provision of these services. This may be done through our own northern Ontario public health service, which was established some years ago to provide public health services to the unorganized municipalities.

An amendment will provide the opportunity for Indian bands to receive services similar to organized municipalities through joining a local health unit.

Although grants have been paid since 1945 to municipalities that have established health units, no grants have been paid to the large urban municipalities that have provided full-time public health services with programmes similar to health units. In order that the programmes in these urban health departments may be strengthened, legislation already produced by these amendments will provide a 25 per cent grant to all municipal boards of health that provide a satisfactory programme of public health services through the employment of full time qualified staff. This will be effective April 1, 1967.

Over the years grants have been paid to cities that form part of health units, at a lower level than those paid to other types of municipalities in health units. While this differential grant was necessary in the early years of the health unit programme in order to encourage the smaller municipalities to obtain full-time services, it is in my opinion no longer indicated, and to encourage the strengthening of programmes in health units, which include cities, it is proposed to increase

the grants to all municipalities in health units to 50 per cent of approved expenditures.

Over the past 20 years it has become apparent that to provide an adequate level of public health service, a large population must be served by the health unit or the local health department. Many of our health units have been established on county boundaries, and recently have experienced increasing problems in properly serving these areas because of the small populations under their jurisdiction.

In order to encourage the establishment of larger units, a grant of 75 per cent will be paid beginning January 1, 1968, to all municipalities forming part of a health district. The boundaries of these health districts will be prepared by my department in consultation with local authorities. In northern Ontario, health districts will generally be established following the territorial district boundaries.

The underlying purpose of the increased grants to local public health services is the realization that many new projects must become the responsibility of local boards of health, to be carried out by their staff. Up to the present time, each board of health has been autonomous in the development of the programme which they feel to be best suited to meet their individual needs. While the benefits of local autonomy are to be preserved we must establish provincial objectives and standards for programmes to be provided to all people in Ontario, and I believe the increased grants to the boards of health will allow them to aim for and achieve a high level of service for their people.

In order that provincial objectives may be established, I have set up under my Deputy Minister of Health of a number of advisory committees and task forces made up of persons expert in their own field to advise on specific programmes. These areas of programming include:

Dental health services; tuberculosis prevention; maternal and child health services, including school health services, family planning clinics, cancer detection; immunization agents; medical rehabilitation; adult health services, including chronic care facilities, multiphasic screening programmes, adult health clinics; home care; community mental health; accident prevention, including medical aspects of home and road accidents; ambulance services; food control; and zoonosis, with particular reference to rabies.

A number of these task forces have already been established and have made their reports. For example, the measles vaccination programme already announced to you was prepared by our immunizing agents advisory committee and our own departmental experts. In my opinion, this is the most up-to-date programme in this area being contemplated by any province in Canada. Our task force on tuberculosis prevention has discussed the programme that must be introduced to keep pace with the many changes that are occurring in the field of prevention, treatment and rehabilitation aspects of such a programme.

A meeting will be held in the very near future with all our full time medical officers of health, and the chairman of each board of health to discuss in great detail with them this new plan for increased support to strengthen the local health services available to each person within this province.

In addition to the grants provided for operating costs, this bill will also provide for capital grants to be paid to local boards of health to assist with the cost of construction, alteration or additions to their buildings. This grant will be similar to that now provided by the Ontario hospital services commission to hospital boards for the provision of community health facilities.

The next amendment, Mr. Speaker, deals with a provincial waste management programme. The amendments to The Public Health Act which deal with waste disposal represent a further progressive step in the department's environmental management programme.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, this is on a point of order, please.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It hurts you a little, does it not?

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: I submit to you, sir, that you are permitting the Minister in doing what he is doing, to read what is, in effect an election document. It is doubtful, if one reads the speculation in the press, that this bill will ever be called for second reading.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They should have had it two years ago.

Mr. Sopha: So he reads this document where there will probably be no possibility of reply. May I remind you sir, that you are the servant of the House? May I remind you of that?

Mr. Speaker: The member has already reminded me of that on several occasions.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, well I would like to see you begin to act as such.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to remind the member that the Minister advised my office this morning that he had a statement to make today on the introduction of a bill amending The Public Health Act.

Mr. Sopha: He did not advise me.

Mr. Speaker: I granted him permission to make the statement accompanying the introduction of the bill.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, and he is reading a partisan document with no opportunity to reply.

Mr. Speaker: The member is out of order.

Mr. Sopha: There is no opportunity to reply to this partisan document.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, apparently the salt is beginning to cause the wounds to smart a little.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The volume of waste produced annually in Ontario outside of this House at the present time is estimated at 6.5 million tons. How much that produced within this House would add to it sir, I have no estimate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: As my hon. friend the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) said yesterday, you are expert at dishing it out, but you cannot take it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker are you going to call this political speech-making to an end? These comments are not in order before the orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: When the effects of increasing population and the rising rate of production of waste per person are combined, it is predicted that within 20 years the total volume of waste produced will be double the present figure.

Urbanization, scarcity of land suitable for sanitary land-fill sites, the growing contribution to air pollution from incineration of refuse, and the increasing bulkiness of our wastes all tend to make our waste disposal problems more difficult to solve.

It was consideration of these factors in relation to the protection of health and the enhanced enjoyment of our environment that led to our decision to introduce specific provisions in The Public Health Act to regulate waste disposal.

The amendments prohibit the disposal of waste anywhere in Ontario unless the site and the method of disposal are approved by the department. New sites may not be established until notice of intent has been published in the local newspapers and the department has issued its certificate of approval.

A manual of practice is being developed to assist municipalities in designing acceptable facilities, and regulations are being drafted to prescribe procedures and standards.

Under the new legislation, a municipality may be required to initiate waste collection, or to establish or improve a waste disposal system, and it is not necessary for the council, in such circumstances, to obtain the assent of the electors.

Existing waste disposal operations may be allowed time in which to come up to the new standards, but where these standards cannot be met the Minister or a local medical officer of health may order the waste removed and the site restored to a satisfactory condition.

Operators of waste disposal systems, other than municipalities, will be required to furnish a financial deposit to ensure that sites are satisfactorily maintained both during active operations and afterwards.

The subsequent use of land which has been used for waste disposal will be subject to departmental approval for a period of 25 years.

Fines of not less than $100 nor more than $2,000 are provided as penalties upon conviction of any contravention of the waste disposal section of the Act or of the regulations.

The implementation of our waste disposal programme will require a team effort. At the local level, medical officers of health and public health inspectors will maintain day-to-day surveillance. At the regional level, the local health agency staff will have available the assistance of regional public health engineers provided by the department. At the provincial level, the waste management section of our public health engineering service, in consultation with our air pollution control service and the water resources commission where matters of air and water pollution arise, will provide an advisory consultative and administrative service staffed by engineers specialized in the field of waste disposal.

With the enactment of this bill and of the regulations, Ontario will have legislation which is more advanced, in many respects, than any in the other provinces of Canada and, indeed, than in most of the United States.

The next amendment, sir, has to do with licensing and regulating health facilities. At the present time, there is authority under The Public Health Act for the licensing, regulating and controlling of diagnostic and public health laboratories, and for the prescribing of qualifications for persons operating or engaged in the laboratories. The proposed amendment to the Act will permit the writing of regulations for licensing, regulating and controlling such class of public health and medical laboratories, radiological clinics for diagnosis and therapy, prosthetic and orthotic establishments, and such other classes of health facilities as the regulations may prescribe. It also provides authority to prescribe qualifications for persons operating or being engaged in such health facility.

This amendment is directed towards the orderly development and maintenance of essential health facilities in the province, providing a high quality of care to the people. It is important at this time, as major changes are taking place in the pattern for health services, and this province wishes to ensure that these developments take place within the framework of the total spectrum. Certain facilities are already subject to this type of legislation, namely hospitals, nursing homes, and so on, and the proposed amendment would extend this principle.

My department will have full discussion with interested groups, in order to develop regulations which will be designed to achieve these objectives.

As laboratories are in the news, I might amplify my remarks with regard to these facilities. Primary attention will be directed towards the development of regulations applying to laboratories. Laboratories in hospitals, as they are departments in hospitals, are subject to the general standards applied to these institutions. However, these laboratories and all others will be required to meet standards and it is proposed to set up an arrangement for quality control to ensure that all our laboratories are providing a satisfactory level of service.

In addition, arrangements for accreditation will be established in consultation with experts in the field. I have asked the Ontario council of health to establish a study group on laboratory services to advise on the best system to meet our needs in Ontario. I am sure that this study will take into account developments in technology, automation and so forth, in the appraisal of the situation. All of these developments will be under the sponsorship of the Ontario council of health, as this council will serve as my primary advisers in this and other health matters. Other facilities which come within the framework of these amendments will be developed in a similar fashion.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, may we hear whether this will be passed into law before the end of this session? Will this become law before this House is dissolved?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, may I very kindy suggest to the hon. member—

Mr. Sopha: No, just answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —a little more time to get on with the business of the House, I think it will be passed into law.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Sopha: The Prime Minister will be saying about that, "It is done, done."

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Done, done!

Mr. Sopha: I can see him on TV.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sopha: Are they going to spend $2 million this time?

Mr. Speaker: I must remind the member now that he is continually keeping the House out of order and I would ask him to desist from these interjections.

Mr. Sopha: But this is an election year.

Mr. Speaker: Election year or no election year, I would like to keep the House in order.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This bill contains some amendments to The Highway Traffic Act, representing some significant progress in safety legislation by providing new standards for vehicles and equipment or by correcting some potentially dangerous situations.

Section 49 will be amended to prohibit used car dealers from selling unsafe cars for operation on the highways. At present a used car dealer delivers to the purchaser a certificate that states whether the vehicle is either in a safe or an unsafe condition. Under the amendment the dealer will be permitted to sell an unsafe vehicle only after he has removed the plates and forwarded them to the registrar of motor vehicles, thereby preventing the operation of the vehicle on the highway. There is provision that allows the purchaser to re-register the vehicle for operation on the highway only after he has furnished proof that the vehicle has been put in fit condition. The amendment will be an effective step in removing unsafe vehicles from the roads and protecting all users of the highways in the province.

The section of the Act on mufflers is being amended to prohibit the use of mufflers that are not effective in reducing the engine noise of the motor vehicles. It prohibits the operation of a vehicle that is equipped with a gutted muffler, a muffler cut out—a Hollywood muffler—or any similar device.

A new provision defines the duties of the medical practitioner to report to the registrar the name, address, and diagnosis of patients under his care who in his opinion are unfit to operate a motor vehicle safely.

The section on tire specification will be amended to give authority to prohibit the use of certain types of tires at certain times of the year. This authority could, for example, allow a regulation prohibiting use of studded tires during warm weather when they might cause unnecessary road damage. This is the amendment which I advised the House earlier would be introduced with respect to studded tires.

Another new section is proposed to provide for effective control of vehicle speeds in construction zones. At the present time appropriate speed limits cannot be imposed that are in keeping with the changing conditions at a construction site. The proposed section provides for the posting and enforcement of various temporary speed limits at these locations.

Another new amendment effecting vehicle safety requires that all motorcycles be equipped with both rear and front braking systems. While it is true that most motorcycles in use today are so equipped, this amendment will cover any motorcycles that do not have two wheel brakes and guards against use of any such vehicles in the future. Another amendment will prohibit motor vehicles—other than commercial vehicles—from towing more than one trailer at any one time. A number of other amendments contained in the bill are of a housekeeping nature and will clarify existing provisions of the Act.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): It is a good thing we have an election every once in a while to get something done, is it not?

Mr. Sopha: Will this be passed into law?

An hon. member: Oh, stop being political!

Mr. Sopha: I do not want the Prime Minister fibbing on TV.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale has a number of questions.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister intend to call bill Pr24, An Act respecting the city of Toronto, for second reading?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, that particular bill will take its order in the usual business of the House. There is no reason why it would not be called. It is not being held back for any reason.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have two separate questions for the Attorney General. The first one is: Has the Attorney General received a resignation from Magistrate Richard Thrasher, the junior magistrate of Windsor? If he has, will he accept it immediately, and if he has not, will he demand one from the magistrate in view of the vacillations of Magistrate Thrasher reported in the press yesterday and today?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I received both the questions, the one the hon. member has read and the one he still has to read, just as I came into the House. I have not had an opportunity to look at them at all. I would ask him to allow me to take them as notice and I will answer them on Monday.

Mr. Renwick: Sir, I would like to put the second question on the order paper. Does Dr. Cotnam's authority as supervising coroner of Ontario to supervise and advise Dr. Shulman, the chief coroner for Metropolitan Toronto, extend to issuing instructions over the head of Dr. Shulman to Dr. Cass, a coroner in Metropolitan Toronto, not to hold the inquest into the death of Francesco Gaultieri at the Downsview workmen's compensation board hospital on March 31 last?

Mr. Speaker, I have a question I placed on the order paper for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree): When does the Minister intend to arrange for the proclamation of those sections of The Insurance Act amending Act passed at the last session which would permit automobile insurance to include an accident insurance coverage providing for compensation without fault?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs is away but he will be back and if there is any delay I will arrange to answer that question.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, the hon. member for York South asked a question the day before yesterday—I think it was maybe three days ago:

> What representation, if any, has the provincial government made to the appropriate federal authorities in the light of the widespread reports that persons suffering from heart trouble are now faced with 500-per-cent increases of prices for quinidine through price management by an international cartel?

My answer, Mr. Speaker, as I stated in reply to a similar question that the member put a year ago, is that I did write to the Minister of National Health and Welfare re the reported exorbitant increase in the price of quinidine sulphate. I received a reply from the Minister of National Health dated May 31, 1966. His letter gave information about the reason for the increase in the price of this drug. I have had no further correspondence and no indication as to his power to do anything to change this. However, I have again checked local prices for this product and can report they are much less than they were a year ago rather than being increased 500 per cent. In May, 1966, when we checked, the price quoted was $12 per hundred tablets. The prices quoted today are from three different sources—$6.55 per hundred; $7.35 per hundred; and $5.30 per hundred tablets.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Minister if he is in a position to tidy up another question I asked quite some weeks ago about the hospitals in which the rule is being applied of RNAs being paid 70 per cent of RN standards.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am sorry that I neglected to answer that. I did get information but not definitive enough as I had hoped to be able to. I cannot pinpoint the hospitals where this is done. Originally this was done in quite a number of hospitals but the practice has fallen into disuse now largely because in several hospitals the RNAs come within the collective bargaining agreement which many hospitals have and their salaries are dictated by this agreement. I have no real authority to say that any hospital is using this method as a procedure to date. At least I have not been able to prove it.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 15th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(*Continued*)

On vote 402:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned late last night I was speaking on this matter of the relative ineffectiveness of regional development councils. It is not that I am opposed to regional development councils as such. I do think that they are helpful. They encourage people on the local level in some respects to organize to help themselves, but they are certainly not nearly effective enough in dealing with the problem that faces many areas in Ontario—in fact, it faces most areas in Ontario, except such areas as the so-called "golden horseshoe" between Oshawa and Niagara Falls.

There is no question that this particular area of Ontario is doing extremely well, but I would like to emphasize again and again that the present economic growth, in the form that it is taking, in the long run is not good for Canada as a whole, and it is not good for Ontario as a whole. Too much of our industry has been centralized in a particular area and, as I have said on many occasions, loyal as I am to Toronto, I feel that in the long run we are going to harm ourselves if we do not have an overall economic policy that brings industry and prosperity to our people throughout the province.

This government is not showing the required leadership. I was one of those who, when The Department of Economics and Development was formed, thought that there might have been a considerable amount of hope that at long last a definite leadership would be shown. I am one who believes that government is going to have to be a very active participant in developing industry in this province and in this country. There is an

obvious necessity that the main source of funds and the main source of leadership is going to be from government leaders who know what they are doing and how they are doing it. This is why I am happy to see a businessman occupying the present position that he does as the Minister of Economics and Development. I think government needs good salesmen, but I think we also need overall basic policies which we must adapt to the age in which we live.

There is no doubt that as we look over the past history of this province and of this country, the system of capitalism and free enterprise worked extremely well to a point. It worked better than any other system anywhere in the world. I do not deny that, but we have to change and adapt ourselves as times change and I think that it is best illustrated in business.

Henry Ford came along with the model T, and it was the greatest car at that time and it gave the Ford Motor Company leadership in that industry. But Henry Ford was so imbued with the model T that he refused to change, and as a result, other companies came along and the Ford Motor Company lost the leadership in the motor industry and it never regained it, because it took him so long to switch from the model T to the model A that he lost the leadership. What concerns me in The Department of Economics and Development is the fact that a system has changed; some of the underlying fundamentals have changed. The old truisms of yesterday are no longer true today and we are not adapting ourselves to the changes that are taking place.

The Minister, when he was speaking last night on this particular vote, showed me that he has not grasped two essential changes. When the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) brought up the changes in municipalities, he said that it did not really concern him, but the fact is that it fundamentally concerns him.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Chairman, may I make a point? I did not say the changes in this province did not concern me; I did not make that statement. I do not know who might have, but I did not.

Mr. Trotter: You shrugged your shoulders.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No. I pointed out that we have 450 municipalities in the regional development council membership now, as against 339 last year, an increase of 111. There are 975 municipalities and I am sure that they will all be in before we get too far—

Mr. Trotter: This is the problem. There are more than 950 municipalities in the province of Ontario. You mentioned that 450 have some type of economic council which they can gather around, but you must remember that these municipalities, which are a basic economic setup in this province, were formed and created in a day and age when it took a horse so long to go from one municipality to another.

Again, you use the illustration of Carleton Place and Almonte and to me the town of Almonte illustrates the whole concept of why the government is so wrong. Almonte is a beautiful little town and nobody, when that town was laid out, ever dreamed that Ottawa would be bigger than Almonte. As you go down the main street there you see the town hall, an ornate palace so out of place and so out of date. Almonte will never amount—unless there is another tremendous change—to the metropolis that was once dreamed of. It is true to my mind that industry will probably be in Carleton Place and that Almonte will probably be a lovely residential area. I admit when I see these smaller communities such as Almonte that I would far rather live there to get away from the hub-hub and the rush. As it is now, it took me—

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I correct the hon. member on the pronunciation of my home town? It is Almonte.

Mr. Trotter: Almonte. Very well.

Hon. Mr. Randall: In sympathy with the hon. member who is speaking, Mr. Chairman, I also used to call it Almontee until I visited there a few weeks ago and was corrected by the Minister of Highways.

Mr. Trotter: Thank you. I use that town for two reasons; one, the Minister brought it up as an illustration, and two, I say quite frankly I think it is one of the most beautiful towns in Ontario, despite the fact that it has a Conservative member.

Here is a situation where, because a town like that was originally formed in a day and age that has long since changed, it does not mean that its importance is any less, but it has to be decided on a regional basis. You have to look at that area as a whole and it is in the interests of the people of Almonte and of Carleton Place that we do this. As long as we look at it either from a municipal basis or from an economic basis—and after all, economics is one of the most fundamental elements in our lives today—you are going to harm that community and also the general area.

One of the main things that this government must do, and come to grips with, is to completely reform municipal government and to remember that we are dealing with areas, particularly economic areas. This also goes in the field of health and welfare, but unless you come to grips with the economic situation, we are not going to be earning the money and earning the tax dollars in order to have these various social things that a number of us would like to see. You simply have to go after the dollar bill, and I think I am talking to a Minister who realizes this. I give him credit; he is a good salesman, but it is more than just salesmanship. You must have a good product first and in government it is a good basic policy. This is what you have to sell and this is what this government does not have.

So I say that it is fundamentally wrong in not realizing that it is the municipal reform that is so essential. In fact, this affects your education tax; it affects your whole taxation system. But there is one other thing that the government has not realized and I often quote good, top businessmen who seem to realize this more than the politicians. I think many politicians are afraid to take strong action because people will say that it is government interference in private enterprise.

I made a speech in this House on April 4, 1962—five years and three days ago—when I quoted certain industrialists, and six lines from a speech by Mr. Kirkpatrick, a former president of the Canadian chamber of commerce. I would like to repeat them because I think that he grasped a fundamental in business and a fundamental in government. I read the quote again last night when some of the members were not here, but it is only six lines and I think it sums up the whole approach we have to have for an economic policy in this province, and it is this:

> A department of economic coordination would be a separate Ministry in its own right. In consultation with an advisory group the new department would have the responsibility of developing general economic policies, and other government departments would plan their actions within the policies so established.

This is so essential, and since I made that speech the government did come along and establish a Department of Economics and Development. But what is wrong is that you do not have this overall policy where other departments dovetail their programmes into that overall policy. Just as you run a business, you have to know where you are going and what you are doing. This government does not know where it is going and it does not know what it is doing, and all the conferences and all the advertising in the world are not going to improve the situation in this province. It annoys me when I go down and read the estimates of this department and see $100,000 spent here, and 300 and some odd thousand dollars given to an agency to do advertising, because to my mind it is a waste of money until you have got that basic policy that you need here in the province of Ontario.

We have to realize that the vast majority of the area of this province is being neglected. I read the various documents that are sent to me in the mail by The Department of Economics and Development, and I must say most of them are excellent. They do not have to be on fancy folders, with expensive drawings and all this modernistic stuff. For example, they issued an ordinary pamphlet, I presume off a Gestetner, called "Population Statistics" by Sandra Jones, full of good information and it is not any of these expensive pamphlets that we get. This is good information and it is obvious that economically there are many things seriously wrong with the province of Ontario.

It is true we can quote statistics to show how well we are doing. We can see new buildings going up on University Avenue and on Richmond Street in Toronto, but this is not fair to the people of eastern Ontario, to Georgian Bay, to northern Ontario, to the many areas where it is shocking to see the boarded-up farms and the land that is left. You ask yourself what is happening to these people.

Well, I told the Minister what is happening to them. The sons and the grandsons of the men who farmed these lands are now in Toronto as unskilled labour, and they are the first on the dole when there is any type of a slump.

This is what has happened to the yeomen of Ontario who originally formed the backbone of this province, and still to a very large extent do. We are not far enough away from the yeomen of Ontario to realize that most of us, whether we were born in the city or not, really have our roots on the farmlands of Ontario or perhaps the prairies or the province of Quebec.

But there is no policy. There is literally no policy of this government to help these people. You have not come out with a specific practical item. You say you have these committees to gather the facts. They have got all kinds of facts; the facts are staring us in the face, but literally it boils down that no action is taken.

The Minister told us last night that they have spent money on research having to do with foundries but they gave it up because even the foundries were not interested. I think the government has got to come to this decision that if they know that certain foundries are needed they are simply going to have to devise a policy that either the government itself or, more hopefully, government with private enterprise is going to establish the necessary plants when and where they are required. Surely something can be done.

We have the Ontario development corporation. I would rather see that we put funds in that corporation and build up industries for Ontario and for Canada. Some people say that we are in a dreamland if we think we can buy back this country from the Americans but at least—

Mr. Chairman: Does the member not think he should wait until 407 for that?

Mr. Trotter: Well, I use that as an illustration. I might point out Mr. Chairman, that we started to bring this in under the main office, we left it to 402. You could almost mention this under trade and industry, and under the Ontario development corporation. These things tie in, and the truth of it is in discussing this matter on regional development councils—I am using this as an illustration—that regional development councils simply are not enough.

They may encourage an interest, but we spend thousands of dollars on the regional development councils, but you and I know, Mr. Minister—and I say this to you through Mr. Chairman—that so many of these councils spend their time and money going around getting memberships. Yet, if an industry is really interested in a particular area, they are not so likely to go to that council. They will come to Queen's Park. They will come to the Minister or one of his top advisers

Essentially, the main policy, the main guidelines, are going to be from Queen's Park. Where else are you going to get the money? Where else are you going to get the personnel? I know in some instances on these regional development councils there are good, able people. All of them are dedicated. They would not waste their time and energy if they were not interested in their own particular area. But it takes literally a cosmopolitan society to produce the men with the economic know-how to decide when and where a particular industry is required, and there are not that many people around with knowledge. It is only here in The Department of Economics and Development, or in Ottawa, that you can pay the salaries and entice the men and women who can take an interest in this problem.

It is a shocking situation that we have drifted from committee to committee and are allowing a major crisis to develop in the province of Ontario. It is economically disastrous. Socially it is disastrous because there are so many people uprooted throughout the province of Ontario, with no place to go except to the cities to live in some room—as many of them do—with no immediate prospects of success. So many of these people from these under-developed areas have a lesser standard of education than those who have been fortunate enough to go to the city schools. This is not every case, but the unemployment statistics show that this is a fact—72 per cent of our unemployed, Mr. Chairman, have a grade eight education or less.

Despite all our vaunted reputation for good education in this province, there are a lot that are not well educated, and it is the rural areas, areas like eastern Ontario, which are bearing the brunt of the suffering.

So I say to this Minister that his policy is non-existent. It is a shame and disgrace that a government that has been in power for a quarter of a century has literally turned its back on the great mass of Ontario, and even in this day and age, that a businessman could come here and still have no policy.

You do not run a business the way the present Minister is running his department. He is grinding into the ground the vast mass of the province of Ontario. Let us not delude ourselves with the fact that great buildings are going up in the centre of Toronto. That is all well and good. I admit it helps the province as a whole, but basically we are denuding the rest of the province and we are going to become like the city of Vienna. It comprised half the nation of Austria before the Austrian-Hungarian empire collapsed.

They had denuded the countryside. They had become so centralized that they had no roots as a nation or a country. We, in our turn, over the years if we do not have farsighted policies will certainly weaken ourselves tremendously. Government has to remember that the old days of free enterprise, of government just sitting back, have gone forever. The government has to give leadership in this province to our business development.

Let me quote to you the words of E. P. Taylor, who is certainly no socialist and who is certainly quite an enterpriser. He says this:

> Many businessmen think that the government's present departmental structure does not deal adequately with many problems affecting business. A new Ministry, perhaps of economic affairs—

This was made before this department came along.

> —might be considered with its main responsibilities the coordinating of economic policies and providing for extensive liaison with other departments and agencies of government.

Well, this simply does not exist. I know you have your committees, but whatever practically comes of them? The Minister, being a businessman, knows full well that if you ever want to get things gathering dust and drag them down, appoint some committee. This is one way to talk, talk, talk. You are in an economic field, and you have to be specific, and you have to make a decision. You know the difference between an economist and a businessman is this: economists can lecture at university and never have to come to a decision—they can discuss all the theories but a businessman darn well has to come to a decision, and this is a business department. It is probably one of the most vital departments in the government because if we do not develop this country and this province, if we do not literally make the money, we cannot spend for the many social schemes that our people want, and I for one think we should have.

We have to earn the money and this is where we earn the money, and you have to have a specific, dynamic, active policy, and it is just a shame that we have to sit around and worry where American subsidiaries are. For heaven's sake, let us be Canadian and build this province up. You have the bones, the skeletons, of doing that here, even in what you have created in this department. This is the shame of it. As I go down these estimates I see the basic solid skeleton, but you have to have meat on the skeleton, you have to give it muscle, and you have to also have a brain up there and be able to use it and have some willpower. This is what the government lacks, this is what the government does not have.

So I say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that for heaven's sake why will the Minister of Economics, who tells us so often that he is a businessman, not act like a businessman and do something specifically—be dynamic and quit talking with all these conferences. Having a drink after dinner and taking the salesmen out is all well and good but you have to have something to sell, you have to know what you are selling, and this department does not have that. You know one of the first things a businessman must be able to do is to capitalize on his opportunities, and this Minister has been given a tremendous opportunity to be a pioneer, to show enterprise, to show initiative, to show drive, all these things that are so necessary in business as in government. Instead we have just got a lot of nonsense about a design for development, but there is no basis to it. It is more than being a huckster, it is far more than being a huckster, because in government today it is a philosophy as well as showing salesmanship.

I admit you have to show salesmanship, and that is why I am disappointed in the present Minister because he is a good salesman. But he is not capitalizing on his opportunities and he could put meat and muscle on that skeleton that he has. Instead we have the tragedy of seeing the Minister miss his opportunities, but what is even worse still, we are seeing the great land mass of this province being denuded; we see hundreds and thousands of acres being left vacant; we have boarded-up homes. We have small towns in a dream world so that they think some great industry is going to move in and in some particular town it may in that area—it is quite possible—but for the 950-odd communities in this province these industries certainly are not going to move in. If we sit back and just depend on these regional development councils, we are going to let a lot of good communities like Almonte die on the vine, and they should not die on the vine because in an overall area and overall scheme they have a very good purpose to serve.

I think that the Minister has utterly and completely missed the situation. He is an honest Tory of the old school and he is waiting for some industry to come in and save the situation and the only people who are going to save the situation are ourselves. We are going to have to do it ourselves. We are going to have to depend upon our own will, our own resources, and we have them, we could use them, but we do not have the leadership in the province. It is a pitiful state of affairs that in 1967, in probably one of the most important areas in all the world to show leadership for democratic government and freedom for people, and that is the province of Ontario, we do not exert ourselves and lead as we could and as we must. Again I emphasize to the Minister that so much of it depends on economics, so much of it does. Not everything—I would not go as far as my friends in the NDP. I feel they emphasize

economics too much, but it is very vital and unless you can make things pay, unless you can make them economic, they just will not work.

Government has to plan, much as Tories may hate the thought of it and much as our grandfathers and fathers will whirl around in their graves at the thought of it. Governments must plan, they must lead; and you are not planning, you are not leading, and we are in a pitiful mess when we look at the province of Ontario as a whole.

Mr. Chairman: Before I call on the member for Sudbury I should remind the members of the House that I would like them, if they will please, to stay with vote 402 which will help expedite—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Last night in your absence, Mr. Chairman, the Minister suggested to the chairman that regional development come under this vote.

Mr. Chairman: The last speaker was dealing with several votes at the same time, actually.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It is all part of regional development.

Mr. Sopha: I want to take the opportunity to—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Before the hon. member for Sudbury starts may I reply to the hon. member for Parkdale?

Mr. Sopha: Would you wait until I finish and reply to both of us?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sure!

Mr. Sopha: I want to take the opportunity to extend somewhat the remarks of my hon. friend from Parkdale and I want to say to him in his presence here this morning that I sat in profound admiration for him, to hear a member from the metropolitan hub speak in the terms that he did, most emphatically and didactically, about the lack of initiative and enthusaism on the part of this government and this Minister in particular for the needs of the great far-flung reaches of the province. Really, it is refreshing to hear him say that, because one often hears from the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent) symptoms of this complaint, which I tell my friend from Parkdale is very genuine and very fiercely held in the outer reaches of the province. Sometimes my friend from Downsview—very good fellow that he is—winces a bit when he hears the member for Grey North, but the member for Grey North perhaps does not put into diplomatic terms those very genuine complaints that the hon. members for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) and Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar) and, to a lesser extent, the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier), who know so well exist in this province and particularly in its northern part. So therefore I call it an act of statesmanship that a man from the very heart of Metropolitan Toronto would take the time of the House as he did so ably this morning, to voice those complaints.

In my view, one of the chief failures of regional development in this province has been that the headquarters of the major industries are located on the higher storeys of the office buildings in the southern part of Toronto, and the people who sit in those offices down there and manage the vital and most important industries located hundreds of miles away, really do not have a view of this province. Many of them, and I do not think it unfair to say so, are thoroughly unfamiliar with the on-the-spot physical characteristics of the areas which give this province its wealth, for I can state categorically without fear of contradiction, that the wealth of this province is to be found in its natural resources —the minerals in the ground; the forests over the top of the Laurentian shield; and add to that agriculture, then you have the great bulk. You have something like 90 per cent of the province.

Then bear in mind that a merciful providence, in addition to bestowing the people in this part of the planet with that wealth, ordained that the great St. Lawrence watershed would strike right into the heart of the continent, giving an additional incomparable asset of a supply of fresh water and a transportation system. Having described it thus, then really you have described those things which make Ontario strong.

The result has been, of course—one notes sadly in 1967—the historical development of those resources has been such that we in this province have largely been hewers of wood and drawers of water. The high point of that policy—that policy of successive governments permitting our resources to be ripped out of the ground, the fruits of our forests to be cut down and transported away—the high point of that policy historically was perhaps the attitude of the one-time Minister of Finance in the Mackenzie King government, Douglas Abbott, who said—and he was listened to with great respect and laid it down apparently as a matter of philosophy of the King government—that our natural role in the economics

of the North American continent would be as the producers of raw materials.

The result has been, of course, that this Minister and this government have—and I hope that they do not think that I am too severe—fatally misunderstood, or have tragically failed to realize the possibilities for development that inhere in this province.

Industry certainly has. The large American-controlled companies, such as International Nickel and that expatriate Canadian, Cyrus Eaton, who controls a goodly portion of our iron ore resources, have been content that the raw materials, the incomparable wealth in the ground, will be transported away and used to provide jobs in Cleveland and Pittsburgh and Ashtabula and other industrial centres on the southern shores of the Great Lakes.

One looks in vain for evidence of any activity from this government that would in any way inhibit the practice that has gone on over the decades, particularly in this century. The only glimmer of hope that one got at one time was once from the Prime Minister of the province.

Let it be noted that the Treasury benches are almost denuded. When one hopes to say something about one's belief in the future of this province, it is a depressing sight to see only two Ministers of the Crown, or 2.5—the member for Scarborough North, one of the Ministers without Portfolio (Mr. Wells) is here. One looks in vain for an audience to try to convey some of the products of one's reflections.

The Prime Minister of the province (Mr. Robarts) at one time, in a speech he gave at North Bay—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Sudbury has the floor. I would ask him to continue on vote 402, please.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): I would like to advise the chair and the House that I was looking after a delegation of constituents of the hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Sopha: I had come to the point where I was referring to the fact that in this connection, the Prime Minister at one time made a speech, I think it was at North Bay in which he called for the return to a national development policy. He was referring to the resolution put on the order paper by Sir John A. Macdonald on March 4, 1878 and which policy was part and parcel of political philosophy and practice in this country down to the end of the 1920's when it ended.

One hoped that perhaps in the person of the Prime Minister that we were going to see a new Macdonald, that here was going to be the emergence of a figure who would take hold of our vast resources and would develop them for the purpose of not only increasing our own industrial plant, but providing jobs first and foremost for the residents of our province and, it is to be hoped, the attraction of a great many more people with skills, intelligence and ability from other areas of the globe where they are less fortunately endowed than we are.

I want to remember one thing at this point, that great Canadian, Leslie Frost, at one time used a phrase that I shall remember all my life in which he incapsulated it to men, so that men of understanding could see part of that vision that perhaps Diefenbaker was talking about in 1958. He said that being as fortunate as we are to occupy the northern half of the continent, "we have," said Leslie Frost, "the moral right, as well as the moral duty to so develop these resources here that history will judge us well about it."

I sometimes think that in that regard, endowed as we are with such wealth in natural resources, that perhaps we do not carry out our stewardship to quite the extent that we might so that when we come to the day history will judge us.

Now, the obverse of that, of thinking in terms of the natural resources of the province which are the foundation of its economy, the obverse is the fetish. The obsession of this Minister; of opening a new clothespin factory. He thinks it is a great accomplishment, when out in Duntroon—just to select a place—or down in Chesterville—that 30 more people are employed in manufacturing bobby pins. This utterly fails to grasp the reality of the potential and the future of this province, which must reside in the judicious use of our natural resources. They are everything to us.

In my opinion, from the point of view of the nation as a whole, it was a tragic mistake in 1867, and in the debates of 1865, to give the natural resources to the provinces. I think it was a very serious mistake that the Fathers of Confederation so ordained that the provinces should have control of the Crown lands and their natural resources, because it inhibited—

Mr. Chairman: I think the member is stretching vote 402.

Mr. Sopha: You think I am, do you? I am talking about the development of this province, and this government's role in it.

Mr. Chairman: I know, but the vote is 402.

Mr. Sopha: In my view, it inhibited the development of this nation as a whole and prevented federal government from so using the natural resources that they might equitably distribute the development of industry and influence the economy over the whole of the nation but we have to live with that, and I say to the member for York North (Mr. Mackenzie) we have to live with the decision that was made.

The whole point, of course, is to get down to real terms. If we had a department of government that was worth its salt, if we had an extension of what the Prime Minister said at North Bay—that we must return to a national development policy—then we would have a Minister whose enthusiasm would know no bounds in hastening the day when another steel mill complex would be established at the Lakehead, and that iron ore at Steep Rock, adjacent thereto, owned by an expatriate Canadian, who must have some sense of loyalty to his native strand.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): He has not!

Mr. Sopha: He has not? But he might be persuaded that they would use that vast body of iron ore there for the manufacture and fabrication of steel products. After all, you do not have to be very sophisticated in economics to appreciate that the highest development of the economy comes when you have a basic steel industry. The steel industry is everything. When once you have a very sophisticated steel industry, all the subsidiary and ancillary industries come along. Now that is one area.

Then let us put the cap on that. There has been a failure to locate a steel industry at the Lakehead, where they have every attribute that is necessary for its success. They have water and rail transportation. They have a labour supply. They have the conjunction of hydro-electric deposits. They have the iron ore. They have a natural gas pipeline. They have got all these things.

In its absence, you see emerge the type of comment such as has been referred to in this House on many occasions, that telegram from the industrial commission at the Lakehead condemning this government for its failure to develop the Lakehead region and you remember the phrase it used, Mr. Chairman—"We wring our hands in anguish." That is the summing up of this government after 24 years, that they have the respectable, hard-working people of a very important area of the province standing like Job, wringing their hands in anguish.

Move further to the east in northern Ontario, but let us not go there until we refer to the member for Kenora. He comes into the House, representing that huge land area that he represents, and he manages to come into the House by the remarkable feat of securing the favour of his electors in that area by condemning the government. What have politics come to in this country, that a man can get elected to the government side of the House by a very wholesome, vigorous, damning criticism of the governing party to which he wants to become a member? That is how he secures his election. And that invites the favour.

Mr. L. Bernier (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I object to these remarks very, very strongly.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They are still true.

Mr. Bernier: That election in Kenora was won by the Robarts government and the Robarts administration, believe me, and we will win again in the next election.

Mr. Sopha: He can say that, and I will leave him alone if he is sensitive, but we read his literature that he published and he cannot deny that he was highly critical of the government's failure to develop the area. But let us leave him alone. He will have to resort to his own devices and in the fullness of time the people will deal with him.

Now let us move east. You would not need a good deal of imagination nor would you need much knowledge of economics to conceive of the multiplicity of industries that could be created in the Sudbury basin by the incidence of that large deposit of base metals there. We could have such industries; to pick one out of the air, we could have a tubing industry, the manufacture of metal tubing, such as in the riding of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar), what I think they call Hersey Tubes. It would be a natural industry, a type of heavy industry that could be located there. But one waits in vain after a quarter of a century to see any move by this government or anyone responsible for the encouragement of the development of a heavy subsidiary industry, those industries that flow naturally from the possession of

these natural resources in the ground in that area.

The farthest they go is this, and we should make reference to it: We pick up the metropolitan press and we see a concession of the purchase of an advertisement by The Department of Economics and Development which has a picture of something. The caption says: "Have you thought of northern Ontario?", whatever that means. But the answer of course is that we do not know if anybody else has thought of northern Ontario, but the evidence abounds—the negligence and the failure and the acts of omission abound—that the Minister has not thought of it. He has not thought of it, nor apparently has anybody in his department, because we wait till this day to see some move toward the establishment of some important secondary industry in that part of the province. But on the other hand, to buttress what my friend from Parkdale has said, I look at my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. Whicher), and there one day a couple of weeks ago I am driving down from Owen Sound and I have the Wingham station on and it is announced that a brassiere factory in Wiarton is going to move to Metropolitan Toronto. It is going to go.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That will hold things up.

Mr. Sopha: I will leave those muddy remarks to you; I am not going to dwell on them. But it is a significant illustration of what my friend from Parkdale was saying this morning. And let us refer to another item of evidence. The federal Minister of Agriculture, John Joseph Greene, a few weeks ago got under the skin of his counterpart in Ontario—a very sensitive man, it is not very difficult to get under his skin—by some remarks that he made in Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Who was that?

Mr. Sopha: John Joseph Greene.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Never heard of him.

Mr. Singer: That is not surprising.

Mr. MacDonald: You think he is dead like Jefferson?

Mr. Sopha: That does not surprise me at all. But one of the things that Mr. Greene was talking about was the failure of this government to develop the Ottawa valley, what they call the Ottawa valley region, and he told the people of Sudbury, "I share your dismay and your regret, your sense of sadness, because I know that when I come from the Ottawa valley area that I know so well and I represent in the House of Commons, I come into an area where you people have the same feeling of that sense of neglect and that sense of futility, the sense of what H. A. Innis—Harold Adams Innis, one of the greatest economic historians ever produced in this country—called a loss of control over time. And by that he meant the judicious use of our natural resources for the advancement of our own province and our own people."

That is the way Mr. Greene put it and then he put it in the converse. The neglect of the Ottawa valley, the neglect of the northeastern region of the province, the neglect of the northwest, the lack of any planning or any intervention is illustrated by the deepest concern of this government, as Mr. Greene so very aptly and accurately said, for the development of the "golden horseshoe."

What they have in mind, so far as I can see, is that they will develop this area called the golden horseshoe, so that perhaps in our time, at the end of our lives and certainly in the lives of our children, they are going to have a vast urban complex here that will stretch from Niagara right to Lake Simcoe, and the way they work at it, that eventuality is inevitable. I pointed out a couple of years ago here, that unlike the central United States we are not geographically blessed with deep and wide river valleys. Part of the economic development is restricted by the fact that the rivers that must supply fresh water for industry and must carry away waste are narrow rivulets that are incapable of supporting extensive industry. The one place in the province that can do that is the area immediately abutting Lakes Ontario and Erie—the Niagara River—and apparently it is the intention of this government that the golden horseshoe is going to be the focal point of industry in this province. That is what my friend from Parkdale was adverting to this morning.

I want to say that when I say these things and when I put them in the historical context, Mr. Chairman, I am going to make so bold as to say it does not matter that the Treasury benches are empty; it does not matter, because there are so few over there that understand these things. The Prime Minister understands them, and the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) perhaps understands them, but I am sure this Minister does not understand the problem. I am absolutely convinced and would put a mortgage on the house to bet my bottom dollar that the Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) would not have the faintest idea

of what I was talking about when I talk about these things. Northern Ontario, on the other hand, so far as I can see, in the 25 years this government has been in power, I say to my friend from Nipissing (Mr. Smith), has never had a strong voice in the Cabinet that advanced this course of action. Not once have we had a champion. We appear to be represented in the Cabinet, from the point of view of regional development, by a group of people who are selfishly interested in their own ridings only—the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), the Minister of Mines, to a less extent the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), because we have not yet had an opportunity to see the kind of stuff that he is made of. We do not know what kind of a champion we have for northeastern Ontario until perhaps he is given a little more time to let us see something of his mettle.

I can say that in the next election campaign, whenever it comes, these are the type of things that will be talked of in northern Ontario. This is what will emanate from the political platforms in all of those 10 or 12 ridings up there. Once again the politicians will come and the voices will proclaim the anguish of a half a century or more in which we have failed to see the development of a sophisticated body of industry in that part of the province, one which uses the resources that we have.

I have spoken of the wealth in the ground. I could say the same things—say to my friend from Humber—*mutatis mutandis* as we say in the law—about the products of the forest. I could advance the same comments about the products of the forests, just changing the illustrations. I could conjure up—and any member could conjure up—types of industries that we could have in northern Ontario by using the great wealth that we have in the forests.

But the day has not yet come, and yet historically the future will tell that this country is a country of the frontier, and our frontier is still in the north. We are one of the few countries left in the world that still has a frontier. The Americans no longer have one. We have one and it is in the north. Our future, the future of our children and our grandchildren must be when some government in this province, or this nation, persuades people to move north. They will have to move north.

There will have to be a reversal of the present concentration. I say to my friend from Parkdale in the golden horseshoe that people will go out into the farthest reaches of this province and the technology, Mr. Chairman, will make the climate comfortable and suitable for their employment, their social living, their recreation, as they exploit the vast resources that still lie under the ground and occupy the top of the Laurentian shield.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member for Sudbury will permit an interjection. This last two minutes I agree with him. That is a great statement, you are right, it will come.

Mr. Sopha: But the day must come more quickly. I remember eight years ago when I came into the House. The department, it was then called commerce and development, was it not, and it was a joke. They had a Minister in it—

An hon. member: Planning and development.

Mr. Sopha: Planning and development. They had a Minister in it and he was weak. A very nice fellow, we all liked him very much. He sat in the seat that his father had sat in, but he was quite inept. He was followed by a great surge of hyperthyroid activity—that is Bob Macaulay. He rushed into it like the avenging angel. He spent his energies and then he departed for greener pastures, and has not been heard of since except the odd time he says a word for Diefenbaker or Joe Piccininni.

Mr. Chairman: On 402 please!

Mr. Sopha: Now we come down, and this is an election year. We come down and I am convinced—and I will say on the hustings—we have a Minister in the department who does not understand this. I do not think he knows this province. I do not think he knows the land area that is four-fifths of the province. Four-fifths of Ontario is north and west of the French River. But he is a great fellow from what one sees in the papers. He is a great fellow for the European junket.

I have met people, personal friends of mine, who have been on the European junket with him at the taxpayers' expense, and he seems to think he carries out his stewardship as a responsible Minister of the Crown by going to Java and Scandinavia and eastern Europe and selling some of the products, or attempting to sell some of the products they produce, when the fundamental problem is the maintenance and the extension of a healthy economy based on the judicious

utilization of the resources that a bountiful providence has provided us. That is to say, our mineral wealth and the wealth of our forests.

There is not much hope that there is going to be any change. One cannot feel confident that this Minister, or any who succeed him in the same vein of thought is going to start to lean on industry a little bit, and say: "Look, we owe it to our people. Here is the statement as well as I can dispel it in its simplest form. We owe it to our people, and to the people we ought to attract from less fortunate lands that we use those resources in order to create jobs here for our people."

It is simply put and the sands of time run out. They run against us because every pound of that ore that is taken out of the ground up there is irreplaceable, we will never have the chance again. Every ton of iron ore at Steep Rock and elsewhere at the Adams Mine site south of Kirkland Lake that is carted away to Cleveland and Pittsburgh, will never be replaced.

We disable ourselves in the utilization of that ore for our own people first and foremost. The Americans, of course, are delighted to come here and rape our resources and cart them away.

My friend from Woodbine and I had the incomparable opportunity—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Do not bring me in on this. I do not support you.

Mr. Sopha: My friend from Woodbine had the incomparable opportunity of discussing these things—the use of our resources—in the presence of a group of young people who were going abroad to represent Canada in the foreign service—their first postings in The Department of External Affairs—and we were in the presence of some of the industrial elite indeed. They were of the industrial elite. To listen to these people from Bay Street, one gets the impression that they do not like you to talk about the use of our wealth for Canada.

They do not like the promotion of any idea that we Canadians would even deign to think that we must use our resources first and foremost for our own people. That is bad for business. That makes the Americans upset.

One gets the impression that the leaders of finance and industry in this country do not want to say or do anything that will upset our American cousins. They like the Americans—to put it another way—to think of us as a placid willing people, who are quite prepared to invite them in with their ingenuity and their wealth, their saved money, their capital, their needs, and the necessity for the use of our resources.

They want the Americans to picture us as being inhabitants of a donkey economy that we will be content to mine that ore out of the ground and assist them to carry it away. Anything that we say that any way advances our country, then that upsets the Americans. They begin to wonder what our attitude is going to be, and consequently, it is bad for business.

One of them, the chief economist I think, for the Bank of Nova Scotia—no it was not him, it was a man from Argus Corporation—he talked in the most glowing terms about seven American steel companies coming in here and providing the capital and the know-how to develop a large iron ore deposit.

So I said to the man: "What does that do for us, the fact that they come in here and provide the capital and the technical know-how to develop that iron ore deposit and take it away from us?"

He said: "Well, we would not develop it without them." To which my reply was: "We would have it if it was not developed to provide jobs in Pittsburgh and Cleveland. We would still have the iron ore."

He said: "You would not develop it for another 150 years," to which I say, "so what?" Our grandchildren, our great grandchildren would have the use of that incomparable resource that we have.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You have not sold me.

Mr. Sopha: I know, because I know which side of the camp you are on. You are a continentalist.

Mr. MacDonald: Just like Sharp.

Mr. Sopha: I have no responsibility. He is a continentalist and I am an economic nationalist.

Hon. Mr. Randall: This is tonight's speech.

Mr. MacDonald: You will stand in the minority in the federal Liberal Party.

Mr. Sopha: What does it matter? If I am the only one, as long as I spoke out of conviction and principle it does not matter, because some great man at some time—I say to my friend—said, "One man and the truth makes a majority."

Mr. Bryden: You support a party that is against your professed principles.

Mr. Sopha: I proclaim the things in which I believe.

Mr. MacDonald: What are you doing in the Liberal Party?

Mr. Sopha: I say these same things everywhere, to put it in the simplest terms, that I believe in the development of our natural resources foremost for Canadians and for the future of this country. To get back to what the Prime Minister said about the return to the national development policy, well of course the national development policy was in a period of stasis from 1930 through to 1958 and really it re-emerged for the first time as part of the Canadian political scene when Diefenbaker won his tremendous majority of 208 seats. When he talked about Canada as a northern country and its northern vision, that was the re-emergence of the national policy. Now Walter Gordon and those who support him are carrying that forward. But as I have said, and here is the fundamental point to remember, the federal government is unable to engage in policies for what we think to be the proper use of the natural resources, because it does not own them and it has not owned them since Confederation. So the responsibility for the development of those resources resides with the provincial government—it is the owner, the owner of the Crown land.

In this department one really wonders sometimes about the attitudes. At the same meeting the member for Woodbine and I were at, there was an official of this department who expressed his view that the tariff policy that has been with us since Confederation—designed to protect essential Canadian industries, and which has been the brunt of complaint and criticism by our western compatriots all down through the years, and which almost disappeared in the reciprocity election in 1911—was all wrong.

Mr. Chairman: Do you think the tariff policy comes under vote 402?

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes, because it has to do with regional development. Oh yes.

Mr. Chairman: In what way?

Mr. Sopha: In what way? I will tell you—because industry could not exist in Stratford and Cornwall, to name two places, without the tariff policy. That is a protective government device to prevent competition from goods that can be manufactured cheaper elsewhere. Yet this official said that had all been wrong. One of the perspicacious young people who is going to represent Canada abroad said to the man, "Without the tariff policy that we have had, what type of industries would have grown up north of the 49th parallel?" That sort of entrapped him, because the Minister's official said at that time—I think I quote him correctly—"I do not want to get involved in that. I am a civil servant, you see." He was unable to answer the question, because the answer of course is that we would not have been able to foster industry in this province and in this country had we not had that protective wall.

The protective wall in this day and age in the development of our natural resources still resides as an instrument of national policy. It still remains. And this government here, if it really took the bull by the horns and said, "We are going to do everything in our power to utilize those resources in the establishment of manufacturing in Canada and in Ontario," would find a willing accomplice in the federal government, which has control over the tariffs, in keeping those areas where they were necessary.

In one large area, of course, men of enlightened understanding, reason, commonsense, and the spirit of compromise, have moved in an area to eliminate them, and that is in the automobile manufacturing business. I am not going to stop to judge whether that has been a success, but it is a step in the right direction—the establishment of a reciprocity in one area. We all look forward—if you are truly liberal you look forward, of course—to the day when there might be complete reciprocity in all areas.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am confused. At one moment the hon. member for Sudbury is building a wall and the next moment he is tearing it down. How many policies does your party have?

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member for Sudbury—

Mr. Sopha: I will not. I made the point. My words are there. I made the point and I tried to make it with clarity. I said that someday, I hoped a long time in the future, we would have complete reciprocity. But we cannot have complete reciprocity as long as the industries we seek to establish here—I am not talking about bobby pin factories, that obsess the Minister; I am not talking about those, but really major industries—are susceptible to unfair and oppressive

competition from any industry south of the border or elsewhere, we will need that protective wall; and then of course to say that is to speak of the history of our country.

So far as the area I represent is concerned, there are my views. I want to say to my friend from Humber, as I will say on platforms throughout northern Ontario—and I will talk about this in Nipigon tomorrow, at that celebrated meeting the Minister of Mines has advertised that I am going to—that I hope in my lifetime, I express the fervent hope, that I will go through that area that is four-fifths of the land mass of Ontario, that I will see these thriving industries—tubing, copper products, products used in the communications industry, industries utilizing in a big way the wood products of our forests—and I will see those in the landscape with the provision of jobs for a much-expanded population than that 700,000—that scarce 700,000, I say to the member for Parkdale, who now inhabit that great land area north and west of the French River—but I cannot hope to see that day soon.

A steel mill at the Lakehead, with this Minister? I cannot hope, because he does not understand. He does not understand this country, nor this province. He does not understand the problem ahead. I never heard a syllable drop from his lips to indicate that he would recognize the national policy that the Prime Minister spoke about, if he met it on the street. He does not know what the national policy is and the vision that Sir John A. Macdonald and Wilfrid Laurier had for this country, and in real terms what they meant when they built the railways to open it up, and Laurier started the immigration policy to people the west, and all those things. He does not understand them, and the Minister of Mines does not understand them. The Minister of Municipal Affairs probably does, and I am extremely doubtful if the Minister of Lands and Forests does.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I at this time bring to the attention of the members of the House, sir, the fine group of young men and women in the east gallery from the city of Windsor who have come to view the proceedings of this Legislature? They are accompanied by three members of the staff of the high school of commerce in Windsor. The members of the staff are Miss Dorothy Hanrahan, Mr. Gerry Doherty and Mr. Don MacEwan, and I know that each and every member of the House certainly hopes that they have been impressed with what they have seen and wishes them—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, just looking at the smiling faces of the young ladies you can see that they have been most impressed and I know that they will go back to the city of Windsor and express the fine outstanding job that the Opposition are doing in this House.

Mr. Bryden: We welcome them anyway.

Mr. Sopha: I do not know whether they are impressed but these words that I now state will be referred to in future years—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bryden: Will you include them in your autobiography?

Mr. Sopha: I will give them the comfort of the assurance that I see I neglected to point out the Minister without Portfolio, the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) who was the former Provincial Treasurer of this province and who understands these things of which I speak.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, before the hon. members proceeds, may I ask a question?

Mr. Sopha: You know, you do not help intelligently.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I do.

Mr. Sopha: You do not.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I want to ask you a very simple question. You are berating a provincial Minister while you are talking about the weakness of national leadership.

Mr. Sopha: No!

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Yes, you are.

Mr. Sopha: No, I emphasized that the natural resources are vested in the province. J. S. Woodsworth, of course, in 1935 moved a very striking and very important resolution in the House of Commons at Ottawa, which won the support of every member of the House. It carried unanimously, for in 1935 in the depths of the depression, the Parliament of Canada realized that it was powerless to influence the economy in order to start the move out of the depression. It was powerless because it had no control over those vital aspects of the economy and Woodsworth stood in his place one day and moved this resolution that every member should go and have a look at, in which he called for immediate consultation

with the provinces. The Minister without Portfolio would remember that as being part of his career when Woodsworth moved that resolution. He called for consultation with the provinces and for them to surrender to the federal government part of their control over the economy, and principally the natural resources, so that the federal government could take the necessary steps to lift the country as a whole.

So I say to the member for York South, how does he want it? How are we going to do it, if we believe in this province and this country as a nation with a sophisticated, industrial plant and with 50 million or 75 million people, instead of the bare 20 million that we have, and with 70 per cent of them living within 100 miles of the United States border with no defence in depth whatsoever to the intrusion of United States culture.

God bless my friend, the hon. member for Bruce. These are the things that he continuously speaks of—the paucity of immigration in this country. The refrain of the member for Parkdale and myself on this Friday morning, April 7, is that we have waited in vain after 24 years. We have waited in vain to see any evidence over there of the courage and determination, the forthrightness to go out into the fringe areas of this province and take the necessary steps to encourage industry.

It is a funny thing that other western democratic nations do it—the Benelux countries, Argentina—a country whose political institutions we incline to be a bit uppity about—and Mexico. They do it by means of governmental intervention in the economy to stimulate development along the paths that they want to see it developed. They do not hesitate. The United Kingdom has been doing it for many years, for it said to the Ford Motor Company—or whatever; I may be wrong in the name of the motor company, but one of them that wanted to locate in a certain area in England—no, they would not locate there. If they wanted to manufacture cars in the United Kingdom, they would locate at Liverpool, because it was judged that Liverpool was the place, in the context of space and time in the economic pattern, that needed the infusion of that type of industry.

Who would say that we are more democratic or that those countries are less democratic? Who would be willing to say that they are less democratic or that there has been any impairment of their democratic institutions for reasons that they are willing to intervene in the economy much more directly than we are.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are not as prosperous as we are.

Mr. Sopha: They are not as prosperous because they do not have the natural resources we have.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No—

Mr. Sopha: Listen, Britain is not selling wheat by the millions of tons to Russia and Communist China, as we are.

An hon. member: What has this got to do with the vote?

Mr. Sopha: He asked a question; that is what it has to do with the vote.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not ask a question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: He made a statement that cannot go unchallenged.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is giving examples of countries which are not as prosperous as Canada. I think that he should give examples of other countries as prosperous as Canada. That is all I said. I do not think that it is true.

Mr. Sopha: All right, he said they are not as prosperous. The point I was making, and I will repeat it for the Minister, is that those countries intervened much more directly in the economy, to stimulate development along the lines that they planned. I said that we would not sit here and say that they have less democracy in the United Kingdom because of it; we would not say that they had less democracy in the Benelux countries—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are talking about prosperity, not democracy.

Mr. Sopha: I sum it up this way, by saying that perhaps the old *laissez-faire,* the private decision made in the board room in quiet, in the cloisters, has been allowed to reign too long in this country, and we must replace that by a degree of central planning where we are willing to tell industry what it must do, to a limited extent, for the good of the body politic as a whole. That is the point I make.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The point is that the Liberals in this province are socialists!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I will not be distracted—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sopha: All right, I have come to the end of my remarks, so I will just say this: The Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) had his chance this morning, and now I have mine. I say this, that—

Mr. MacDonald: They are both abusing the House.

Mr. Sopha: —this business of the lack of development that the members for Parkdale, Timiskaming, Algoma-Manitoulin and Nipissing speak about and know so well, will be one of the central issues in the forthcoming contest, of course it will. These are the things that we will talk about. We do not expect that the Minister of Economics and Development will come into that part of Ontario; we do not expect he will because when he talks about bobby-pin factories and corset factories and that kind of thing, he will be talking to people who will recognize immediately that here is a man who, if he talks about junkets to Europe, does not understand the fundamental nature of the economy up here. It would require somebody like the Prime Minister.

I will give you a tip; I will tell you how to win the election. If he comes in there and he makes that national development policy speech again and expands it a little bit, then who knows if he is really serious about the utilization of that vast wealth we have in four-fifths of the land mass. Who is to say that maybe the people up there, when he gets finished, will say, "Here is the new John A. Macdonald; he really means it." But the funny thing about the Prime Minister, and this is my last sentence, is that he makes the speech about the national development policy at one place and a week later he is making one somewhere else saying, "We need American capital." Thank you very much for your patience.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment before any other remarks are made.

Mr. Bryden: That is the only reason he sat down.

Mr. MacDonald: He abused the House more than the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, there he goes heading for the vomit box. He even made himself sick with what he had to say this morning. I can deal with the comments of this member in a few seconds. I should say his short interjections from here on in should be restricted to the weakest kidney. What you have heard from him this morning is exactly what you will hear at the Head of the Lakes tonight, but I am sure that people up there will not go for that kind of a snow job. I am also of the opinion that his family is very fortunate that he chose the legal profession because if he was in trade and commerce they would starve to death—they would be on the "pogey" from his knowledge of trade and industry.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): You are devastating—let us get on with it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I appreciate I am devastating but I have listened to this vindictive member for the last couple of days and it goes to show what happens if you cross him. He is very, very vindictive, and he continues to be vindictive so as far as I am concerned. I told him the other day that if he wants to hand it out he had better be prepared to take it, but you can see he slides out of the House the minute he is finished.

Mr. Nixon: That is it—now let us get to the point.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we will get to the point so do not take his part; he is quite able to look after himself. If he is not you had better get a new member for Sudbury. You are going to need one anyway because I feel this morning after listening to him—maybe you are optimistic—but I would say after listening to him that there is a feeling of a cool, clammy defeat in the Liberal Party when he has to do the things he is doing. I was amused at his comments on the bobby pin plant. He said 30 people in a bobby pin plant means nothing and the Minister is very excited about it—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): He said in the over-all picture.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, now just a minute. Let us not get carried away, now. The hon. member for Parkdale made a very intelligent presentation this morning about the very things that I am talking about. A 30-man bobby pin plant in some of these areas we are talking about is like 300 or 3,000 in some of the major areas.

Mr. MacDonald: Even in Wiarton area.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right—you would be glad to get one of those bobby pin plants in Wiarton but our friend from Sudbury, he writes them off, you see. The thing that he has passed up completely in my estimation is

that he has written off the millions of dollars being spent and invested today in the iron ore deposits of northwestern Ontario and if he thinks we are going to wait until they build a steel mill anywhere to absorb all those iron ore pellets, I can tell you that we are going to waste a lot of our time and this country is going to be much poorer for the wait.

He also forgets the fact that there are only ten per cent of our people employed in forestry, mining and agriculture. Most are employed in manufacturing and this is the area where this government is striving to make sure that we have the manufacturing operations. He seems to forget also that in Timmins there is already a large concentrating plant and there is a zinc plant announced —a smelter—in the next few weeks. Now, he has written off all these things that are going into northern Ontario as of no consequence. I hope he can sell the people in northern Ontario because he has certainly not sold me. As many other members of the House have said, and I quote:

> Our natural resources are becoming less important each year in the growth of our economy and the standard of living. Increasingly our economy's future is becoming dependent on our people—their technical skills, new developments in research and technology and our ability to produce sophisticated products in an internationally competitive market.

Now, perhaps he will read that in *Hansard* and it will mean something to him. I might also say, Mr. Chairman, that he has made a lot of wide and—oh, I think useless—contributions to this debate here this morning and I do not think there is any more interest on my part in wasting time on what he had to say because I do not think anybody else is interested. But I would now like to turn, perhaps, to the more intelligent part of the presentation this morning of the hon. member for Parkdale. I think he had some very good comments and he said during his comments, "I wonder if the Minister could be specific".

That is what I am going to try to be—specific. First of all we do have a Cabinet committee on regional development on which I serve and we have an economic and financial committee. I serve on this also and I can assure him that we do have planning in mind for the economy—we are not just rushing out helter skelter in all directions. If you think we stole some of that from our socialist friends, well, give them credit, but I just assure you at the top level of this government we are spending $2,000 million a year. It is all going into regional development, not just the estimates we are talking about here this morning.

I would seriously doubt some of the statements that the hon. member made this morning and that is that the children of our farmers are now in the city, unskilled, uneducated and looking for jobs. I think with the education opportunities that are given to our young people in the country today they do not necessarily want to follow the footsteps of their fathers any more than a minister's son or a doctor's son or a pharmacist's son. I think we are going to see more of these people from the country drift into the major cities where the opportunities are greater. This is the freedom of choice we have in this country and this is going to continue.

Mr. Trotter: Not much choice on the farm.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, maybe there is not much choice on the farm but you are not going to keep them back on the farm if the opportunities exist in the city. I think if that was true even the leader of your party would be back on the farm 24 hours a day. But he is in education—he left the farm to go into teaching—and now he is into politics and we are the richer for it; and I would hate to think that we lost that talent because somebody said he had to be a farmer. The opportunities for personal advantages in our major centres today and our growth centres were never better in the history of this country. Perhaps we are going to see more of our younger people off the farms in our major centres because we are producing more with a lot less people owing to automation on the farm as well as automation in the factory.

The hon. member referred to Almonte this morning and Carleton Place and these are good illustrations of the need to create one growth centre at a time. It could be possible in the next 10 or 15 years that those two towns will amalgamate—it will be one new town, who knows? If the growth centre in Carleton Place continues this can happen. And when I am talking about Carleton Place perhaps I will be permitted to quote from *Time* magazine dated February 10, 1967. We did not give it to them, they interviewed us. I will not read the whole column; I will just read the last paragraph which bears out the fact that we are being specific with our regional development problem in all the areas we can get into:

> Last week the Ontario Economics and Development Minister, Stanley Randall, travelled to Carleton Place, population 5,000, a backwater on the banks of the Mississippi River, 30 miles southwest of Ottawa, to open the first concrete and brick result. It is a $400,000 plant built by Leigh Instruments Limited which manufactures crash position indicators for aircraft and is just the sort of promising but unproved company that the Ontario development corporation was established to help. With loans guaranteed by the Ontario development corporation it has in three years boosted a work force of 35 to 250 and sales to $4 million, 75 per cent of them to the United States and Great Britain.

I do not know how more specific you can be than that.

Mr. Whicher: Yes, but the Minister will agree that is the exception.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it is not the exception. I have also an excerpt from minutes of the eastern Ontario development corporation, by Mr. Callon. He reports that industrial development in eastern Ontario has definitely improved mainly because of the Ontario development corporation.

> The ODC has initiated a number of plant locations in the past—

this is the council I am talking about.

> —and Milt Phillips, assistant to the general manager, was working on a deal that would probably put three or four new plants in eastern Ontario. The development picture looks good for the coming year.

I think that is being specific.

I have a couple of letters here. Too bad the hon. member for Sudbury did not stay. Here is one from a Mr. Donald Anderson in Capreol and he has written to Mr. Hogarth of the Ontario development agency and he said:

> I want to take this opportunity of thanking both you and Mr. Wilson for your consideration and discussion at the President hotel. Your advice on projecting the cost, weekly and monthly, presents a clear picture of a project to the point of delivery. Through a step at a time I believe a productive market can be achieved.
>
> Thanking you once again, Donald Anderson.

This is on quartz mining in Capreol. This is a small town. Here is one from the Sudbury district industrial commissioner, addressed to myself. It says:

> With reference to the recent visit to the Sudbury area by the consulting team of the Ontario development agency, we wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to you and the development agency officials responsible for the arrangements. The initial reaction by many of the small businessmen in the area has been favourable, and it is hoped that the degree of interest generated by the teams result in the possibility of arranging another visit to the area at a later date.

Signed by "Mr. T. Smith, industrial commissioner".

Here is one from Horwood Mining Limited, Sudbury, Ontario, addressed to the agency itself:

> We express our appreciation and thanks for your consideration and interview of August 10. Due to Mr. Gray's planning of the Ontario development corporation and advice our financial problems at Horwood Mining have been solved. We would like to keep you informed in our future projection and would respect any suggestions. Information on our project will be sent to you soon.

Signed, "Edward Blanchard, president Horwood Mining Limited".

This is just one of the 2,600 people who were counselled by the Ontario development corporation last year, that I mentioned in my presentation.

I was glad that you mentioned the county of Glengarry, because the hon. leader of the Opposition pointed out, I think it was last year, when he talked about rural poverty, that Glengarry was one that was very low on the list and it is one that we could aim on and try to do something about in a more concrete and specific manner. So let me tell what we have done in Glengarry.

We have the Red Booster Sportswear Limited, called Bantamac already operating in Glengarry. It was financed through the Ontario development corporation partially, and partially through ARDA because this is a rural area and we have drawn on ARDA funds to help in this area. These funds are available for manufacturing plants in basically rural areas. They now employ 150 people. I will be going down there on May 8 to officially open the plant, and if any of the members would like to join me, be my guests.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Promised; done!

Hon. Mr. Randall: I also want to point out that this is only one plant in Glengarry.

Another one is Fashions Promotions Corporation Limited. This is a small plant that is in Alexandria. They were in a difficult position because they could not get financing. We financed the company on a loan and they are putting on a major expansion on their textile plant and will go from 80 employees to 150.

I say to you in view of the statements made by my hon. friend from Sudbury this morning about the bobby pin plant which he disparages, that I hope as long as I am in this job, that I can get thousands of plants this size throughout Ontario. This will solve the problem as you see it, and I am sure as I see it.

Mr. Whicher: Whereabouts are these plants?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I also remember in my days as a member of the Canadian manufacturers association, which had 6,500 members, that over 80 per cent of these members employed less than 100 people. This is the make-up of the major Canadian work force.

Now there is another one in Glengarry county under consideration, which will employ another 150 to 200 people. This is one of the counties which I think we all recognized when the hon. leader of the Liberal Party spoke about it last year that needed assistance, and this is only one that we have assisted. I could mention others when we get into the development corporation estimates. But it is only a few of those that are being considered in many of these slow-growth areas, as we refer to them. Perhaps this answers the hon. members doubts this morning, as to what we are doing in trying to decentralize industry into the areas that require it.

Mr. Nixon: I am still doubtful.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, that is a matter of opinion. Nobody has a magic wand. I never professed that when I took on the job that I would have a plant in every major town in Ontario overnight. But I think that when you take a look at what we have put into these towns over the last three years, and what is estimated will happen in the next few, that many of these growth centres will be available to people in the areas you have been talking about, rural people who need more employment and higher income, and that is the basis of our government's programme through the regional development.

Mr. Chairman: One moment please. I have been asked by the member for Parkdale to take note of the fact that in the west gallery are students from St. Josaphat school and St. Rita's school, from Toronto Parkdale.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, a great deal has already been said about the whole field of regional development this morning, and I do not want to cover that territory again. I was interested in the new socialism of the party to my right. I am not sure that the hon. Mitchell Sharp has heard about this yet, and perhaps that message ought to be conveyed to him in Ottawa. Perhaps one of the members here would take the responsibility to see that is done.

It was also very interesting to hear the progressive, even though uncoordinated line that the party in Opposition takes in this House. I am not sure that if they ever did achieve government that they would carry this through, but like their confreres in Ottawa, they will become reactionary once they achieve power. That remains to be seen.

Now Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the Minister's recital just now of the new industries that are coming into Ontario and I think this is good to build up our industrial base. But I would call this the bits and pieces approach to the whole problem. We are not getting at the fundamental, basic things that need to be done. I wonder if the Minister heard the Minister of Health this morning, when he presented his white paper on the election? He said, and I think he put his finger on the nub of the problem that the Minister of Economics and Development is facing today: "While the benefits of local autonomy are to be preserved"—this is the kind of thing we hear from this government year after year—"we must establish provincial objectives and standards and programmes to be provided for all the people of Ontario."

What for? Why set these standards? Why set up these provincial objectives? The reason is to overcome the very difficulty which they get into when we try to preserve this thing we call local autonomy. This is the problem. So we, somehow or other, try to preserve these little municipalities, these little power centres, because they are, I suppose the power base for the government party in the province. We preserve them, and we talk about them and give them lip service, but then when we try to operate within this kind of municipal structure, we find ourselves handicapped. We find that it is a sheer impossibility to operate in this kind of structure. So the various Ministers set up their own power bases, their own operative organizations, and the Minister of Health said this

morning that he is going to set up something. I think this is significant and would like the Minister to hear it. He said:

> Over the past 20 years, it has become apparent that to provide an adequate level of public health service, a large population must be served by the unit or the local health department.
>
> Many of our health units have been established on county boundaries and recently have experienced increasing problems in properly servicing these areas because of the small populations under their jurisdictions.
>
> In order to encourage the establishment of larger units—

they are going to give larger grants--

> —the boundaries of these health districts will be prepared by my department in consultation with local authorities.

In other words, The Department of Health is now coming to the conclusion that the regional units that are set up are now too small again, and that something larger must be looked at if we are going to have efficiency.

The Minister should take this to heart and should be telling the other Ministers of this dilemma of the Minister of Health, because the other Ministers are having exactly the same problem—they select their own boundaries for their own administrative units, but the problem the Minister faces is a very simple one, that he has set up his economic development councils. But in this setting they find that they are helpless, that they are powerless to do any significant job in this province, and so they are floundering. They are duplicating work that is being done by the chambers of commerce and by the tourist boards in the various cities and all these other organizations. They do not know where to go, and so the Minister is setting up a new kind of organization to discover where they ought to go and what they ought to be doing. The problem is there and he is unwilling to face it.

Instead of saying that the problem is fundamentally one of governmental jurisdiction, he sets up new boards, commissions and investigating committees. Instead of recognizing that we have to face the fact that new municipal power units must be set up, he flounders through these processes. The day is here when new regional, municipal governments must come in Ontario if we are to overcome these problems. In his department, and in every other department of this government, the sooner the Cabinet and this Minister face up to this fact, the sooner we are going to find our way out of this dilemma.

And so I say to the Minister today that his bits and pieces programme is not going to solve the problem. He is going to put an industry in there, and he is going to find that the housing shortage is more desperate than it was before and he does not have the houses to house his workers. He is going to find that the transportation system is not adequate. He is going to find all kinds of services which are going to be demanded and cannot be provided adequately and properly.

The only way these things can be done is to set up the kind of unit that can plan effectively and efficiently for the future, in cooperation with the government of this province, because today these small municipalities are helpless when it comes to planing in any realistic sense and in setting up the kind of centres that are need in providing the services that must be given for even these new industries that the Minister is putting here and there across the province.

So I say to him, let him be honest today; let him face this responsibility and this dilemma in which he finds himself. Let him admit honestly and frankly that the development units that he has set up in this province do not have the power to do the job, and then let him give leadership in setting out a new plan of municipal government which will encompass his dream as well as the dreams and the plans of the other Ministers. After all, this Minister is a pragmatist. I will say this: that he will look at propositions and his question is, does it work or does it not work? I think this is one of the characteristics of the man. And when he sees that a thing will not work, he generally says, "Well, let us find something that will work." And that may be what he is searching for with the new set-up in his department, trying to find what regional government means, or regional development means. But I gather that not yet is he willing to admit the need for regional government.

Well then, let him be a pragmatist. Let him see that this plan is not working and then let him move forward with a question, "What will work?" Let him look at the problem head on and realize that this whole matter can be resolved only with regional government with power to resolve these problems. So I say to the Minister today. "Give that leadership in the Cabinet, be honest and frank with your confreres, and let us see a new development in this province which is

meaningful, a development of regional government, which will then give you regional development." Let him realize that short of this new kind of municipalities, we are just not going to achieve the goal that he is setting himself to achieve.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, just a word and comment, I appreciate the hon. member's contribution this morning. I did not have an opportunity to read the Minister's statement as he presented it in the House any more than you did, perhaps he had a chance to go through it, I have not. But I would say there is a sub-committee of the council of health advisers—or an organization of health services—and the economics department is represented on this committee. So the very things I think he has suggested—perhaps he has been reading the Minister's mind, but we do have representation on that committee.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 402 carry?

Mr. Newman: May I ask the Minister, is an individual wishing to construct a warehouse eligible for assistance from the Ontario development corporation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are quite prepared to talk to anybody depending, as I say, on the circumstances. If it is a warehouse, say in the city of Toronto, we think they can get financing here. But if it is a warehouse in an area we have been talking about this morning, we are prepared to bend over backwards and see what we can do to help them.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am quite concerned about the Ontario advisory committee on Confederation whose funds are voted under this vote. I wonder if the Minister might give some indication to the House as to the extent to which this committee is in operation; if there have been changes in personnel; if the report that they have been able to develop in their months of research are available publicly in any way.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I might speak to this. The committee has been meeting on a regular basis since it was established, and as it has been discussed in this House previously there was some reluctance on the part of the members of the committee for some of their research to be made public. I have asked them if they would agree, but of course they serve as individuals. I would hope that within the next week or 10 days I will be able to table here in the House, some of the research they have done, and the papers that have been produced as a result of that research.

I have made very clear, and I will make it clear when I table them, that these papers do not constitute a government policy or government thinking.

Mr. MacDonald: Are they going to be anonymous?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, and they probably will not even represent a consensus of opinion among the committee itself. On the other hand, they are the product of great scholarship and great research and it is my wish that they do be made available. I am quite certain that they will not be agreed with by everyone, and I am quite certain that they will provide a high degree of stimulation of debate and discussion of these matters. I am happy to be able to tell you that I have been able to propel it along to that stage, and I would hope that over a period of time we will be able to present to the public a good number of these papers. I have some that are presently being prepared, and as soon as they are available I will table them here in the House.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that this information will be made available. I know that later in the session we will have an opportunity to discuss the Prime Minister's resolution on the proposal for the Confederation conference. It appears to me that the deliberations that these gentlemen have undertaken in the months and years gone by could very well give us a broad, common foundation on which our comments might be made, and it would obviously be useful not only to the people in the House here, but outside as well.

I was wondering if the meeting that was undertaken by the people coming into the office of the chief economist with their counterparts in the province of Quebec or Kingston recently, would have been at the behest of those people concerned with the Ontario advisory committee on Confederation. Perhaps the Prime Minister might make a statement on that conference.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would be quite happy to answer the question. I know that there has been some confusion. The conference was sponsored by the institute of intergovernmental relations at Queen's University, and it is only one project of several, I am informed, that the institute is going to carry out. These people were there in their individual capacities; in other words there was

no invitation extended to this government to send their committee on constitutional matters to this conference. The invitations were issued to the individuals concerned. There were members of the civil service of this government present and, once again, they were not there officially, they were there as individuals. I gather that there were some frank and informal discussions held at that time.

Mr. Nixon: They were private discussions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: They were private in that they were sponsored by this institute. The institute had the conduct of the meeting and the decision to make as to how the discussions would be conducted, and so on and so forth; so that our people were not sent there with any instructions from this government, because they went there as part of this government. As I said, it was sponsored by the institute of the university. The procedures followed were the decisions of the institute itself. I understand that there will be other meetings of a similar kind held and sponsored by that institute.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I have some other questions, if—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think that I would move that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed: Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think it has been mentioned through the Whips that we will sit on Monday night, and I think that we may take it that we will sit Monday, Tuesday and Thursday nights for the foreseeable future.

The order paper is starting to build itself up again after the Easter recess. We cleared off all the legislation there was and so I want to be in a position to call second readings of these bills that have been introduced in the House this past week, as soon as they have been on the order paper long enough for the members to acquaint themselves with the bills. When we have completed that, we will resume the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 57

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, April 10, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 10, 1967

Presenting report, Mr. Welch 1907

Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 1907

Statement re Dr. Morton Shulman, Mr. Robarts 1907

Notice of resignation, Mr. Thompson 1909

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Dr. Morton Shulman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Ben, Mr. Singer, Mr. S. Lewis 1909

Questions to Mr. Wishart re workmen's compensation board hospital, Mr. Singer, Mr. Trotter 1914

Question to Mr. Bales and Mr. Dymond re workmen's compensation board hospital, Mr. Trotter 1916

Questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Dymond and Mr. Bales re workmen's compensation board hospital, Mr. MacDonald 1917

Question to Mr. Wishart re Magistrate Richard Thrasher, Mr. Renwick 1918

Question to Mr. Wishart re personal property security bill, Mr. MacDonald 1918

Questions to Mr. Davis re secondary school curriculum, Mr. S. Lewis 1918

Statement re predator control, Mr. Brunelle 1919

Statement re federal-provincial Ministers' conference on financial institutions and securities regulations, Mr. Robarts 1920

Whirlpool Rapids Bridge Act, 1967, bill intituled, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 1921

Lewiston-Queenston Bridge Act, 1967, bill intituled, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 1921

Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, second reading 1922

Energy Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, second reading 1922

Division of properties into parts that are to be owned individually and parts that are to be owned in common, and to provide for the use and management of such properties, bill to facilitate, Mr. Wishart, second reading 1922

Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading 1928

Hospital Services Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading 1933

Election Act, bill to amend, on second reading, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Bryden, Mr. Demers, Mr. Newman 1934

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 1940

Recess, 6 o'clock 1944

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 10, 1967

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools; in the east gallery, Kent senior public school, Toronto; in the west gallery, St. Cecilia's separate school, Toronto and Royal York collegiate institute, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the 1966 report of the Minister of the Ontario Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE, 1961-1962

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to implement the commitment in the Throne speech to prohibit discrimination based on race, colour or creed in connection with the occupancy of all self-contained housing accommodation.

Hon. members will recall that the present provision of The Ontario Human Rights Code bans such discrimination only in respect of dwelling units and buildings containing more than three such units. I feel sure that all members of this House will fully support this further step to uphold the right and dignity of the people of this province.

This amendment will place The Ontario Human Rights Code in the forefront of all anti-discrimination legislation in North America. Equally significant is the second change which extends the fair employment provisions of the code to all employers by removing the present exemption to employers of less than five persons.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I should like to make a statement concerning certain allegations made by Dr. Morton Shulman, the former chief coroner of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

In the events of these past few days there have been certain allegations made by Dr. Shulman in regard to the conduct and motives of this government in a general sense, the Attorney General and senior members of the Attorney General's staff.

I do not treat these accusations lightly. I feel they are accusations that can raise doubts in the minds of the public as to the conduct of senior civil servants in the discharge of their duties and as to the motives of the government in conducting the affairs of the people of Ontario, and are in themselves very destructive of morale among the civil servants.

Mr. Speaker, it would be unwise, and the government does not intend, to permit these allegations, with the inferences that may be drawn from them, to remain uninvestigated or unanswered. If we are to have a government and a civil service in which the general public can have confidence then it is necessary that accusations such as these should be either proven or completely discounted.

It is therefore my intention to proceed immediately to appoint a single commissioner under The Public Inquiries Act to conduct a full, complete and impartial inquiry into the accusations made by Dr. Shulman against the government, against the Attorney General and against various civil servants.

In view of the fact that Dr. Shulman has been relieved of his responsibilities, he may, without fear or favour, lay his allegations before this inquiry in order that they may be impartially assessed.

Mr. Speaker: Regarding this matter, I wish to advise the House that my office received two motions this morning. The first one was submitted by the member for York South

(Mr. MacDonald) and the second by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) asking that this House do now adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance; namely, the peremptory dismissal of the chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto under circumstances which inevitably give rise to apprehension that information of vital public importance may be suppressed.

After considerable deliberation and looking into the rules of the House on this matter, I wish to make the following statement and I have so advised each of the respective party offices to this effect.

I have looked very carefully into the rules and precedents respecting the adjourning of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance re Dr. Shulman. I have come to the conclusion that while the subject matter of the proposed motion is definite in that it is a specific matter of recent occurrence, I have considerable doubt as to whether it can be considered urgent or of general public importance.

The dismissal of any public servant may be important in the area in which his duties were performed, that is in this case Metropolitan Toronto, without being of general importance to the province as a whole.

However, the most important consideration is that precedents have clearly established certain rules. May covers this whole question in the 17th edition, pages 363-369 inclusive, and gives specific examples of motions that have been deemed to be in order and thus deemed to be out of order. In paragraph four on page 366 he points out that the matter must involve more than the ordinary administration of the law, and as an example of motions that have been ruled out of order on this ground, sub-clause 9 towards the bottom of page 366 gives examples of cases where matters were ruled out of order because the matters involve only the exercise of discretion under statutory powers, such as the refusal to appoint a court of inquiry in a marine wireless dispute.

I am therefore of the opinion that the matter raised in this motion does not involve more than the ordinary administration of the law and is, in fact, an exercise of discretion under statutory powers. Consequently, following the precedents, I have no alternative but to rule this motion out of order. All questions that have been submitted on this subject today, however, will be allowed and, of course, the matter may be further discussed on the Budget debate which is presently before the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I realize that your ruling is not debatable. Nevertheless the allegations brought forward by Mr. Shulman, not his dismissal, are the matter of urgent public importance. The Prime Minister's statement a moment ago is going to put this—

Mr. Speaker: May I call the member to order. Whenever I have given a statement that the matter is out of order it is most difficult for a member to rise then to argue the reasons why he thinks it is in order, because in doing so he is really debating the question. I am afraid that I cannot allow the member to proceed with any remarks regarding the subject.

Mr. Nixon: With respect, there is only one thing then that is possible for me to do; and that is, with regret sir, to challenge your ruling in this matter.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can be permitted an observation. It is our right to challenge you in this ruling. Quite frankly we have long ago come to the conclusion that challenging the Speaker's ruling is a futile pursuit, partly because the government members are all going to back you in any case, and secondly because I think it brings into disrepute authority in this House. Basically the problem is the rules of the House. If this motion is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker, this rule is a dead letter. If this rule is a dead letter and we are denied our rights in this House—traditional rights—then we have no alternative but to go outside this House and to say there what we are not permitted to say here. That I propose to do immediately by calling a press conference.

Mr. Speaker: Before the questions of the day I would like to bring to the attention of the House a letter that I have received from the member for Dovercourt (Mr. Thompson).

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have challenged your ruling. Does this not call for some action on your part?

The House divided on the ruling of the Speaker, which was upheld by the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Ben
Auld	Braithwaite
Bales	Bryden
Beckett	Bukator

AYES	NAYS
Bernier	Davison
Boyer	Farquhar
Brunelle	Freeman
Carton	Lewis (Scarborough West)
Connell	Newman
Cowling	Nixon
Davis	Oliver
Demers	Singer
Dunlop	Smith
Dymond	Taylor
Eagleson	Trotter
Edwards	Worton
Evans	Young—17.
Ewen	
Grossman	
Guindon	
Hamilton	
Harris	
Haskett	
Henderson	
Hodgson (Victoria)	
Johnston (Carleton)	
Kerr	
Knox	
Lawrence (Russell)	
Lawrence (St. George)	
Lewis (Humber)	
Mackenzie	
MacNaughton	
Morningstar	
McNeil	
Noden	
Olde	
Peck	
Pittock	
Pritchard	
Randall	
Reilly	
Reuter	
Robarts	
Rollins	
Rowe	
Simonett	
Spooner	
Villeneuve	
Walker	
Wardrope	
Welch	
Wells	
Whitney	
Wishart	
Yaremko—56.	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 56, the "nays" 17.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the ruling upheld.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions for the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), before the orders of the day, notice of which—

Mr. Speaker: Before we start the questions, I have another matter to bring to the attention of the House, if the member will permit me at this time.

Kendal Post Office,
Kendal, Ontario.
April 6.

HON. D. H. MORROW,
SPEAKER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,
QUEEN'S PARK,
TORONTO.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER:

I hereby tender my resignation as the member for Dovercourt riding in the legislative assembly of Ontario to take effect as of the above date.

Yours truly,
(signed)
ANDREW E. THOMPSON

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have five questions for the hon. Attorney General.

Would the Attorney General inform the House whether under his interpretation of The Coroners Act, a coroner's chief responsibility is to the people he serves, or to The Department of the Attorney General?

It is my understanding that you would like these all put on the record at this time and the Attorney General would then reply. Is that so?

Second, why and on whose authority did Mr. Jack Hills, the executive officer to Dr. H. B. Cotnam, advise Dr. E. Cass that he should not conduct the inquest scheduled for April 5, 1967, into the death of Francisco Gaultieri?

Third, why was Dr. M. T. Shulman advised by you by letter dated April 7, 1967, that his appointment as chief coroner for Metropolitan Toronto had been terminated?

Was there any order-in-council passed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council authorizing such termination? If so, on what date and at what time was that order-in-council passed?

Why was no announcement of such governmental decision made to the Legislature on Friday, April 7, 1967, while it was in session?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in answering the first question, "Would the Attorney General inform the House whether under his interpretation of

The Coroners Act, a coroner's chief responsibility is to the people he serves, or to The Department of the Attorney General?" I would answer as follows:

The coroner has a common law duty to the public which is circumscribed and defined in the provisions of The Coroners Act of Ontario, as enacted by this Legislature. His duty to the public is related to the supervisory and advisory capacity of the supervising coroner for Ontario, as set out in section 2 of the statute.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): There is more to it than that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker—I have had so many questions today —that I have the order of these as they were read, but the question from the hon. leader of the Opposition was, "In view of the dismissal of Dr. Morton Shulman as chief coroner for Metropolitan Toronto, would the Minister advise the House why and on whose authority" and so on.

The first part of the question—the direction that he should not conduct the inquest into the death of Francisco Gaultieri—was on the authority of the supervising coroner of Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: Who has no authority in the matter; he has no statutory authority at all.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): None at all.

Mr. Bryden: The executive branch is trying to interfere—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps the hon. member should read the Act.

Mr. Bryden: I have; the Minister has not represented it accurately.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, "Why was Dr. Shulman advised by you [that is myself] by letter dated April 7, 1967, that his appointment as chief coroner for Metropolitan Toronto had been terminated?"

Why? Because he had been dismissed by order-in-council on April 6, effective April 7, and as the Minister in charge of coroners, I sent him the notice of termination.

Question three, was there an order-in-council? Yes.

Four: "Why was no announcement of such governmental decision made to the Legislature on Friday, April 7, 1967, while it was in session?"

Well, for two reasons, I think. I think it would be courteous to have the official concerned receive the notice first, to be the first to be informed, and we were not able to have that notice placed in his hands until about 3.30, I believe it was, on April 7.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Why did the Minister not quote the order-in-council in his letters?

Mr. Bryden: Why did he not tell them there was an order-in-council?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Does the hon. member want to ask a question?

Mr. Ben: I have three questions of the Attorney General, notice of which has been given.

1. Has the Attorney General ever been informed by the former chief coroner for Metropolitan Toronto of inquests in which he, the former chief coroner, felt that information had been suppressed?

2. Can the Minister recall any kind of agreement, verbal or otherwise, that the supervising coroner of the province would not interfere in the work of the Metro coroner's office nor call individual coroners about their cases, if Dr. Shulman agreed to release no critical comment of The Attorney General's Department or its officials, and agreed further to communicate with The Department of the Attorney General through the supervising coroner?

3. Would the Minister inform the House what plans, if any, he has to appoint an acting or *pro tem.* chief coroner for Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: As I say, Mr. Speaker, I have so many questions I am having difficulty in locating the typewritten answers, but I am prepared to answer the questions in any event.

Mr. Ben: May I assist the Attorney General by reading the questions again one at a time?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I recall them: Has the Attorney General ever been informed by the former chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto of inquests in which he—that is the

chief coroner—felt information had been suppressed?

The answer is, Mr. Speaker, he has informed me of some such alleged cases and these were reviewed in substantial detail. I was completely satisfied that the allegations were unfounded.

The second question: What plans has the Minister for the appointment of a full time chief coroner for Metropoliton Toronto? I would answer, Mr. Speaker, that this matter is under consideration.

The third question: Can the Minister recall any kind of agreement, verbal or otherwise, that the supervising coroner of the province would not interfere in the work of the Metro coroner's office nor call individual coroners about their cases, if Dr. Shulman agreed to release no critical comments of The Attorney General's Department or its officials; and agreed further to communicate further with The Attorney General's Department through the supervising coroner.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer this question quite fully. The coroner for Metropolitan Toronto, Dr. Shulman, had an interview with me in the early days of April, 1965, when he attended upon me with respect to certain difficulties which we were having with his manner of procedure.

Three things were discussed with him at some length. One was that he should not interfere with matters outside of Metropolitan Toronto, that is, matters having to do with coroners. And it was pointed out to him that his jurisdiction was Metro Toronto and that he should not be getting into disputes and attempting to assert authority over coroners outside that area.

The other was that he should communicate with my office, and with me, through proper channels; that is, through the supervising coroner for Ontario, who has supervision over all coroners.

With respect to criticisms which he had to offer, it was suggested to him and he was asked to observe this arrangement; that if he had criticisms to make of things which he thought were wrongful, or where there was negligence, or failure or room for improvement, that he should make that to The Department of the Attorney General rather than running first to the press, so that we might have an opportunity to have his criticisms, to have his information, to have his suggestions and to deal with them.

This was perhaps not too important a thing but we felt it was only reasonable for an official serving in the office he was holding to bring his critical comments, his suggestions, critical or otherwise, to us. Those things he was asked to do and on April 5, 1965, Dr. Shulman wrote saying that he was prepared to observe these three matters. He then suggested in the same letter that he would like to suggest that Dr. H. B. Cotnam, the supervising coroner of Ontario, should not interfere in Metropolitan Toronto, or should not take any part in Metropolitan Toronto.

That letter was acknowledged on April 7, 1965, by myself, in which I noted his undertakings. I would point out that there was no agreement—and I want to make this very clear—there was no agreement having to do with Dr. Cotnam, and I would not—nor would any Minister of the Crown—enter into an agreement with an official—

Mr. Bryden: Did the Minister's letter say that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There was no suggestion of an agreement.

Mr. S. Lewis: What is an undertaking?

Mr. Bryden: The Minister wrote him a letter in answer to a letter from him. Why did you not deal with all the points in his letter?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I accepted his undertaking.

Mr. Bryden: But did the Minister tell him he did not accept the other part?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the member will allow me to finish, he can ask another question if he likes and I will answer it fully. I answered the letter on April 7 referring to his undertakings and appreciating those undertakings—

Mr. S. Lewis: Read us the letter!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The member will have an opportunity to see it. I noted the suggestions which he had made and said they would be taken under consideration. But I want to make it clear that there was never any thought in my mind, and I am quite sure there was not in Dr. Shulman's, of any suggestion that there was an agreement entered into. First of all, I would not contemplate entering into an agreement with any official of my department, and secondly the duties of the supervising coroner of Ontario, as well as those of the supervising coroner for any metropolitan area are set down in The Coroners Act. There was no agreement.

Mr. Ben: May I ask the Minister a supplementary question arising out of that answer?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Ben: Is it not a fact that the coroner's office was established in the early days of English history in order to determine whether or not in essence the king's men, or the baron's men had in fact liquidated a person who was found dead, and the coroner and his jury were supposed to be completely impartial and were to protect the citizens against the ravages of the king's men? If this is so, and it is, are you not in fact now cutting out the office of the coroner because you in fact are the king's men?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this is really not a question but I would like to say this: I think it is definitely a fact that the coroner's office was established and ran under the common law for many years. We have now The Coroners Act—a statute—which sets forth in definite terms the duties and responsibilities of a coroner and he is still responsible to the Crown in the right of the province of Ontario, as the original coroner was responsible to the Crown for his appointment.

Mr. Singer: I have a series of questions as well, bowing to—

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Yorkview have a question for the Attorney General?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Yes. It has to do with the question placed on the order paper on Friday by the hon. member for Riverdale and it seemed to me to be an appropriate time when the answer to that question could be elicited.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: That question was already submitted to the Minister and the Minister will answer it whenever he decides to do so. I do not think it is in order for you to read the question again. The Minister can take it on his own time when he is prepared to answer this question.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, it seemed to me that we were now right on the question asked on Friday and it might be a good time for the hon. Minister to answer.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but there are other questions that we have to deal with first today.

Mr. Singer: I have a series of questions for the Attorney General and I will read them and he can answer them in order.

On what authority and on whose instructions did Mr. Jack Hills attempt to seize Dr. Shulman's files on April 9, 1967?

What was the purpose of these instructions?

The next question: With respect to the employment of coroners in the Metropolitan Toronto area:

1. Why was Dr. Shulman's recommendation that Dr. Sereny be appointed as a coroner for Metropolitan Toronto never acted upon?

2. Why and on whose recommendation were two coroners, Drs. Bennett and Cranston appointed to serve in the extreme east end of Toronto?

3. Why has a coroner not been appointed to fill a vacancy in North Toronto, a vacancy first brought to the attention of the Attorney General by Dr. Shulman more than a year ago?

The next question: In view of the controversy surrounding the former chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto, will the Minister advise the House whether a full inquiry will be made into these various matters by the standing committee on legal bills?

Will the Minister table in the House all correspondence between himself and Dr. Shulman from January 1, 1965, and up to the present date?

The next question: In view of the statements in the press by Metropolitan Toronto's former chief coroner, Dr. Morton Shulman, would the Minister inform the House:

1. Were the plans for the workmen's compensation board hospital ever submitted to the Ontario fire marshal for his approval prior to the construction of that hospital?

2. Was the workmen's compensation board hospital ever inspected by the Ontario fire marshal or his officials either while it was being constructed or after its construction was completed? If so, on what dates and if so, would the Minister table copies of such inspection report in the House?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I have been able to keep the questions in order but I shall answer them all in any event. They may not appear in order as they were read.

On the answer to one of the questions as to the warrant for the inquest on April 5, I am advised that the warrant for the inquest to be held on April 5, 1967, was issued on April 3, 1967. On the morning of that date Mr. Hills advised Dr. Cass that he should not proceed with an inquest as the supervising coroner for Ontario would be issuing a warrant and would

be conducting an inquest in the immediate future as the matter related to a provincial institution and was of significant concern to all the people of the province.

This direction was given pursuant to subsection (3) of section 10 of The Coroners Act and pursuant to the general authority of the supervising coroner for Ontario under section 2 of that statute.

Perhaps I can relate the next question: Why was Dr. Shulman advised by you by letter of April 7 that his appointment as chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto had been terminated?

The answer is: Dr. Shulman was advised to this effect because, as clearly stated in that letter, he had repudiated the authority of the supervising coroner for Ontario, and he had without justification impugned the integrity of my office in a manner which was completely inconsistent with the responsibility and the jurisdictional authority of the office of chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto.

The third question: Was there any order-in-council passed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council authorizing such termination? If so, on what date and at what time was that order-in-council passed?

The answer is, the order-in-council was approved by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor and dated Thursday, April 6, 1967, and terminated Dr. Shulman's appointment effective Friday, April 7, 1967.

Mr. Singer: What time was the order-in-council passed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The order-in-council was dated April 6 and the termination of the employment was effective April 7.

Mr. Singer: What time on the day of April 6 was it passed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: What time?

Mr. Singer: What hour of the day of April 6 was it passed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Was the order-in-council passed?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The Cabinet meeting was held on the regular day of Cabinet meetings, on April 6, commencing at 10 o'clock and ran through, I believe, until some time between noon and one o'clock. I could not give the member anything closer than that.

Mr. Singer: Well, there was a full day and a half sittings of the House after that.

Mr. S. Lewis: He did not bother to inform the House.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The termination was not effective until April 7.

The next question: Why was no announcement of such governmental decision made to the Legislature on Friday, April 7, while it was in session? The answer is: It was felt that in fairness to Dr. Shulman, he should be advised of his dismissal by the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General prior to the disclosure to the public of that dismissal.

The letter was delivered by hand to the office of Dr. Shulman at approximately 3.15 on Friday afternoon and the disclosure was subsequently made public by the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

Question five: Why was Dr. Shulman's recommendation that Dr. Sereny be appointed as a coroner for Metropolitan Toronto never acted upon? The answer, Mr. Speaker: Under the provisions of The Coroners Act, a coroner is appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, who acts upon the recommendation of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

The recommendation respecting Dr. Sereny was received from Dr. Shulman and it was given every consideration. Dr. Shulman's recommendation was reviewed by the supervising coroner who obtained advice from persons familiar both with the individual and the duties of the office, as is the procedure followed with all recommendations.

I might say I have a question on this same point from the hon. member for Scarborough West: why was Dr. George Sereny not appointed? I would like to deal with this on the same time: Why was Dr. George Sereny not appointed a coroner for the north-central area of Metropolitan Toronto? If there is a reason, why was it not conveyed to either Dr. Sereny or Dr. Shulman for more than a year after application was made?

My answer, as I had framed it to that question, was that while Dr. Sereny had admirable qualifications in some specialties, there are other qualifications that we felt might be desirable for a coroner.

The second part of the question—the application was under consideration for a considerable time as are many appointments. I would add that we do consider that general practitioners who are not specialists, may be more objective in conducting inquests since they receive expert advice generally from witnesses.

The next question is No. 6 on my list: "At the time of the construction of the workmen's compensation board hospital—"

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, before the Attorney General proceeds to answer the next question, I wonder if he would answer the second part of the question by the hon. member for Scarborough West. It was: Why were neither Dr. Sereny nor Dr. Shulman advised of the reasons why you were not willing to appoint him, so that another recommendation could be made?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I did really answer that question, Mr. Speaker; that part of it. I said the matter was under consideration for a very considerable time, but in the meantime other appointments were made.

Mr. Bryden: But not for that area.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Coroners are not necessarily appointed for areas. They are appointed for large areas, not for a section of the city.

Mr. S. Lewis: You were overloaded in Scarborough, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have had no difficulty in getting coroners to go out there as far as I am aware.

Mr. Bryden: But the Attorney General did not get any recommendations from the chief coroner with regard to the appointment that was made. He simply sat on the one made to him and then went on his own and appointed other people.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That may be.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary question to those questions, if the Attorney General—

Mr. Speaker: The member will have to ask the Attorney General if he will answer a supplementary question.

Mr. S. Lewis: I said, if the hon. Minister would permit.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I will permit.

Mr. S. Lewis: Just what precisely are these additional qualifications required which prevented Dr. Sereny from assuming this post?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think I can answer that at the moment. I have indicated that general qualification is sometimes much more valuable in the coroner's appointment than to have a specialist in one particular field. This recommendation was put forward to my office by Dr. Shulman as a specialist to deal in one particular field and he would actually be much more valuable as an expert witness. It was a matter of—

Mr. Bryden: Why did the Attorney General not tell him that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Just a moment; if the hon. member will allow, the recommendation was based on Dr. Sereny's knowledge in blood alcohol tests and effects, which was an expert type of knowledge and I take nothing away from that. But as a coroner, we did not feel that was a prime consideration.

Mr. S. Lewis: Are there any other coroners who are specialists in the province?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I would not say we have none, none that are not specialists. But we do not particularly pick a specialist to sit. It would not be a disqualification.

Mr. Bryden: The Attorney General has given no reason at all.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member can shout out his opinion.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The question of the hon. member for Downsview, No. 6: "Were the plans for the workmen's compensation board hospital ever submitted to the Ontario fire marshal for his approval prior to construction?" The answer to that, Mr. Speaker: at the time of the construction of the workmen's compensation board hospital, there was no provision or regulation by which the plans were to be approved or required to be approved by the fire marshal.

In 1961 the procedure was instituted with the coordination of the Ontario hospital services commission, whereby all plans for hospitals would be submitted for approval to the fire marshal as to fire safety measures, prior to construction.

Mr. Singer: What about the second part of that question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is an extra question: "Was the workmen's compensation board hospital ever inspected by the Ontario fire marshal or his officials either while it

was being constructed or after its construction was completed?" The answer is no.

Question No. 8, as I have it, "Will the Minister advise the House whether a full inquiry will be made into these various matters by the standing committee on legal bills?" I think in the light of the announcement made by the Prime Minister, the inquiry will certainly not be before the standing committee on legal bills.

Mr. Singer: —not mutually exclusive at all—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am sure there will be a full inquiry.

In answer to question No. 9: "Will the Minister table in the House all correspondence between himself and Dr. Shulman?" No, I do not propose to table that correspondence in the House; also in light of the inquiry which has been announced, all the correspondence will certainly be made public.

Mr. Singer: Very convenient—an inquiry—

Mr. Bryden: Start it after the election.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Will the Minister proceed if he has any further answers?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the next question of the hon. member for Downsview was: "On what authority and on whose instructions did Mr. Jack Hills attempt to seize Dr. Shulman's files on April 9, 1967, and what was the purpose of these instructions?"

The answer is that Mr. Hills attended at the office of the chief coroner on Saturday, April 9, for the purpose, firstly, to ensure that the employees would be aware of the changeover with the dismissal of the chief coroner, and to ensure that no further public files would be removed from this public office, because Dr. Shulman had been removing material from the office; secondly, to obtain the name and address of a witness in Saskatchewan who was under subpoena to attend the Stern inquest tomorrow—that is Tuesday —in order that he might be advised of a proposed adjournment of this Stern inquest.

I would like to elaborate, Mr. Speaker, to say that nothing has been removed by the department from that office. There never was any intention of so doing, but a number of files, following Dr. Shulman's dismissal, have been removed by him.

Mr. Bryden: And placed in safekeeping.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the next question, the final one I think, from the member for Downsview, was: "Would the Minister advise why Dr. Shulman will not be allowed to conduct the inquest into the death of John Stern, scheduled for Tuesday, April 11, 1967, and who is now going to conduct the inquest?"

I think it is quite apparent that the reason why he will not be allowed to conduct it is because he is not any longer a coroner, and therefore has no jurisdiction to conduct the inquest since his appointment as coroner was terminated on April 7. It is proposed that Dr. F. B. Cruickshank, senior coroner for Metropolitan Toronto, will conduct that inquest and he has been asked to do so and he has had preliminary meetings with the Crown attorney and with others involved. It is anticipated, however, that the inquest will be adiourned tomorrow to a date in the near future so that the new coroner may become thoroughly familiar with the matter.

Mr. Singer: What is the significance of the word "senior coroner"? Is that by time of appointment or—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I refer to him in that way because I understand that he has less than a year to go before he is required to retire under The Coroners Act. I know this further, that he is one of the most capable and highly regarded coroners in Metro Toronto, and has had a long experience and is highly respected.

Mr. Singer: How long has he been a coroner?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not able at this moment to tell the hon. member the number of years he has served. It is a good number of years.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions of the Attorney General. I did have three, but in the course of answering some of these, he did answer one I had.

The first question is: Now that Dr. H. B. Cotnam, the province's supervising coroner, is in charge of the inquest into a death at the workmen's compensation board hospital, what extra witnesses if any, does he intend to call?

The second question is: In view of amendments last September to The Coroners Act which make it mandatory for a coroner to check all nursing home deaths, (1) would the Minister say whether or not these amendments will cost perhaps an extra $250,000

across the province, and (2) what useful purpose, if any, is served by the new scheme?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question, I would simply say that Dr. Elie Cass, who had received Dr. Shulman's warrant to conduct the inquest into the hospital fire death, remains in charge of that inquest. The question premises that Dr. Cotnam is in charge. Dr. Elie Cass will continue to conduct that inquest.

The second question, as to the effect of amendments last year to The Coroners Act making it mandatory for a coroner to check all nursing home deaths, asks: (1) Would the Minister say whether these will cost perhaps an extra $250,000 across the province; and (2) what useful purpose is served?

The amendments to The Coroners Act last year brought in a number of public institutions where persons were going, not necessarily voluntarily, but were being sent and kept in those places, other institutions, such as nursing homes, where persons were in a sort of public institution. It was felt—and this was thoroughly considered at the time the legislation was prepared, and at the time it was presented in this House—that where deaths occurred to persons in those types of institutions, they should be reported, and I think this is very right and proper. They should be reported to the coroner in the area, so that the public may know how these institutions are being run, and have an opportunity to investigate where deaths occur.

I would say this, that certainly I would not anticipate for a moment that in every death that occurs in such institutions, hospitals included, it would be necessary to have an inquest, but it was felt that the coroner should know and have the notification, so that he might make such inquiries as were proper. I would anticipate there would be some additional cost in those investigations, but to suggest a figure of $250,000 seems to me to be just picking something out of the blue without any reason whatsoever. I should think the cost would be rather small, as a part of the coroners' duties, and I do not anticipate that a great many inquests will come from these cases. But it was legislation designed to protect persons in public institutions.

Mr. Trotter: I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would permit a supplementary question?

When the Minister says the figure will not be $250,000, but small, how small is small? Has the Minister no idea of the overall cost?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member's judgment is perhaps as good as mine. I do not know where he got the figure of $250,000. I do not know if that is his figure or not, or where that came from. But certainly I would think that would be ten times too much. I can make an estimate as well as whoever made that one. It is simply a matter of reporting the deaths in these public institutions. The coroner will make some necessary investigation to determine, perhaps from the doctor who is treating the person, how the death occurred, but I certainly do not anticipate any more than in hospitals, that every death needs an inquest.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour.

The question is: In view of charges that supervision at the workmen's compensation board hospital is such that patients have been taking night leave to go across the road to a drinking establishment and crawling back into the building through windows, what action if any does the Minister intend to take?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the allegation and it, like other circumstances of the unfortunate occurrence, is being investigated. That investigation was started the same day that the fire occurred.

Mr. Trotter: I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister could give us any idea when we might have an answer?

Hon. Mr. Bales: At the moment, Mr. Speaker, I have no idea as to when the investigation will be complete. But I will proceed with it as soon as I get the report.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, one last question from me. It is for the hon. Minister of Health.

Would the Minister inform the House whether any hospitals in Ontario are being built with inflammable paper fibre ceilings? If so what, if anything, does the Minister intend to do about it?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney General pointed out, since the hospital services commission came into operation, all plans for new construction in public hospitals, all plans for renovation, are examined by the fire marshal's office before approval is given by the Ontario hospital services commission.

I am advised by the fire marshal's office that since April, 1961, only non-combustible

ceiling tiles have been approved for installation in new or renovation hospital projects.

The Ontario hospital services commission is now investigating whether there are any combustible tiles in older hospital facilities that have not been replaced through renovation projects undertaken since that date.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could tell us when the fire marshal might have some final report in, in regard to older hospitals that may have this type of ceiling which at the moment we do not know of? Is there any date when he will finalize the report?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, there is no date. We are trying to push this forward as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, conceivably some of these questions have been replied to, in part or in whole.

One, are general hospitals regularly inspected for fire hazards?

Two, if so by whom and under what regulations?

Three, do these regulations apply to and are such regular inspections carried out with the workmen's compensation board hospital?

Four, if so, why would inflammable material be used in the original construction or their existence be tolerated in the subsequent operation of the workmen's compensation board hospital at Downsview?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member has been pretty well stated in my previous remarks and those of my colleague, the Minister of Health.

I would simply say my department does not inspect the buildings—hospital buildings—but the fire marshal does approve the building plans for fire safety purposes of all hospitals, that practice having been introduced in 1961. That was subsequent, of course, to the construction of the workmen's compensation board hospital which suffered the fire.

I think that answers the question as to why the inflammable materials were used—because there were no regulations at that time, certainly not affecting my department, none at all with regard to the inspection and passing on the material to be used. And we still do not inspect hospitals. We do inspect the plans now to make sure that they are proper as to material, as to design, as to fire safety, doors, construction, and so on.

Mr. MacDonald: Who then does the inspecting?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This I would have to ask. The Ontario hospital services commission, I think. I am not sure whether they cover workmen's compensation board hospitals or not.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, who does the fire inspection?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well sir, I have been looking into this since this unfortunate incident occurred and I can tell you the safety of hospitals, fire safety, fire drills, and so on, are the responsibility of the local boards and the administration.

However, the administration is required to have periodic inspections by the representative of the fire marshal's branch, and it is my understanding that every local fire chief is a representative of the fire marshal. However, I might well be wrong in that. But the hospital administration is required annually to report to the commission on the findings of the fire marshal's representative or the local fire department in the matter of safety.

In the matter of the materials, the Attorney General has pointed out The Department of Health, through the Ontario hospital services commission only came into this area in 1959, and since that time, as I pointed out, all plans have been submitted to the fire marshal's branch before approval is given.

Mr. Singer: Did I understand the Minister correctly when he said—

Mr. MacDonald: It is my question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Well, it was partly yours and partly mine earlier.

Mr. MacDonald: Mine, I thought. I assume that what the Minister has said refers to general hospitals. Does it also apply to the workmen's compensation board hospital in Downsview?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Speaker. We are not responsible for that hospital since we contribute nothing to its maintenance.

Mr. MacDonald: Who is?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The workmen's compensation board.

Mr. MacDonald: My question, Mr. Speaker, is this. Maybe I am directing it to the wrong Minister. Who is responsible for the periodic inspection and report, comparable to the kind of report that must come from a hospital board annually through the fire marshal? Maybe the Minister of Labour can—

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I do not have all the facts before me, but I would simply advise the hon. member through you that it is my understanding that the township fire department makes inspections there. This forms part of the investigation that is going forward at the present time.

Mr. S. Lewis: The Attorney General called it a provincial institution.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question is, is it a public hospital under The Public Hospitals Act, or is it a private hospital?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is a convalescent hospital in the first instance, sir, but it is not to the best of my knowledge under The Public Hospitals Act.

An hon. member: Which Act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot tell you that.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can leave this and go to something in which there may be more clarity. But unfortunately the Minister is not here, so maybe I can put it on the record for his perusal when he returns.

To the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme): Can the Minister clarify details in connection with the proposed location of the four lane highway through the Niagara parks commission territory?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I had a question which I submitted on Friday to the Attorney General. I wonder whether he has an answer to it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Which one?

Mr. Renwick: Has the Attorney General received a resignation from Magistrate Richard Thrasher, the junior magistrate of Windsor? If he has, will he accept it immediately? If he has not, will he demand one from Magistrate Thrasher in view of the vacillations of Magistrate Thrasher reported in the press yesterday and today—Thursday and Friday?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have not received any resignation. I think I would like to add that I read in a newspaper an article about a suggestion that he was thinking of some political venture and I have asked him to come and see me at once, to let me know what his thoughts are.

Mr. Singer: Give him political advice.

Mr. MacDonald: Do you fire those who want their jobs and keep those who cannot make up their minds?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have not seen him yet, but he is coming in soon.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. In view of the statement of the chairman of the law reform commission in Halifax on March 18, last—

> I think it is now an open secret that the bill and complementary and amending and repeal legislation is ready for enactment—

—when does the Attorney General intend to introduce the personal property security bill?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the report of the law reform commission on The Personal Property Securities Act, what I thought was the final report with the bill attached, was received very recently. You will recall that I filed the report last year in order that it might be studied and we have had discussions here in my estimates about the studies which went on.

When I received the last report, I gave it some study. There were some things still which we felt we should have a look at and discuss with the law reform commission. That is being done. I believe that we have resolved pretty well our discussions now and I should be able to introduce it very shortly; a matter of days, I would think.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), which I would like to put on the record.

When does the Minister expect to receive the study of the Ontario securities commission, announced June 11, 1964, under the direction of James Baillie of the Timmins area penny stock boom?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, I have a two-part question for the Minister of Education.

Would the Minister elaborate on the meaning of remarks in his Hamilton speech attributed to him by the press this morning, to wit:

(a) Students have found that the four year secondary course cuts them off from full secondary studies.

(b) The government has abandoned the idea of eliminating grade 13. Precisely how does the Minister intend to make grade 13 a more useful educational year?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister for Education): Mr. Speaker, I really cannot account for the interpretation placed upon not only a speech I gave in Hamilton on Saturday evening, but some dialogue or discussion between the Minister and those who were in the audience. This is perhaps sometimes an unwise thing for a Minister of the Crown to do but I indulge in it quite regularly.

I think the statement with respect to the four year secondary school programme really should be taken in context with the explanation I was giving as regards the development of the colleges of applied arts and technology. I believe I stated in my speech and in the question period afterwards that one of the reasons for the comprehensive development of this programme was to accommodate many of the students from the four year programme in the secondary schools, and that parents, teachers, and most of us were recognizing that a good portion of young people needed something beyond the secondary school, and this is one of the roles which the community college will fill.

With respect to the idea of eliminating grade 13, I endeavoured, Mr. Speaker, to explain to the group there the pros and cons, if I can use this term, of the decision with respect to the grade 13 year pointing out some of the steps that have already been taken and indicating that not only administratively, but educationally, it was a very difficult decision and that it would require further study before any decision was made. It was very specifically stated that the matter was still very much under study.

I went on to relate a personal observation that I make from time to time, which I have also made in this House, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the member recalls this, and this is perhaps the reason for the story: That is, that in my own personal view, it was not a question of eliminating grade 13, but that the course content therein would continue to be relevant to the entire course of studies, and probably if this did happen it would involve a restructuring of curriculum from grade 1 to grade 12 to offer in 12 years what is presently being offered in 13 years. This is perhaps the solution to the grade 13 problem. If the hon. member still follows me I think I have made this statement in this House before.

With respect to the final part of the member's question, I indicated that I believe one of the chief benefits of eliminating the external departmental examinations in the grade 13 year will be to make it a more useful educational experience, without the emphasis on examinations and the teaching that is related to achieving a passing mark in June on the external type of tests. I believe that the secondary school teachers can, and will, do a better educational job in the grade 13 year than has been the case heretofore.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, this explains rather briefly the rather lengthy statement and discussion I indulged in on Saturday evening in Hamilton.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I grieve for the misinterpretation placed on the Minister's remarks and would only ask him, by way of a supplementary question, how does he manage to get so much bad press so often?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I could answer this by saying that the member on occasion has accused me of just the opposite.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Lands and Forests.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement on a matter of some public interest—wolves. The following is a statement on our predator control programme.

The department's wolf management programme is based upon facts revealed by a research programme conducted over a 10-year period. It is evident that predation due to wolves in particular areas can be reduced by efficient trapping methods. Frequently, damage can be attributed to one or two individual animals rather than whole local populations, where farm livestock is concerned. In agricultural areas in general, predation is due to coyotes, coyote-dog hybrids and frequently to farm dogs, especially where sheep are concerned. Coyotes are cyclical and during the last three years population levels have been high. A decline is anticipated. Where no predation on farm farm animals occurs, there is no real reason for controlling wolf populations.

At present, the department has 25 specially trained predator control officers whose responsibility is to effect control through trapping in local areas where damage occurs. They also assist local farmers and trappers to use more efficient means of trapping, and this has been a successful approach.

It is proposed to appoint additional predator control officers. These are to be placed where there is expressed need.

The value of predator control workshops was demonstrated in 1966 in Pembroke district, where 65 local people attended, to receive instruction from a professional trapper. During

September and October while the workshop was in progress, 20 out of 29 wolves bountied from this district were captured using the methods which had been taught.

During 1967, it is proposed to conduct three predator control workshops under the direction of the same trapper in Parry Sound district, Haliburton and the North Hastings-Renfrew area. It should be noted that these are critical areas since agriculture is being practised within or adjacent to heavily forested country.

To rebuild the deer herd and maintain it at a reasonably high level, the department proposes to rehabilitate 20,000 square miles of southern Ontario deer range. On the basis of existing knowledge, improvement of 18,000 acres annually spread over the whole range above would be necessary. The average cost of such an operation would be $15 per acre or $270,000 annually with particular attention being paid to areas where there is indication of a low level of deer population. A special effort will be made to attract deer to selected spots along Highway 60 in Algonquin Park.

After considering all factors relative to increasing the bounty for wolves, the department feels it cannot justify such action.

Any increase in wolf bounty would not necessarily result in more wolves being taken in areas where predator control is desirable. All provinces in Canada and practically all the states in the United States, except Alaska, have abandoned wolf bounties due to the fact that they could not prove that they had any bearing on the number of wolves taken.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to inform the House of a federal-provincial meeting of Ministers concerned with financial institutions and securities regulations which is being held today in Ottawa.

The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs is attending on behalf of this province, which is why the hon. member for Riverdale has not had his questions answered today. In recent months there have been several suggestions put forward for convening such a conference at the Prime Ministerial level. These included a recommendation which came from the Prime Minister of Quebec to the Prime Minister of Canada dated February 10. Mr. Johnson's suggestion was then referred to each of the provinces and was very enthusiastically endorsed by this province. The outcome of this was the conference which is now being held in Ottawa as the Ministerial legal preliminary to a further meeting of Prime Ministers.

In an opening statement to the conference at Ottawa, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs stated—and I am going to quote his statement as I think it is of interest to the members here:

> Among the various problems requiring resolution in a federal-provincial context there are none more pressing than those concerned with financial institutions and securities legislation. For this reason the government of Ontario is pleased to participate in this meeting. We hope that this conference will mark a milestone along the path to an explicit agreement on our respective responsibilities as well as ensuring that we can establish effective machinery to discharge those responsibilities.
>
> We agree with the Prime Minister of Quebec that the urgency surrounding these matters makes an early conference appropriate. As you know, I supported publicly the suggestion of the Minister of Finance last December that there should be an early meeting to discuss legislation dealing with finance companies. On December 19, Mr. Sharp suggested to the House of Commons that the provincial authorities must find ways to make investor protection more adequate and that the federal government was prepared to assist them. During recent months, under a new department of government, we have demonstrated our determination to take quick and effective action in the province of Ontario. However, I have stressed in the Legislature our belief that the federal government must play a major role in the regulation of financial institutions. Ontario is anxious to see federal initiative and federal leadership in this matter.
>
> In effect, the capital market in Canada should be a single integrated market. Therefore we believe that such leadership is necessary not only to ensure uniformity and thoroughness in investor protection across Canada, but also to provide the federal government with the means of guaranteeing an effective monetary policy. At the same time, if federal leadership is not forthcoming, then Ontario must, in the interest of its own investors, further extend its own means of investor protection.
>
> Therefore, the first step must be the clarification of those grey areas surrounding the operations of near-banks, trust and loan companies, and other financial institutions. In our view an explicit decision on the respective jurisdictional responsibilities should properly precede changes in techni-

cal and administrative arrangements. We also believe that such clarification can well be achieved by agreement under the general constitutional arrangements which presently apply. However, should our deliberations indicate some constitutional modification or amendment may be necessary, we also believe that we should not be reluctant to undertake such a measure.

The Prime Minister of Ontario has gone on record on numerous occasions to the effect that changes in Canadian Confederation should be approached with a view to functional and practical improvement in the workings of our federal system of government. There is no area at this time that commands greater public concern as well as promising reasonable improvement under our present arrangement. During the past year, we found the various meetings on securities legislation both profitable and helpful. We were pleased that our own legislation provided a useful guide to the federal government and other provinces.

I was pleased to hear from my officials of the successful and informative conference held in Ottawa last week dealing with consumer protection legislation. Ontario strongly supports the action taken by the federal authorities in providing a forum to assist the provinces in their efforts to have uniform legislation in this field across Canada. In the same manner, we believe this federal-provincial conference should enable the various governments to arrive at the highest common factor of good practice in the various areas of financial activity. We also hope we can move quickly to a comprehensive agreement on the proper role for each level of government in this broad area of common concern and shared interest.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to assure the House that Ontario recognizes the urgency of dealing with the various matters that will be dealt with at the conference. We look forward to participating at the level of the Prime Minister of Canada and the heads of all provincial governments in a subsequent conference in an effort to solve the numerous, difficult but extremely urgent matters involved in this area of joint federal and provincial responsibility.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE WHIRLPOOL RAPIDS BRIDGE ACT, 1967

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill 61, The Whirlpool Rapids Bridge Act, 1967.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, just out of my ignorance, would the Minister advise why there is always a substitution of a grant in lieu of taxes in bills such as this and in the succeeding bill?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, in the general sense—I do not think I can explain it in the specific sense associated with these bills—it is brought about largely because of the trust indenture associated with the issue of bonds for the construction of the bridges under the jurisdiction of the Niagara bridge commission, and in particular also because of the fact that no taxes whatsoever are payable for similar facilities on the American side. Basically though, it is because the trust indenture associated with the issue of the bonds for the funds required to build these structures, permits no payment of taxes, so this then is in lieu of taxes.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, along the same line, why does the amount decrease so marked by—$144,000 from 1964 to 1967 and then it reduces to $36,000.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the $144,000 is the collective amount for the four years; four times 36 is 144.

Mr. Singer: It is not an annual amount?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LEWISTON-QUEENSTON BRIDGE ACT, 1967

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves second reading of Bill 62, The Lewiston-Queenston Bridge Act, 1967.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, if I may touch on this issue, I have taken this matter up with this House on several occasions. I do believe we ought to say the right thing at the right time, and I do believe the government has taken a step in the right direction. For four years inclusive, from 1964 to 1967, $144,000 and $80,000 will be paid respectively, and then there will be an annual sum of $20,000 for Lewiston bridge and $36,000 for the Whirlpool bridge. The bridge was owned privately some five or six years ago. There was a contract with the private investors concern that owned that bridge. When the Niagara Falls bridge commission took over, it continued the contract and when it expired the grant was dropped somehow along the way and this bill is just putting the house in

order. I am very pleased with this bill that has come into effect; it is a step in the right direction.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD ACT, 1964

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves second reading of Bill 63, An Act to amend The Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, this may be only proper when the bill is being considered clause by clause, but it seems to me that section 2 deserves some comment by the Minister by way of explanation.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps clause 2 of the bill, being just one particular section of the bill, might be better dealt with by the Minister during the clause-by-clause discussion of the bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ENERGY ACT, 1964

Hon. Mr. Simonett moves second reading of Bill 64, An Act to amend The Energy Act, 1964.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

DIVISION OF PROPERTIES

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill 65, An Act to facilitate the division of properties into parts that are to be owned individually and parts that are to be owned in common, and to provide for the use and management of such properties.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Attorney General intends to make any further statement about this bill other than the statement which he made when he introduced the bill, before any other comments are made.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would say that the hon. member will note that with the bill is a very long explanatory note, very complete, I think. I think all hon. members are aware this bill is the result of one of the studies of the Ontario law reform commission. I would say this should perhaps go to the legal bills committee and be dealt with there. That would give an opportunity for full and open discussion.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Does the Minister intend to send it there?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I would suggest that.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would still like to make some comments on the bill. I am certainly not going to undertake to discuss the legal complexities of this very complex bill. Apart from the fact that I am not qualified to do so, I think the proper place to discuss such matters would be where the Attorney General has suggested, namely, in the committee on legal bills, where the legal brains of the House can go to work on the wording of the bill. So I am not concerned about the wording of the bill at this time, I am rather concerned about the general principles to which expression is given through this extremely complex legal language.

The Minister of Economic and Development (Mr. Randall) has included this legislation as part of his new HOME programme. In fact there are only two items in the HOME programme that are new—one is a land assembly-land rental scheme, the other is condominium housing. As far as the government is concerned, I take it, and certainly as far as the Minister of Economics and Development is concerned, this is part of the government's overall attack on the housing crisis with which the province is now faced.

I am personally, and this group is collectively, in support of the principle of the bill. We are in favour of enacting legislation which will facilitate the construction of condominium units in the province, Mr. Speaker. However, we would like to call attention to the fact that like all of the government's approaches to the housing crisis, this merely nibbles at the fringes of the real problem. We would be fooling ourselves if we thought that any significant progress will be made in dealing with the housing crisis through the enactment of this legislation.

I have no doubt that the legislation, when it comes into force, will be of some benefit. For that reason, I support it. It will not, however, be a major item in dealing with the major crisis with which the HOME programme purports to deal, but does not in fact deal in any effective way.

Mr. Singer: That is much less important to us, that aspect.

Mr. Bryden: Pardon?

Mr. Singer: I think it will have much less importance.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for Downsview says that he attaches even less importance to it than I apparently do. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure how much importance should be attached to it as a measure. I would say at best it is a fringe measure. I do not know even if it will be effective on the fringes, but I am quite willing to give it a try. My regret is that the government is only willing to try fringe measures. It is not willing to deal with the basic problem by measures which experience in every country has indicated are necessary if we are really to tackle the problem.

However, even dealing with it as a fringe measure, which is all it is, there is some reason to doubt if by itself it is enough. For example, a statement was issued not long ago by the Toronto metropolitan home builders association, relative to this and other matters. This association represents the people who would likely build condominium units if any advantage is taken of the legislation now before us, and they have raised two very important points relative to the bill.

I should say that they, like us, express support for the principle, but they raise two very important points on which the government has been quite silent. Indeed, one could almost say that the government's position is pretty clearly indicated: it intends to do nothing about the points that the home builders association has raised. The home builders association has suggested that if something is not done about these two matters, the legislation will likely be very close to a dead letter.

The two points are best put in their own words and I will read a portion of a statement they made not long ago:

> The association is pleased with current condominium legislation, but before it becomes a reality in the form of family accommodation, especially in the suburban municipalities, this type of construction will have to attract a good deal of private mortgage money. Practical experience suggests that mortgage financing is more likely to be available for construction in the downtown areas.
>
> Essential, too, is a change of attitude on the part of the municipalities. Their reluctance to encourage multiple housing units designed for families with children stems from a combination of two factors. First, such accommodation is less attractive from an assessment standpoint. Proper design calls for fewer units, larger units and more of the property land area set aside for recreational purposes.

I think this is a very important point to stress, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the hon. member with much interest. He said he supports the principle of this bill and he is reading from the home builders association presentation, in which they support it. It seems to me if we are debating the principle of this bill, that is pretty well accepted. It is going to the committee on legal bills. And it seems to me the hon. member is dealing with extraneous matters—whether people will loan money; how much land is set aside with this for recreation.

Surely these things are outside the scope of this legislation. We present a condominium type of title and ownership which we hope will attract people, and particularly elderly people, and free their homes. But if we are going to get into a debate, perhaps there are failures on the part of the government to do some things in housing. Perhaps that is debatable.

Mr. Singer: You are right on that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But it is not in this bill. We agree, I think, this bill is a step. Maybe it is a small step, maybe it is a large step. We will never know until we try it. But to go off into whether people are going to loan money and how much land you have to have for recreation area besides this, those are things that can be done but they are not part of this bill.

Mr. Bryden: They flow immediately out of the bill. The bill is meaningless if you have not got an answer to these points.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: May I just say one thing further—is the hon. member suggesting, for instance, that we could by any stretch of the imagination incorporate in this bill the amount of money that would have to be loaned, or how it would be got, or how much land we should stipulate in here; that with so many units we should stipulate in this bill that there shall be so much recreational area? Is he driving at that? I wonder—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, the point the Attorney General has raised is valid only if

one regards this bill as an exercise in legal ingenuity. If that is all it is, and if he is willing to say that is all it is—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, no!

Mr. Bryden: All right then; he says, oh no, he will not. I am saying that we have to take it in its context, and the context is that it has been put forward by the government as part of its programme to attack the housing crisis. I think at the stage of principle we have to discuss it in that context. At the next stage, the stage of the legal bills committee, those who are members of the committee can discuss the adequacy of the actual language of the bill. But we here are now concerned with the principle.

The principle, as I have said relates to the government's attacks on the problem and I would say that we should not have to pass on the principle unless we know what the government has in mind. Of course, I do not suggest to the Attorney General that he should write into the bill what steps the government will take to ensure that mortgage money become available for this type of construction. But I believe that in considering the bill at this stage we should be advised as to what, if anything, the government has in mind on that point.

Now the second point that the home builders association raised, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, may I make an observation? I would like to suggest to you now that central mortgage and housing corporation are already loaning money on condominium in British Columbia, and Mr. Nicholson himself stated at the conference on February 10 they were delighted to loan mortgage money on condominium.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, that raises a rather interesting point, which I had planned to raise myself. It is true that Mr. Nicholson not too long ago indicated that the federal government, under NHA would be quite happy to lend money on this type of housing. As to the other statement the Minister made, I would like to get from him the figures on lending that has been done or is being done on condominium housing in British Columbia.

If he has figures on that, I would like to hear them at some appropriate time, whenever he considers it appropriate. I inquired of central mortgage and housing and I was told by them that they did not know of any lending that had been done under NHA at all for condominium housing anywhere in Canada. And this, I think, is a point that we should bear in mind. It is not being done. I know the Minister is willing to do it, but in fact it is not being done and I think it probably arises from the difficulties raised by the home builders association.

There are only about two or three more sentences, Mr. Speaker; I would just like to complete what the home builders association said. They gave reasons for believing that this may not attract mortgage money, and they said also that the accommodation is unattractive from an assessment point of view. This leads the municipalities to discourage it. Secondly, they said, children mean additional provision for education, which also leads municipalities to discourage condominium housing. And then the brief goes on to say:

> These factors pose problems not only to condominium construction but to the development of town houses and low-rise apartments which are designed specifically for families with children. On the other hand, high-rise construction is ideally suited to downtown areas, attracts financing, but is neither designed nor suitable for families with children.

This harks back to a point that I tried to make under the estimates of the Minister of Economics and Development. I am not going to repeat now what I said then, but the point is that the government's policy of leaving the thrust in housing to private enterprise leads, as the spokesmen for private enterprise themselves have said, to a concentration of resources and accommodation that is not suitable for families.

It leaves the concentration of funds, of lending funds, in the type of units which bring the best profit. Where else would one expect private funds to go? In the units where you maximize revenue per square foot of floor space, as I said on an earlier occasion.

A condominium unit, if it is to be of any value, cannot possibly maximize revenue per square foot of floor space for the reasons stated by the builders themselves. You have to have larger units if they are to be suitable for children. You also must use some of the land for playground facilities and other services of that kind. Moreover, the municipalities discourage this type of construction because it does not produce the greatest assessment. We all know, I do not have to repeat it now, that the municipalities are in a very tight box and they are going to do everything possible to maximize their assessments, to try and relieve the pressure on the mill rate.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that this bill is really nothing but a legal exercise, an interesting legal exercise, unless the government can come forward with concrete policies which will meet the points that have been raised by the builders themselves. First of all, they have to do something to relieve the municipalities of the burden of education, which will otherwise lead them to discourage the type of construction that is facilitated legally but not otherwise by this bill; second, there has to be some way of encouraging builders, if it is to be left in the hands of private builders, to undertake this type of construction. If that is not done, this bill will largely be a dead letter.

I indicated earlier my idea of how the problem is basically to be answered. In my opinion the government should move in with large-scale public housing programmes to deal with the problems of low-income families and senior citizens and leave the rest of the market to private enterprise. The government will not, however, merely by juggling with legalities, make any difference in that type of construction. In my opinion, the type of construction envisaged in this bill is the type of construction most desperately needed. We need family units on the one hand; on the other hand, there simply is not enough land available for single-family dwellings, each on its own plot of land. We have to learn ways of making more efficient use of land if we are going to provide an adequate number of family dwelling unts.

However, it is quite obvious that the government has a far greater responsibility in that field than it has shown any disposition to accept today. If the most it is willing to do is to sort out the legal difficulties that arise from condominium without taking either action by itself to produce such units or else positive action to encourage the production of such units in the private sector, then the bill will really be meaningless. It will be a tribute to the ingenuity of the legal advisors of the government, but it will make no difference at all or no noticeable difference in solving the housing problem of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I ask the hon. member a question? How can we do it until the law is there to do it? Right now the builders cannot build condominium in this country, at least in this province, and now we are making it possible for them with this bill.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I think I covered the point. I agree that the law should be amended. What I object to is the obvious assumption on the part of the government that if they merely amend the law so that it is possible for builders to build such units, they will in fact be built. I am not saying the occasional one will not be built; what I am saying is that the building in this field will be a very small item in the total housing picture, without other positive steps on the part of the government, which I tried to outline. I think I have made my point, Mr. Speaker; I do not think it is necessary for me to pursue the matter any further.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to just say that it seems to me that in one of the main points which the hon. member made, he completely overlooked the effect of the condominium construction which this bill will enable to be carried out.

Mr. Bryden: I think I dealt with it fully.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The legislation permits the stratified ownership, the horizontal ownership, 16 or 20 storeys up, or whatever. And the point which is overlooked in the brief which the member referred to, is that this will free homes now occupied by elderly people who cannot keep them up—

Mr. Bryden: It will not if the units are not built.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, they are there, it will give the elderly people a chance to move into the condominium type of ownership and that home which they occupy will become a family unit for children and their parents. That is one thing. I do not think I need to spend any time debating the question of where the money is coming from. It is admitted in that brief, and everyone who has experience in condominium knows, that money will flow to meet this kind of construction, that it is a good type of investment, and that there will be no trouble to get money to build it.

Mr. Bryden: Home builders say it is not.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It will have the effect of making homes now occupied by elderly people available to the people with children.

Mr. Bryden: That is sheer speculation, it is not based on any analysis of fact.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But this is experience, this has been the experience in other areas.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Why gamble?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is not a gamble!

Hon. Mr. Randall: What does the hon. member want to do, stand still and do nothing?

Mr. Bryden: The Minister is the one who is doing nothing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, there are groups of houses of this kind already built in Metropolitan Toronto, condominium housing without the legislation and with some very real problems. People do own the units in which they live but the grounds and the amenities in common are still owned by the builder and there is a real field of friction here between the two because of supervision and maintenance and all the rest. Now there is real hope on the part of these people who have bought that the condominium legislation will enable them to purchase their homes and then form a co-operative organization, if you will, along this line to administer the amenities and the common property.

I would like to ask the Minister, whatever Minister may be able to provide the answer, whether or not this legislation can apply to these homes already in existence? In other words, will money be made available so that these people can discharge their obligation to the present owner of the condominium, that is, the owner of a common property in the condominium, and in effect become condominium owners under this legislation?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I could answer this very quickly.

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps it really is a question that could more properly be dealt with in the House in committee, when some Minister would undertake responsibility for it. I would rather the principle be discussed only at this time.

Mr. Young: I think this applies to the general principle of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will get the information for the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister will undertake to get the information for the member and perhaps he can give it during the time the bill is in committee stage.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot speak for the principle of this bill. Perhaps the crystal ball I am gazing into, in trying to look into the future, may be a little hazy, but the fact is that I deem this bill to be nothing but an expedient to give more covenantors to the people who supply money. This is supposed to be a scheme which is going to make it easier for people to own homes or own residences. I dispute that. To me, condominium is nothing but the old pyramid game that the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice and the postmaster have been trying to stop. As a matter of fact, you might call this a legal pyramid and a physical pyramid because physically condominium is pyramid housing.

It is fine to say that it is now going to be easier to own a dwelling unit, but let us look into the future and try to find the pitfalls in this. Just like the pyramid game and the pyramid letters, the first people in it stand to profit—the persons whose names are on the list—but after a while you run out of victims and anyone who is stuck with what he has got is in fact stuck. He cannot retail it. This has already been proven in cooperative housing where the people who have had cooperative apartments could not sell them. I myself had experience with three different people who finally gave up their cooperative housing because they could not find a buyer for it.

This proposed Condominium Act is going to be the law of diminishing returns. The longer you are in a condominium apartment the more your investment diminishes. For instance, you could be called upon by a 60 per cent vote to contribute towards certain amenities in the apartment. If you do not want to, then there is provision for you to be bought out. But just how many people can the people already in there—who are, let us say, on limited incomes—buy out over a period of time, especially if they cannot sell to somebody else even at a loss? So what is going to happen? Costs are continually going to be increasing as they are today and the owners of these condominiums will have to find the money to contribute their share to the corporation. If they cannot find the money then all they can do is sell. If they do not want to go along with the majority vote, then there is a right for them to be bought out—but there is a limit to the number of people that can be bought out. There is a limit to what these people can be called upon to contribute. In every condominium dwelling there are going to be some people who just cannot contribute beyond a certain amount.

Then, going further, after 40 years—which we contemplate to be the life of any kind of a dwelling in this area, although they last

longer than that—after its amortized life what have they got left? They have their share in the land on which that building stands and how much is that worth? How many square feet of land on which they stand are they going to be entitled to by way of compensation? After all, we are going up; we are not spreading out.

So is an owner of one of these condominium apartments, when the building has lived out its useful life, going to be left with 20 square feet of land? And what is it going to be worth in relation to his initial investment?

The older the building gets the less equity he is going to have. To me this is nothing more than finding some way of ensuring that the lending institutes are going to have more people to go on the covenant; in other words, spread their risk and make it safer for them to loan money.

I do not know how many of these senior citizens that the Attorney General speaks of are going to find their way into these condominium apartments. For my money they would be the last ones that should go in there, because all it means is that when they pass away their estate is going to have a difficult time trying to find somebody to take over that condominium apartment. They are the last ones that should be going in there because they and their estates will be the first ones to get burned. I think the Attorney General ought to give more and deeper consideration to this, because to me this is just a ploy of the financiers to make their money a little safer.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, there is an aspect of this bill that concerns me and that deals with the land registration aspect. The Attorney General knows that over a period of a considerable number of years we have discussed methods of improving the system of land registry. Now, here is an opportunity where the government is about to embark on a new system of land ownership, and provisions are being made in this bill so that we will continue this new method in the registry offices rather than in land titles offices.

True, the slate is going to be wiped clean to the point that a certificate of title is going to have to be produced, and the registrar is going to have to be satisfied. But then each individual unit is going to start all over again.

It would seem to me that if this is a reasonable system of land ownership, I cannot get nearly as concerned about it as some other people have because it has been an accepted system of land ownership in many other jurisdictions in this country and in the United States. For those who want it—good, let them have it, but it would seem to me that since we are embarking on a different system of land ownership, surely we should try at this stage to clear up the registry procedure insofar as this kind of ownership is concerned.

Would the Attorney General not think that there would be substantial merit in taking this back, at least the portions referring to the method of dealing with the registration, and ascertaining whether or not it would not be more advisable to put all condominium registrations within the land titles offices across the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, that is perhaps a worthwhile suggestion. I do not think that would be difficult to work out even if you did not put it in the Act. Perhaps we might make some amendment like that in the committee on legal bills. If you have got, let us say, in Metro Toronto an area which is in registry office and you are picking up a block or half a city block on which to build a high rise type of building which will be the condominium ownership, it seems to me that with all the titles that have been searched in that type of area—the background of title is there; you are not going to have much difficulty in getting a good root of title and having anyone certify it in very short order.

Mr. Singer: No, but you are pretty well starting over again because you—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Under The Certification of Titles Act.

Mr. Singer: Before these registers—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, that would go a long way towards approving the title for land titles entry.

Mr. Singer: So you are starting at a point where you could go into land titles.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would say that this is perhaps a worthwhile suggestion, as I started out to say, and I think if we can come to that we can do it in legal bills committee.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I just have two brief comments to make on the principle of the bill and both of them are to support previous speakers. I support the member for Downsview totally and completely on the question that if we are going to enter into this kind of involved arrangement, the least that can be done is to make certain that it is

handled through the land titles office and not through the registry office system.

This is one opportunity when a very complicated system of the ownership of interests must have the support of the province behind the interests which are involved. And the only way this can be done is to have a person who is involved in this kind of arrangement protected under The Land Titles Act and through the insurance fund provided under that statute.

I think this is an essential amendment which must be made at the present time. Now, Mr. Speaker, the other point is simply to support the member for Woodbine in his statement as to our position. The point which concerned us about the law reform commission's report is that while it dealt with the legal problems which were involved in the concept of condominium and the various interests involved, and which becomes a very difficult and abstruse topic of interest only to lawyers who are involved in that kind of technical real estate problem, the part that was entirely omitted from the law reform commission's report was any kind of intimation as to how successful or otherwise this had been as a method of ownership for the purpose of solving the housing crisis or housing problems which have occurred in the European countries in which it has been used; and how effective it has been in any other countries, such as the South American countries where it has also been used. But particularly in the European countries which have been faced with the congestion in their cities and the lack of adequate accommodation.

It seems to me that if the government is putting this forward as part of its overall housing programme, and although it is coming in as a bill because it is a legal bill under the auspices of the sponsorship of the Attorney General, I do not think he can avoid the problem of giving some indication to this House as to the degree of success which this very complicated system of ownership provides, fraught as it is with many of the difficulties that the member for Bracondale has raised, and many others which are involved in the whole content. Does it on balance permit an actual improvement in the housing situation, based on the economics of the situations that have developed in other countries?

Did the law reform commission, in making its survey, commission any study to find out whether this is a valuable adjunct in solving the housing problems? Or have we begun to adopt willy-nilly whatever particular fad and fashion has begun to seep through the common law jurisdictions by way of adaptation, as something which has been used in Europe, in the hope, and indeed, I believe the faint hope, that it will in some way assist in solving the immediate crisis in the province of Ontario?

Or does its validity simply stand on the legal decision to provide for this kind of land ownership so that if people want to take advantage of it in a permissive way in the future, they may find it of interest to them to take advantage of it, but which in fact will not have any driving impetus from the government to make certain that it plays any part in the HOME programme, which is so much at the heart of the government's position on the housing crisis in the area.

It seemed to me that the interjection of the Minister of Economics and Development was simply to say that CMHC has lent some money in British Columbia for this purpose. Everybody can well understand there is no reason why CMHC would not lend money on this kind of security. They are going to have a first mortgage on the whole combination of units and on all the common property involved. There certainly is not any reason why they would not lend money.

But in what way will it provide additional housing accommodation in the sense that the government sees a way in which this kind of technique and method will be used, promptly and immediately upon the passage of this bill, to provide solutions for the housing crisis in Metropolitan Toronto, and in lesser degrees in other centres throughout the province?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill 68, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few remarks on the principle of this bill. I will be short, because this whole matter on The Medical Services Insurance Act has been discussed so many times over the last few years and all that we can say has been said.

But the fact that this bill must come before us once again to be amended is overwhelming evidence that the government, when it first originally passed the bill, was wrong and has

continued to be wrong in principle as it conducts its Medical Services Insurance Act here in the province of Ontario. The fact that this particular section one, subsection one is before us today, is evidence that we simply have no control of the cost of medical insurance here in the province of Ontario. The Ontario medical association is virtually dictating to the people of the province what they are going to pay for their medical services. It is most unfortunate that the government in the beginning did not, and even today does not, take stronger action in this whole matter.

I know that it is continuous repetition over the years of a principle that we have tried to emphasize to the government, but as we look over the history, as we have argued the principle of the various medical insurance bills, we can see the gradual retreat of the government. At first, in principle, they were going to have nothing to do with such a scheme, and then gradually they have moved slightly towards having a universal scheme of medical insurance here in the province of Ontario. We know if we are to get the grants from the federal government that we must have a government-operated scheme, we must have a government controlled scheme. But as long as we have sections or regulations in our Acts whereby the Ontario medical association can virtually at any time decide it is going to change its schedule of fees and then we as a government must tag along, we will only increase the cost of medical insurance completely out of all commonsense.

I know this is an election year, Mr. Speaker, and I am quite certain that because this section is passed that the premiums will not be raised this year. But if the government is going to keep the cost of medical insurance within limits, it is going to do one of two things. It is going to raise the premiums and put the cost of medical insurance beyond the reach of the average person, and I think eventually this is what the government will do. As a result of this section being passed today, this amendment, it will increase the premiums after the election is over.

The second return as a result of this amendment is that the people of Ontario are going to have to subsidize the medical profession and it is a pity that the medical profession is giving itself such a poor image in the province of Ontario. We all know that the medical profession has been absolutely and utterly irresponsible towards the people as a whole and its own patients in particular. Despite the pleadings of this Minister, despite the pleadings of the Opposition, the medical profession has completely and utterly disregarded anything that the members of this Legislature had to say.

Previously the Minister used to adamantly stand up for and defend the medical profession, because we all know that he is an ardent supporter of the medical profession. Of course he is a good doctor and is highly respected in that regard. But now, even he, in his recent public utterances, has had to criticize his own profession. This amendment that is before us today is evidence that the Minister of Health is even starting to open his eyes to the problem we have here in the province of Ontario, and that is that the medical profession has become, probably next to the insurance companies, the strongest lobby in the province of Ontario. It is a lobby strictly in its own interests and it has utterly disregarded the health needs and the economic needs of the people in this province.

Inevitably, Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen is that once again this bill, The Medical Services Insurance Act, will be before us and it will have to be amended in a number of regards as to the principle of the bill. Certainly that principle is going to mean that the Ontario government will have to take unto itself more power in order to properly administer the bill. The doctors in the long run, sir, are working against their own best interests. This is the group that fears government. But because they are so greedy, because they have become so narrow, the government is going to have no other recourse but to move in on the administration of this Act, in setting up the proper fees that are going to have to be charged.

If you belong to a group plan, let us face it, it is the group plans that make the money; that is where the profit is, in insurance. We, under this scheme, have taken the old and the sick, those who cannot pay, and we are paying the bills. From those people on whom a profit is made, the insurance companies are getting the benefit.

This legislation in so many ways has been for the benefit of the insurance companies and most certainly for the doctors. I am sure that when we see and read this bill, short as it is, the Minister must come with a great deal of embarrassment, because he certainly realizes it, whether he says so in public or not, that the Opposition over the years has been right and that he has been wrong. But it is a step the government is going to have to take and that is to simply get tough with the Ontario medical association, if they will not measure up to their public responsibility, which they are not doing.

Much as we may admire our own individual general practitioner, much as we may have confidence in our own doctor, certainly as a group they are the narrowest and greediest group in the province of Ontario. They are certainly among the highest paid in the country, but they are not satisfied with being the highest paid in the country, they are still out to get more, regardless of the cost to the taxpayer, regardless of the difficulty that their patients are going to have in order to pay either increased premiums or increased doctors' bills.

It is with regret that I see this come about, yet I am not surprised to see it, Mr. Speaker. I know that in the next session we are going to be faced with higher premiums and higher doctor bills, and the pity of it is that this is going to go on year in, year out, as long as we have legislation that is going to let the doctors really run this province.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have only one or two observations to make on this Act. As the hon. member for Parkdale has pointed out, this issue has been subject to much discussion, particularly before the committee on health. The avariciousness of those involved has been alluded to on that occasion and I shall not pursue that particular aspect at this time.

I think, however, the bill's name is a misnomer because the real name of this bill should be "An Act to capitulate to the medical profession." That is precisely, of course, what the Minister has succeeded in doing. I have no doubt that he is a somewhat chastened and sheepish Minister, feeling for reasons of obvious identity that he could control the medical profession in some of its more irresponsible inclinations and that, alas, has not proven true.

I think that when we debated this bill last year, particularly on clause 13, if I recall the bill correctly, where this issue was central to the debate around that clause, the Minister felt that he could cope with the demands of the medical profession. He has obviously been demonstrated as mistaken, and it is a very sad thing indeed, Mr. Speaker.

As a matter of fact, what this bill does is to demonstrate once again how far we have capitulated. The medical profession insists that what we are granting is an 8.6 per cent increase to the general practitioner. That is what was stated unreservedly before the health committee, Mr. Speaker. There were other members in this Legislature in attendance at that committee; they can correct me if I am wrong. The Minister, in a report to the press, indicated that the overall average was in fact 15 per cent and that that overall average increase was arrived at because certain specialists under the new schedule of fees would receive up to 30 per cent.

So what do we have, Mr. Speaker? We have an increase which in fact is 15 per cent, and therefore the medical profession was not honest with the health committee and there can be no other structure put upon it. I am quite persuaded that if the Minister of Health says he made that analysis, I will accept that analysis. But not only is it in fact an increase that is somewhere in the vicinity of 15 per cent, Mr. Speaker, but as the chief Whip in this House pointed out at that committee, $25 million of new money has been pumped into the medical profession by virtue of OMSIP, by virtue of those who were formerly helped as recipients of social assistance, and are now almost entirely paid for, at least to a level of 90 per cent by OMSIP. This averages out—this inflation for the doctors—to an increase of $5,000 per year, which is something in terms of their 1966 income of roughly a 20 per cent increase.

No matter how one looks at it, Mr. Speaker, the doctors have effectively extorted from the government an actual increase of something in the vicinity of 30 per cent or more. Even in these days of strong wage demands, that is a pretty hefty increase in one lump. I think it was about that, that the Minister became quite properly exercised. I do not think the profession played fair with him or with this Legislature at the time of discussion of this bill last year and subsequent to it. The figures I have given—I stand to be corrected—were accepted at the health committee and they come from the mouth of the Minister himself.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister leaves himself open by the amendment, by the principle enshrined in this bill, to a precise repetition of exactly the same set of circumstances, because he has refused to include a pattern of negotiation between government and the profession which would make it impossible for any subsequent unilateral increase in the fee schedule.

And I say to him, Mr. Speaker, that all he is doing is inviting the Ontario medical association to clobber OMSIP yet again next year by refusing to insert into the body of this Act a clause whereby there would be a regular and systematic review of the schedule of fees, and the medical association could not act in so peremptory and arbitrary and arrogant a fashion.

No matter how one puts the case, Mr. Speaker, we in this party cannot help but

feel that the action of the medical profession was motivated primarily to scuttle the medical services insurance plan; not so much as an effort to simply increase income, although I have no doubt whatsoever that that was also in their minds.

And that leads to an incidental point, Mr. Speaker, I for one as a member of this Legislature object, as some of my colleagues do, to the constant relationship with the Ontario medical association. I think this Legislature should be dealing with the college of physicians and surgeons, not with the Ontario medical association, because the college of physicians and surgeons is the body that we enshrined by statute in this Legislature. It is responsible by statute to this Legislature through the Minister and we would not, as it were, be held to the wall by the Ontario medical association if we more properly used the statutory body which deals with the profession as a whole.

There is another aspect, Mr. Speaker, which I would suggest to you is very disturbing indeed. The argument used by the medical profession to justify the increase in the fee schedule, and which prompts the principle of this amendment, is that it was the only way to preserve the life's blood of the medical community in Ontario, namely, the general practitioner.

It is an entirely specious argument because indeed, in terms of the overall fee increase, it is the general practitioner who receives rather less a percentage increase than many of his colleagues in the specialties. And everyone knows, and the Minister should not allow the argument to be so easily deflected; everyone knows that the problem of providing sufficient general practitioners is not solved by an increase in the fee schedule. It is solved by a reorganization of medical practice in the province of Ontario; nothing less will suffice.

That means, Mr. Speaker, the proliferation of community medical clinics modelled on the Sault Ste. Marie experiment, right across the province, and a shift from our preoccupation with illness and hospitals, to preventive social medicine in the community.

And until the Minister of Health brings himself to this fundamental reorganization of medical practice and health services, we will always have an insufficient number of general practitioners. And we will lay ourselves open to this kind of amendment year after year on the obviously fallacious argument that this is the way we shore up the profession.

I make the final point, Mr. Speaker, that obviously we must have a universal medical care plan in this province as quickly as is humanly possible to prevent a reoccurrence. And I would predict, Mr. Speaker, that after the election is over, if by some incredible misfortune this government were to maintain a one-seat minority or something of the kind, or even during the campaign—in some order-in-council or regulation which one would hope the public did not see, the government would be forced on the basis of this bill to raise the premiums from where they now stand at $60 to $120 to $150; rather the formula would be $75 to $150 to $180.

That is precisely what the content of this amendment means. It is that kind of percentage increase in the premium and that, of course, again is what the Minister of Health is inviting from the medical profession. We urge him, sir, through you, to repudiate the applied or attached principles of this bill and to deal in an orderly and coherent way with the medical profession, and to move immediately into a universal plan, for there is no dealing with these men by way of a sense of propriety and confidence which apparently exists in other pieces of legislation and other areas of government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I want to make one or two comments on what I consider to be the greatest failure that is shown by the need to introduce this bill and that is the fact that the Minister himself, through his department, has not been able to keep in contact with the medical profession, and that he has expressed himself as being surprised and in fact deeply hurt that the profession has come forward with the requirements for increases in its schedule. It seems incomprehensible that the Minister, who has the main responsibility for administering our insurance plan in this province, would not have some means of communication with those active in the profession and who would be the moving spirits in the changes in the schedule.

I think that one of the additions to this bill that we should have before us is some means to meet, on common ground, those who are active in the medical profession. I disagree with my hon. friend who spoke just recently that it has to be the professional organization that the doctors themselves sponsor and the organization that sets the fee. It seems incomprehensible that there is not some common ground that the Minister and those responsible to him cannot sit down on a continuing basis with the doctors and

see that everything is done to provide them with the facilities they require, so that as their financial requirements change during any year, or any particular period, the Minister is aware of their changing views and is in a position to put the view of the administration before unilateral decision is taken by the medical people.

Surely this has been the serious breakdown; not the fact that the Minister was forced to go to his Cabinet colleagues and get their consent to come in with this bill, which I hear will cost us an extra $10 million this year. It is the fact that he has not been able to carry out his responsibilities and deal with the doctors on a professional level. It is not enough that he himself is a doctor and probably is on their mailing list and hears what they have to say. His responsibility is far beyond that and it is a matter of great regret to me and of some considerable consternation that OMSIP is still progressing without the liaison with the profession that we require.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I only have one very brief comment along the lines of a comment made by my hon. colleague from Scarborough West and that is this: It is absolutely essential, if we are going to have any final solution to this problem and the amendment to the Act does not provide for any final solution that the Minister remove this question from the trade association of the doctors into the professional association of the doctors, because it is the Act which establishes the college of physicians and surgeons which enshrines the professional ethics of that profession. It is that body which is charged with the duty and the responsibility for the public interest.

By way of analogy, but not in any sense wanting to drive it to extremes, I would point out that this government, when it dealt with the legal aid question and gave the authority to the law society of Upper Canada—including the authority subject to the approval of the Attorney General to establish the schedule of fees which is required to provide for the services under that Act—in my view chose the right body to make this provision for what the fees would be for the profession to receive, subject to the control by the government. It would have been totally wrong had the legal aid bill provided for the schedule of fees to be set by, shall I say, the trade association of the legal profession such as the Ontario section of the Canadian bar association.

I think it is very important when the Minister is searching, as I am certain that he is searching, for some long-term solution to this problem that he think in terms of requiring the college of physicians and surgeons to establish, in consultation with the government, the schedule of fees, and that the schedule of fees so established be subject to the approval of this government. I view the confrontation, veiled as it may have been, between the doctors and the committee of this Legislature in the health committee as a very serious foreboding of what will happen again. I would ask the Minister to seriously consider withdrawing now, and making certain that in some way or other he obtain the cooperation of the college of physicians and surgeons with the government, in the sense of the performance of their obligation to the public as a profession in this province, so that we are not faced with a worsening situation and further confrontations where the doctors feel that they must establish, for whatever reason they think is valid, this sense that they are in some way not under the control of this government.

It is quite possible for a profession to discharge its functions in making this OMSIP plan work and a universal medicare plan work without the profession feeling that any member of the profession has thereby lost in some way his professional status, and I leave that thought, Mr. Speaker, with the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I have noted the remarks of the hon. members, but quite frankly, sir, it would not be possible, I submit, to enshrine in this amendment to the legislation that we establish a meeting ground with the profession. You cannot by legislation force negotiation. You may force a meeting, sir, but as in the old saying, "One man can lead a horse to water but 10,000 cannot make him drink." I think that this government has done everything humanly possible to find that common meeting ground. The profession is quite well aware that both the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and myself, on frequent occasions, sought meetings with them and on occasion did meet with them, only to be told finally that those with whom we met, the elected representatives of the organization, did not have the power to negotiate.

It is to that end we are working now, and we are working in every way possible to the end that we meet either the college or the association—as my hon. friend, himself a professional, rather crudely calls the trade association. Whether it be with it or whether it be with the college I do not know. Traditionally the college has looked after purely professional, disciplinary, registration and educa-

tional matters. The professional association has traditionally looked after social and economic matters. The delegation of responsibility for the setting of a tariff has rested with the association. Whether the profession would be disposed to change this or not I do not know but I do not think, sir, that any Legislature in a free society will ever reach, at least I hope it will never reach, a point where it orders a profession what branch of its membership shall do certain things other than observe the law.

However, the fact does remain, sir, that I am not happy about this amendment. I have made no secret of this. I think in the interests of the people whom we are trying to serve this amendment was essential. We are determined to do everything in our power to see to it that this sort of thing cannot happen again. Of course there will be changes in the fee schedule. It may go up, it may go down, and with our blooming economy everything has been going up. It is not the fact that the fee schedule has gone up that worries me the most. It is the fact that we did not know about it at the time when we were introducing our legislation which would control the income and the outgo, and this is the part of the whole matter that annoys me the more. If we had known at the time—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Were you not entitled to know?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I kept quiet while you were talking; would you mind giving me the same courtesy?

Mr. MacDonald: Were you not entitled to know?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Of course I was entitled to know but if they did not choose to tell me I cannot force them to tell me. They themselves may not have known then. They did advise me that certain adjustments were not yet completed, that when these adjustments were completed they should be considered as part of the 1965 schedule of fees and we accepted that. At no time did they indicate to me that there would likely be a widespread or a general change in the fee schedule for 1967. I made very clear, as did the Prime Minister, to the profession that when our legislation was passed, the schedule then obtaining in Ontario would continue to obtain under our legislation for two years. At no time can I remember them mentioning it to the Prime Minister, certainly not to myself, that they were contemplating and must then have been working upon a revision of the fee schedule. I can assure you, sir, and through you this House, that we are doing everything in our power to see that this sort of thing does not happen again.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HOSPITAL SERVICES COMMISSION ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are happy to see anything that is done in order to encourage the education of more nurses, and anything that will raise the standards of nursing. And, of course, we include the people who are connected with technical work in the health field.

It has been obvious for some time that there has been a tremendous shortage of personnel in the nursing profession and it is about time that the government brought in such legislation as this. Of course, why some of us become skeptical, Mr. Speaker, when we see legislation like this, is that we wonder: Is the government really going to do something; are the funds really going to be made available, or is this election year window dressing? I hope not. And only time will tell.

But certainly this legislation has the heartiest support of this party, and more of it is needed. But again I must emphasize: how much does the government actually intend to invest and how quickly is it going to be done? I would hope that the Minister, before we pass second reading, would give us some specific information on what he intends to do in the immediate future as a result of this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this money is being given now and has been for several years. The only difference is, at the present time for a school to qualify for grants or loans the money must be paid through a hospital board. Now, because of the establishment of regional schools, for example—which we ourselves pioneered some years ago, more vigourously in the last two years, but the first one goes back really to the Nightingale school—the money now can be paid to a board, established specifically for the purpose of operating a school of nursing, or a school for the training of any of the

ancillary or para-medical personnel, without going through a hospital board.

This is simply to facilitate the establishment of these bodies on a more widespread scale than has been possible before. The machinery up to date has been somewhat cumbersome.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ELECTION ACT

Mr. Nixon moves second reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Election Act.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Not the 26th order? The bill to amend The Election Act! Is that not the one?

Mr. Nixon: Bill 22 anyway!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have got Friday's order paper.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this bill, I would draw to your attention that the members of this House are probably more concerned with the election law reform in the weeks and days immediately before an election and also immediately after an election. It was in the session following the election of 1963, that resolutions for an electoral reform first appeared on the order paper, sponsored by the Liberals. And in every session since that time we have urged the government to undertake either far reaching reform, which is needed very desperately in the province of Ontario, or on other occasions, very specific reforms of the type that we are referring to this afternoon.

The government did accede to the pressure from all parties, including their own, for reforms in The Election Act by appointing a select committee last year, which gave an interim report to the House just a few weeks ago.

Mr. Bryden: There has not been an interim report.

Mr. Nixon: No interim report? Oh, I thought that—

Mr. Bryden: We are struggling along trying to get one.

Mr. Nixon: Well, the committee is meeting and deliberating on an interim report which has become completely academic, I would put to you, sir, because it appears that the government is not prepared to take any of the action that is needed in order to reform the antiquated election procedures that govern the democratic process in our province.

Rather than put on the order paper this year a resolution calling for the general reform that is so desperately needed, it was our view that the select committee, having been appointed a year ago, would be giving a forum for citizens as well as the membership in this House to express their views in some concrete way; to bring in recommendations to the government that might very well have been enacted at this very session, so that as we approach the coming election in this Centennial year we would be able to do so on a more equitable and modern and efficient basis.

Now it appears that no changes are to be taking place, although I would bring to your attention, sir, that the specific bill now before the House is an important and specific matter that could be enacted readily by the Legislature in the days that remain to us in this session.

It would remove only one of the inequities that are so apparent on any examination of the electoral laws of the province. It deals specifically with the assurance that the young people, and some people not so young, who are in attendance at educational institutions away from their normal homes would be enfranchised if this particular bill were passed into legislation. I want to deal specifically with this, Mr. Speaker, because we can compare what we are doing in the province with what is possible under the statutes of Canada, where this has been dealt with for some years and, as a matter of fact, students at post-secondary institutions are not disenfranchised under The Canada Election Act.

Since 1938, Mr. Speaker, in federal elections students and I quote, "duly registered and in attendance at a recognized educational institution", have been entitled to be enumerated both in their home constituency and in the constituency in which their university residence is located and have the option of voting in either of these locations.

Thus a student from, say, North Bay, attending school in Toronto, who cannot readily return to North Bay to cast his ballot, is not deprived of his right to vote. There has never been such a provision in The Ontario Election Act. In this bill, we have taken the section from The Canada Election Act where it appears as subsection 9 of section 16, and made only one alteration to it in proposing

this as an amendment to The Ontario Election Act.

The operative date of The Canada Election Act provision, that is the date by which the student must be registered and in attendance for the section to apply, is the date of the issuance of the election writ. The results in 1965, in the most recent federal election, when the election writs were issued two weeks before the school term began, rendering the section inoperative in an election which took place ten weeks into the normal school term, prompted us to make the one change from The Canada Election Act section, extending the operative date to the last day of the sitting of the revising officer.

The Ontario Election Act says in section 16 that a person is eligible to vote in the constituency in which he resides at the date of the issuance of the election writs. It goes on, however, in subsection (r) of section 1, the interpretation section, to say that person is deemed to reside where his family resides, unless he takes up some other residence with the intention of remaining there. Thus the key to the section is the intention. Does the person who has moved to a new place of residence, away from his family, intend to remain there?

In practice, no such canvass of intention is ever taken. The section is ignored and people are enumerated where they are found, with one exception. The only group against which the section is applied are students and here it is not applied by canvassing their intention but simply by an arbitrary decision: that they all should do their voting at their family homes whether they have family homes or not.

Enumerators are instructed not to list persons living in university residences, although some of the students living in them may well be without normal family connections or may long ago have ceased to live with their families. Many students who live in residence at the University of Toronto, for example, from September to May, live in Toronto year round, renting a room or apartment in the city for the summer months. They are not enumerated at the university or elsewhere.

This amendment has been unanimously endorsed by the 90-member student administrative council of the University of Toronto. It has been endorsed by the Ontario region of the Canadian union of students. It has been endorsed further, Mr. Speaker, and I know you will be interested in this, by a number of other student groups including the Ontario Progressive Conservative students federation.

These groups of students, almost all of them with a view to the future and the part that young people must play in the democratic activities of our province and our country, regard this as legislation that would enfranchise a large and important group and surely we in the Legislature should take steps to see that this is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, if this amendment is not passed, many students will effectively be deprived of their vote. Part 1 of the analysis of Canada's post-secondary student population, commissioned by the Canadian union of students and dealing only with undergraduates at Canadian universities, shows 47 per cent of the undergraduates at Ontario universities to be over 21 years of age and 57 per cent of them to live away from their homes.

Thus it is estimated that 15,800 university undergraduates in Ontario are affected. As well, the Spinks report sets the number of graduate students in Ontario at 8,500 virtually all of whom are over 21. Hugh Armstrong, the president of the Ontario region of the Canadian union of students, estimates that 6,000 of these would live away from home, bringing the total for universities alone to almost 22,000 people.

But as well as the universities, there are institutions such as Ryerson, Osgoode Hall, Royal military college and technical, vocational and agricultural colleges, with voting age students in attendance and living away from home. Exact figures of these will be avilable in about three weeks, I am told, when part 2 of the Canadian union of students study is released. But Mr. Armstrong estimates that at least 2,000 students in these institutions are affected, bringing the total to at least 24,000 people.

Thus an unrealistic provision in our Election Act which could deprive these many thousands of their vote has been enforced discriminatorily against students alone and could cost 24,000 of them their right to vote this very spring if the election is called, as rumours indicate it will be. Or, of course, in the fall any time.

A special provision for disabled soldiers in hospitals or vocational training institutions has been in our Act for many years to insure that they are not deprived of their vote. Surely we can extend the same protection to students.

Mr. Speaker, I brought to your attention in my earlier remarks that we in the Opposition parties are deeply concerned about the general overhaul of our election procedures.

This should have been undertaken by a select committee meeting immediately following the last election, when the difficulties and inequities associated with our present law were fresh in everyone's mind. But it is obvious that the government is not going to take this broad and imperative approach.

There is still time, however, sir, for the government to accede to second reading of this particular bill or to bring in legislation of their own that might be phrased in some other way, but has the same intent. And I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we have given up hope that there will be the general revisions that Ontario so desperately needs so that the candidates who will be offering their services in the weeks that lie ahead will in fact be on an equal basis as they put before the constituent their own view of the issues and their own particular view of what the future holds for our province.

It will take a change of government to bring about the reforms that are needed in The Election Act of the province. But it is obvious that here is a specific and rather simple approach that could be enacted very readily in the days that remain of this particular session. The government does not have to be convinced of its merit by speeches that I would make. There are many who are much more impartial in their political approach who can assure the government of the outstanding merit of this proposal.

We are, as I have said, very deeply concerned that many others are disenfranchised by the provision of The Election Act of the province; those people who through no fault of their own find themselves ill and in hospital, have no provisions available to them so that they can record their democratic choice. But it is not my intention, sir, nor would I be in order to extend my remarks beyond the provisions of this rather short and specific recommendation that I make to you and to the government of Ontario at this time.

We are disappointed that the select committee has been rendered inoperable chiefly because they were appointd so late in the life of this Legislature, and the fact that there is no intention on the part of those people who are operating the committee to take the steps that are needed.

But here is a definite proposal; one that could readily be acceded to by the government. I would assure you, sir, that it is based, in fact, on the statistics that have been put before you, have been made available by groups of students who are involving themselves more and more effectively in student activities and political activities that affect them in this province.

We would say, sir, that this is legislation that we in the Liberal Party support. I would venture to say further that there are people, members of this House of every political persuasion, that would consider this legislation should be on the books before we go to the people in the days that lie immediately ahead.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the principle of the bill. The specific method to be used in achieving that principle is not, I think, before us now. The important point is that something should be done in this area.

Some time ago, early in the session, I protested the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the select committee on election law seemed under the guidance of government appointees to be proceeding on the basis of one step forward and two steps back. In other words it was making no serious effort to bring down a report on the reform of the election laws.

At that time I proposed that even though I thought the law needed a complete overhaul, at least we could proceed at this session on five specific points. I will give the government the small credit which is due to it—that it has proceeded on one of those points that I raised, namely, the appointment of returning officers in advance of the election. I think that returning officers have now been appointed for all or most of the constituencies and that is something that will help in the effective conduct of the election.

Another of the points—I will not go through the five points—related to the specific question of eliminating the disabilities that now apply to students under The Election Act as it stands and as it is now interpreted. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is no reason at all why we cannot do that as well before the forthcoming election, whenever it may be.

There are a number of other things that I think are quite feasible to do before the coming election. I will not put myself out of order by discussing them now, but clearly this can be done. It is a relatively simple matter. I would do it in a somewhat different way than the hon. leader of the Opposition has proposed, but that is immaterial. The important point is that we should eliminate this disability which quite unjustly applies to a certain group of citizens of this province.

I may say that after I had protested in the House at the failure of the select committee to do anything at all—its failure to

meet since January—we have had some meetings of the committee with a view to presenting an interim report. I do not know if we are going to be able to blast an interim report out of the committee or not. I am one of the members and I have been doing my best. As a matter of fact I was under the impression that the committee was going to meet this morning. I looked high and low for a meeting of the committee but I could not find it. Unless it was meeting in some catacomb somewhere without anyone telling me, apparently it did not meet. It should get on with its job; it should bring in a recommendation.

I do not know if I am letting out secrets, Mr. Speaker, but the situation has reached the point that I do not care. I am going to advise the House that this committee has already agreed that something should be done about students. This is a committee representing all parties in the House. If it can be induced to make a report, that will be included in its report, if it goes on the basis of the decisions that it has now made. So why do we wait?

Under the law as it now stands, presumably this same disability would apply to people working in lumber camps or in long-term construction camps. But the chief election officer has advised us that administratively he has always interpreted the Act and instructed his returning officers to interpret it as meaning that a lumber camp or a long-term construction camp is the place of residence of the people working in such camp. I do not know if that interpretation is soundly based in the law, but it certainly is soundly based in common sense, and I would commend the chief election officer for having made that interpretation down through the years so that people working in lumber camps and in permanent construction camps do have their vote.

Mr. Speaker, the case of the student is analogous. In most cases the student no doubt has a home apart from the place where he is now studying. It is, however, a home, from which in most cases he is in the process of severing his connections. By the time a student gets to the point where he is going to a post-secondary institution of learning, he is on the way away from the ancestral home. In fact, I am not even sure that it is reasonable to say that the ancestral home is now his home. His home while he is a student is the place where he hangs his hat. He is in a transitional stage, leaving his parents' home and in transition to setting up a home of his own. In that transition he should not be disfranchised. Yet he is inevitably disfranchised, if the place where he studies is at some substantial distance from his parents' home and if he is engaged in his studies at the time the election takes place.

At this time, there are three universities in Ontario with the tri-semester system. There is an increasing number of graduate students who usually carry on their studies at the university to which they are attached throughout the year and do not go home for a summer season. In addition, there are many other types of advanced training where people are liable to be studying at any time of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that under our laws we should make it easy for these people to vote. We should not prevent them from voting. I think the easy way is to change the definition of residence, so it is quite clear that a student can count as his residence the place where he is living in pursuing his studies at a post-secondary institution of learning. That is the easy way. But if the government prefers the way suggested by the leader of the Opposition, that is immaterial to me. All I want to see is some action on this matter and I do not see why action cannot be taken immediately. It is a simple point. It is quite easily dealt with from a technical point of view. As far as I know, there is no disagreement on this principle. That being so, let us bring in an amendment along this line right away, if the government is not prepared to accept the bill of the leader of the Opposition.

The leader of the Opposition also made reference to some other groups who find themselves in a similar position. I think I have already mentioned two major groups in this category, and I have suggested that by virtue of administrative interpretation, those groups are not in fact disfranchised. I think probably that, while we are clearing up the law for students, we can also make it abundantly clear for workers in lumber camps and construction camps, that they also are entitled to regard those camps as their place of residence for the purposes of the election.

There remains one other group, namely the people who are confined to active treatment hospitals, to general hospitals, both on the dates of the advanced poll and on the actual election day. I say that we should be able to make provision for those people too, so that they will not lose their franchise. I am not going to suggest that we should have something in the nature of mobile polls in general

hospitals. I am not letting any secrets out now, because this was at a public session, but we heard in our committee from Mr. Nelson Castonguay, and he convinced me that that type of poll is undesirable, that it is very disruptive of an institution where there are some extremely sick people. However, in my opinion, we can deal with their problem through voting by mail. This is done in many jurisdictions; I do not see why we cannot do it here.

Mr. Nixon: Is that the way the member would handle the students?

Mr. Bryden: I am suggesting that we accept some sort of proposal to change the definition of residence for the students. In the case of the people in hospitals, I think the only feasible solution is voting by mail. I would like to see the vote by mail made available to anyone who will legitimately be absent from his constituency, both at the time of the advance poll and on election day. I would like to see that relaxation made in our law, but I do not think that should be to the exclusion of the sort of proposal that the leader of the Opposition has put before us. I think we can reasonably incorporate both provisions in our legislation.

The one thing you could say about the vote by mail is that it would also assist students who are neither at their ancestral place of residence nor at the university, but are off in the summer trying to make enough money so that they can go back next year, at some temporary place of employment. They would be looked after by the vote by mail. But I do not put these proposals forward as mutually exclusive; I put them forward as complementary. In my opinion, our objective in this Legislature should be to do everything possible to facilitate voting by our citizens. As long as we carefully exclude any possibility of corrupt practices and of illegal voting, and I think that can be easily handled, then surely our objective should be to make it possible for everyone to vote and use whatever devices are necessary. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this should be done now, before the next election.

I do not know when the next election will be, but I am inclined to accept the rumours I hear from the Tory backbenchers that it will likely be at the end of May or early June. But whether it is then or September or a year from now does not matter to me. I think we should get our law straightened out right now, so that whenever the government decides to advise His Honour to dissolve this House, we will be assured that all citizens of this province will have full opportunity to mark their ballots when the election comes. I do not see how we can face the people again in good faith, if we continue to discriminate against certain people and make it impossible or extremely difficult for them to vote because of circumstances over which they have no control at all.

I urge the government to proceed now, either with this bill or with one that would achieve the same purpose.

Mr. J. C. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I first want to congratulate the hon. leader of the Opposition for placing this amendment to the election laws on the order paper. I found his remarks to be very enlightening and I must admit that questions of electoral law have always fascinated me. When I served my constituents as a municipal clerk-treasurer and returning officer, I always enjoyed making the annual review of the municipal election laws. I found that each new election brought new situations and new interesting problems which had not occurred in the previous year. I must admit that I found very few experts on the electoral law and I should confess that as a municipal returning officer, I learned most of my lessons by making mistakes of interpretation.

In spite of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that I agree in principle with the hon. leader of the Opposition this afternoon, I must admit that I have never read a more lengthy and complex amendment to a provincial piece of legislation than the one we have before us today.

Presumably the hon. leader of the Opposition's amendment was drafted by counsel learned in the law, and as my favourite legal advisor, the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), is not in the House this afternoon I had to give the amendment my own layman's interpretation.

I should add that the proposed amendment is certainly the longest sentence we have ever attempted to place on the statute books of this province. Now this does not necessarily make it bad. I have read and reread the hon. member's amendment and after several hours I did not know if the intent is to allow university students to become enumerated in one place, two places, or even in three.

An hon. member: Two!

Mr. Demers: Two. As a member of the select committee on election laws I have had a chance to discuss amendments to the same section of The Election Act on several occa-

sions. The hon. member for Wodbine remembers the long sessions we have had in committee over the provisions of this very same question. The members of our committee certainly recognize the desirability of clarifying the present statute with regard to electors who for some reason have to establish temporary residence outside the riding which they call their own place of ordinary residence.

Reference was made this afternoon to the federal statutes dealing with elections, and I think we all recognize the problem that arose about a year and a half ago when university students were caught in a predicament which resulted from a series of coincidences in the date of arrival at the campus, the date of the federal election and the date the writ of election was issued.

I suppose we could argue that a similar situation could arise in this province and this has been the subject of much study by our select committee. Frankly, I am of the opinion that our electoral laws should be as clear and simple as we can possibly make them. In spite of the good intentions of my hon. friend from Brant, I feel that his amendment to The Election Act would serve only to confuse the whole issue.

Our committee has considered other possibilities, and I hope I am not offending the hon. members who are members of this committee by suggesting that our deliberations have already produced a tentative solution to this very problem. In listening to the discussions in committee and in considering the problem myself, I have concluded that we can best eliminate this grey area by amending clause (r) of section 1 of The Election Act and this would be achieved by adding to that section the following paragraph and I quote:

> the place where a student resides at the time of polling in the course of his attendance at a university or other recognized educational institution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, such an amendment would solve the problem in a briefer and much more general way. To my knowledge, as the hon. member for Woodbine has already said, the proposal I have just mentioned is receiving the unanimous approval of all our committee members. Our proposal would widen the definition of "residence". The hon. leader of the Opposition's proposal would perhaps solve the problem, but in my opinion and from my limited experience, it would completely confuse the electorate and the people charged with the responsibility of operating our election machinery.

I discussed the hon. leader's proposal with some of the most politically concerned university students in my own area and I reached the conclusion that the students are much more interested in the issues of the riding that they are from than the issues of the area where they happen to be studying. I have heard the argument, for instance, that the hon. leader of the Opposition's amendment would give the students the impression that they are allowed to vote on the campus and not in their home constituency.

Giving them a choice is an excellent suggestion, but the question is: how would it work? One student suggested to me that we adopt a system similar to the armed forces vote. This opens the door to more arguments as to when the votes would be counted, and I think we all deplored the long delays in reporting the armed forces vote and this is another area which our committee is looking into.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have just mentioned I believe we should tackle this problem in its broader context. I believe that the select committee on electoral law should, in arriving at some concrete recommendations, bear in mind, sir, the recent recommendations of the select committee on youth, and we should do this not in a piecemeal fashion as has been suggested today, but in a very broad and general way.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief comments on Bill 22, the amendment to The Election Act as proposed by my leader. First I would like to refer to the comments of the hon. member for Nickel Belt. He had gone to some length in describing the fact that the amendment as proposed by my leader was lengthy and was complex; it was extremely difficult to understand; it would have caused a lot of problems to the university students.

Yet may I bring it to his attention that the amendment as included in Bill 22 has been operative on the federal field now for 29 years. It has been in operation since 1938 and it is the verbatim wording of section 16, subsection 9 of The Canada Election Act with a single change being its operative date—the last day of the sitting of the revising officer than the date of issuing the election writs in the federal Act. That is the only change, Mr. Speaker. So if it could have operated in the federal field for 29 years surely, Mr. Speaker, it can operate well in the provincial field. My hon. leader makes one specific suggestion only, and this is to do with the university student or the student away from home. He

does not suggest that there are no other types of amendments that could be suggested. In fact he was very specific in his comments that the whole Election Act needs complete revision. He picks this out as a concrete example of something that can be done very easily and in this sitting of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, when the youth committee was originally appointed on May 8, 1964, in the terms of reference we have the following, and I will read the first paragraph of the terms of reference only:

> Ordered—that a select committee of this House be appointed to conduct a comprehensive inquiry into and report upon the special needs of youth with particular reference to educational, cultural, recreational, and employment opportunities as well as health, welfare and sports facilities now available to youth, and the steps to be taken to ensure a wider participation by youth in the life of the community.

Mr. Speaker, what better way could we come along and have the youth of our community participate in its life than by giving them the right to vote? The youth committee's final report recommends the lowering of the voting age to 19 even though four of the members recommended a voting age of 18. Were we to have this amendment accepted by the government either in this form or in some other form that the government itself would prefer, we would have taken care of any future legislation that may be introduced by the government concerning the lowering of a voting age. Today it is only the 21-year-old and over who is affected when it comes to his opportunity to vote. In the future—and it is fairly certain that the voting age will be lowered, if not to 18, to 19 or 20—by not accepting such a change, we would be disfranchising too many of our university students.

The opportunity to exercise the franchise is now given to—I can refer specifically to my own community—the home for the blind. These people have the right to vote. They are enumerated in the institution and have the opportunity of exercising their democratic privilege. A hospital for the aged, Riverview hospital in my community, gives the patients the right to vote. Students attending nursing schools are given the privilege of voting, yet the student who attends a university is denied that same democratic right. Surely we are not being fair with all our segments of the community when we deny to a university student the right to vote and on the same token we give it to a student attending a nursing school. Surely we have set a precedent now by giving it to nursing school students, but I think we could include the same privileges to the student attending a university.

People in active treatment hospitals do not have the right to vote and I notice one of the recommendations made by the hon. member for Woodbine that voting by mail could be one way by which they could exercise their franchise. I think the suggestion has some merit. I think even though the government in its wisdom may not want to implement that suggestion at this time, the amendment as proposed by my leader certainly has merit; it certainly gets the endorsation, I would say, of every member in this House. And I would like to see the Prime Minister call this bill up for a vote in the House and put this into legislation. Simply because it happens to be suggested by an Opposition member does not mean to say it could not be implemented by the government. This is a good type of legislation. Why not implement the thing?

We could discuss other things, other revisions, reforms to The Election Act, but today we are specifically dealing with this one subsection and I think that it behooves the Prime Minister to put this bill to a vote so that come the election, be it at the end of May or the first of June or later on in the year, our university students as well as students attending other types of institutions will have the same privileges of exercising their franchise as does any other citizen in this country.

Clerk of the House: The 17th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(Continued)

On vote 402:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, when we were last discussing this vote, I was asking some questions concerning the advisory committee on Confederation. The Prime Minister had undertaken to answer them since he, I believe, would receive the reports from this committee rather than the Minister under whose estimates the vote occurs.

I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, and I made the point previously in my general remarks concerning this department, that obviously this particular vote should be under the Prime Minister's department. It is an ad-

visory committee that deals with the head of government, and through him to all the members of the Legislature, since he has particularly indicated that its findings or the information that it has collected is going to be made generally available.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he would think that this might be transferred in the estimates in the future, so that he might have some jurisdiction over it, and if in fact there have been any changes in the committee as it was constituted some time ago?

Hon J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, there have been no changes. The committee was put under this department in the beginning because the chairman of the committee is the chief economist, who of course carries out his function in this department. That is the reason the estimates are here. I think it functions very well as is, when you understand that the committee is controlled by a chairman who is a civil servant in that department. I cannot see any reason for a move. You would just move from one situation to another, if you were to shift it.

There has been one change since the committee was originally established. Mr. Justice Laskin, when he went to the bench, resigned from this committee. That is the only change in personnel.

Mr. Nixon: Is there a full complement set up in its terms of reference, or is it just made up of those—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There was no number specified in the original terms.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I would imagine that the chief economist is the chief person who will be examining into the Carter report and subsequently into the Smith report when it appears. In due course, as a result of the study that he does and his advisers do, he will be advising the government insofar as its attitude to those two reports is concerned. We have had the Carter report for some considerable period of time and I would have thought that by now the office of the chief economist could have been conducting certain examinations of it. The Smith report is still delayed. I do not know, if the Prime Minister said May 12; somehow that date is fixed in my mind—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That must have been one of the guesses as to the election. I did not give any specific date.

Mr. Singer: Maybe the Prime Minister can tell us when we are going to get the Smith report.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can only say, as I have said so often before, no one is more anxious to recieve that report than the government. We press as much as we can. When you ask men to do a task and they assume the responsibility, they are going to do it as best they can. I can only tell you that as much pressure as I can exert without just being objectionable, I do in order to get the Smith report, but I cannot tell you, nor have I ever really specified a date, as to when it would be available.

Mr. Singer: The Prime Minister being as cooperative as he is, will he tell us what date the election is going to be?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well now, if I knew that, I would tell you that too.

Mr. Nixon: There must be something you know.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): You are pretty well in a fog.

Mr. Singer: Well then, let us just deal with the Carter report. Can the Minister tell us, or the Prime Minister, if the office of the chief economist has been examining the Carter report; if there is anyone in government now who can tell us some of the views or some of the studies that have been directed to the contents of the Carter report; if the government has any views, or even if it has received reports that it is considering in regard to it. The Carter report is a very significant document in the economy of this country and we would like to hear whether or not these advisors have progressed to the point where any reports can be made available to the House and to the people of Ontario, insofar as the Carter report is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There are studies going on but the results of those studies are not yet available either to us or to the House; that is the analysis of the report itself.

I have spoken in this House at some length on the general approach to the Carter report. I put on the record the opinion of the government in general terms, which I do not propose to repeat. You can find it in the Throne Debate. I believe I went into it at some length in my remarks. I do not know whether the hon. member was here or not at that time, but I dealt with the Carter report and in a general way what we thought

to be some of its deficiencies, the primary one being, of course, that in its terms of reference it was not given the responsibility of going into the boards and commissions and so on that are set up under the provincial government nor was it it given the task of dealing with provincial taxation *per se,* only in relation to federal taxation.

Then I pointed out also that we thought it was somewhat unrealistic for the Carter commission to state as it did that there was a major problem here in federal-provincial relations, because that was none of its affair. Therefore, I presume it came to its conclusions without really any reference to the effect its conclusions might have on federal-provincial arrangements in this area and this, of course, will be in my view one of the major stumbling blocks in the implementation of the Carter commission report—particularly if you accept the proposition it has made that it cannot be done piece by piece but must be taken as a whole, in other words, that it is a package. The report itself contains this statement, that it would be difficult to break it down and to take specific pieces.

If you are going to try to implement the whole report, one of the first things that must be done is to get some arrangement between the federal government and all the provinces because it gives cause for some very wide readjustments, such as the provinces giving up corporate and personal income tax and the federal government giving to the province, in return therefor, sales tax. Constitutionally, corporate and personal income tax is a field of direct taxation which in our Constitution is a field of the provinces, so that here again the Carter commission is asking in its recommendations the provinces to give up what is constitutionally theirs. These are the general comments I have made before in this House.

In due course the Carter commission report and the impact of its recommendations will be assessed by our experts, and I would hope they might make their opinions available to the House.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I guess that is about as far as we can go. Both the effect and the impact of the Carter report, and the Smith report when it arrives, are going to have the most important influence on the future of Ontario, the future of Canada, as any type study that has been done.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Providing they are implemented!

Mr. Singer: Provided they are implemented; this is true.

But in the event they are not implemented, we have this federal committee that sat for a number of years and cost the taxpayers an awful lot of money. I hope there was something useful in that report.

I can see several avenues of good inquiry, several good suggestions. I understand what the Prime Minister has said and I can understand his field of criticism. At the moment, without much more detailed information I am not prepared to enter into a debate on that.

But the major point is this: Whether the Carter commission recommendations are implemented; and/or whether the Smith commission recommendations are implemented; the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that we have reached a very difficult position in the economy of this province which demands some kind of action. Whether it will be Carter type action or Smith type action or government suggested action, I do not know, but it goes without saying that we can no longer continue this municipal system of taxation which is slowly grinding our municipalities to a halt because of their inability to carry on the duties that present legislation assigns to them.

Now we have difficulty in this field, Mr. Chairman, because we do not have available to us, we just do not have the resources to get the type of expert economist's opinion that the government has. The government has a whole department, and they are not too tied insofar as money and resources are concerned. They have a whole department available to study these things.

The Prime Minister has said there will be reports coming forth and he hopes to make them available. Good! But I say this is one of the most pressing problems in my opinion that we have in the economy of the province of Ontario and at the moment we are just marking time. I could have hoped that there could be some sort of goal that we could imagine and that we would be striving for in order to get to something more conclusive than we are going to have when we leave it this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 402:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment on the items six to nine under data processing. Is there one department of government that has overall responsibility for the provision of data processing equipment in any centralized way, or does each department proceed with its own requirements?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): The Treasury has made a study of that, and the automatic data processing is a shared facility in which we are participating. We will use it to provide services for other departments but Treasury board has made a study of all data processing.

Mr. Nixon: In fact, the acquisition of equipment is on the recommendation of another department for you people?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think with our recommendations plus others, the Treasury board made the recommendations as to what kind of equipment it would require.

Mr. Nixon: I understand that the facilities in The Department of Education, for example, are available to individual school boards; the facilities of The Department of Municipal Affairs may be made available to municipalities; and the facilities of The Department of Highways can be made available to a road system, municipal or otherwise. Can you make your facilities available to businesses who come under ODC and ask for that sort of help?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I do not think we want to do that. There are private facilities available. We recommend—

Mr. Nixon: Of course that is true for highways, and schools and everybody else in the—

Hon. Mr. Randall: We recommend where they could go and get these services but these facilities are for our own internal use. However, if for instance there was a study being made on the chemical industry, which we have already made in our department, we would use those facilities and provide that information to the chemical industry.

Mr. Nixon: Are you in a position to rate the efficiency of the use of this installation in your own department? Whenever these are purchased by a company, normally there is an attempt to run them for as many hours as possible—frequently 24 hours a day—so that the expense of a complicated apparatus merits this kind of personnel programme.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The only answer I can give the hon. member is as I said—it has been studied by the Treasury board. The equipment is on order, the equipment is not here yet.

Mr. Nixon: Oh you are not operating?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No. We are setting up the facilities to handle it.

Mr. Nixon: It seems to me that with the developments associated with this sort of thing, they could very well have a centralized system and perhaps a feed-out for your department and you would make use of this on a programme basis. It seems rather strange that the expensive apparatus is purchased by each department. I cannot see that it is unified.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Perhaps I could read you the report that I have on the shared facility if you would like me to take the time. It will take about three minutes; let me just give you the information. This is a shared facility and will serve the operating, administrative and statistical requirements of The Department of Economics and Development, Department of Labour, Department of Lands and Forests, Department of Municipal Affairs and such other departments and agencies as may require access to service facilities.

Such a shared facility is being implemented to provide access to computer hardware for the above mentioned departments, each of which has a number of salient computer applications but which on its own could not immediately justify full scale computer installation.

In the interests of economy and programme efficiency there will be one shared data processing centre. The manager of this shared facility will report to the chief economist or work closely with the Ontario statistical centre to gather economic, social and municipal statistics for inclusion in the central data bank. This type of statistical data will be of crucial importance in future economic forecasts and in-put/out-put analysis. This is the story here.

Now I understand the highways centre for engineering and computer work is a service for three governments. It does it for Highways, it does it for Treasury and at the moment has been doing The Department of Economics and Development statistics. That is why the new equipment is being—

Mr. Nixon: You are moving out of that combination into another one?

Hon. Mr. Randall: There are three centres, as I say. There is the Highways centre, there is the Treasury centre and Economics and Development statistics centre.

Mr. Bryden: With respect to the item in the estimates for this work, Mr. Chairman, is that your share of the cost, or is that the total cost? I presume something is going to be charged back to the other departments. Have you netted that out in your estimates?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is the total cost for the computer that we will use in that department.

Mr. Bryden: But will you be making charges back to the other departments, or are you just going to carry the whole cost?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes they will be charged; depending on the type of work we are doing for them, they will be charged.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this is precisely in order, but I have heard the praises of the chief economist sung for two years now and I am not just sure I would recognize him. Is he present in the chamber this afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, he is in Ottawa today. I understand he will be here tonight or tomorrow morning. He was here all day Friday and Thursday.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the Minister, does the department undertake studies as to the effects of the exportation of jobs by shipping raw material outside our boundaries and having it processed in other countries rather than having it processed here in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is one of the factors we would like to take a look at, our own export and import figures in the province of Ontario which we must get from DBS, and then try and deduct ours from DBS in order to arrive at what we think is an Ontario figure. In setting up this statistical department we hope to get that kind of information.

Now whether it will be precisely in detail as you suggest, I do not know, but these are a number of things we are looking at with reference to the statistical department. We hope, as I said the other day, we hope to have an Ontario DBS department operating through this section here.

It being six of the clock, the House took recess.

No. 58

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, April 10, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 10, 1967

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 1947

Motion to adjourn, Mr. MacNaughton, agreed to 1984

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 10, 1967

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(Continued)

On vote 402:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, on vote 402, I simply wanted to ask the Minister of Economics and Development if the department studies corporation take over and its effect on the economy?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): No, we have not made any studies on that. We are interested in it. Along with the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), we may do some work for them through The Department of Economics and Development, but we are not making any particular studies ourselves.

Mr. Newman: Then may I ask the Minister if he is alerted by industry when layoffs are going to take place so that through his department he may plan on overcoming some of the effects of the layoff in communities?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, as a rule the employer does not advise us when he is going to lay people off. But when we hear of a layoff, as we did in the hon. member's city of Windsor, if it is a motor car layoff, and as he knows, we made a study down there and brought out a report. We are doing the same thing in Oshawa, with the layoff in Oshawa. In the areas where some of these small plants were affected by the motor car industry we have made a study there, and as I pointed out to the House here the other day, very few of these small manufacturers were affected on that basis.

Mr. Newman: Do any manufacturers give the Minister advance notice of pending layoffs?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not to my knowledge, unless they do with The Department of Labour, but they do not notify me.

Mr. Newman: I will ask The Department of Labour. I thank the Minister.

Vote 402 agreed to.

On vote 403:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on vote 403, the Ontario economic council, I would like to throw out for the attention of the Minister and for his consideration a concern which I have about the question of prices. Before he comes to any unwarranted conclusions about it, I want to try and place before him the situation which we have arrived at in the province of Ontario because of, shall I say, the total failure of the approach which has been used in Canada under The Combines Investigation Act or under the criminal code to deal effectively with the concentrations in the province of Ontario of economic power through corporate enterprises of one kind or another.

The Minister knows as well as I do without enumerating them, that in almost every sphere of economic life in the province of Ontario there are certain corporate empires which dominate that particular sphere. Then there is a large number of fringe, marginal, smaller companies which do not dominate the economy in any way. Our approach traditionally has been, as it has been in the United States, to deal primarily with this matter as a matter of criminal law. Of course when that happens you immediately castigate the business community, which is charged with an offence under the code as being engaged in breaking the law. It also means that when the matter does come to the court for determination you are in a very rigid setting and you are dealing with events which have taken place in the past in order to prove that there has been a breach of the criminal code or of the corresponding provisions under The Combines Investigations Act.

My understanding of what the economic council of Canada had to say about the price aspect of our economy, is that it did not think that for various reasons it was possible for the federal government to deal effectively in the field of prices. Again, I am not speaking about price controls of any kind, I am simply

speaking about that part of the economy in the province of Ontario where we have no knowledge of the way in which prices are in fact determined in areas where there is a high concentration of economic control. The concern which I have is that there should be some thought given by the Ontario economic council to the introduction of a much more pragmatic and a much more sympathetic and a much more practical method by which prices in the major sectors of our economy, which in a very real sense appear to be administered prices, would be subject to some kind of public scrutiny.

I am specifically ruling out for the purpose of this any suggestion of talking about a price control operation, I am just not talking about that at all. But what I am saying, and I think it undoubtedly meets with the approval of the Minister unless he wants to engage in an exchange of views to indicate otherwise, is that it appears to me that the Minister is a person who believes that in some way or other the play of the market forces determines the prices which are charged in the basic areas of our economy. Whereas it would appear to me that, for example in the automotive industry, there is a leader and that the price is in a very real sense an administered price.

In a number of other fields in the province of Ontario—in the forestry industry, the mining industry, and the large concentrations of power in the mining industry and in the food area—it would appear to me there is a very real indication that the administered price as distinct from the competitive price, and without being black and white about either one of them, tends to play a more dominant part in the structure of our economy than we are aware. There is therefore an almost complete hands-off policy by the government from any endeavour to indicate that it is a matter of legitimate public interest as to why prices are set at the levels at which they are set, what the reasons for the fixing of prices at those levels may be, and any feeling by the government that industry should in some way permit government thinking about industry's prices, and that the ways in which it establishes its prices could be subject to this public scrutiny.

I think it is fair to say that the price itself in any area of our economy is a matter in which the government should be concerned. I am not competent to speak in those fields but certainly it is a very real element in the question of the inflation in the economy, if there is inflation in the economy. It is certainly a very real element in the pressure which has been placed upon people and their incomes in order that their incomes may provide them with things which they believe they are entitled to have. We have had a very clearcut example recently in the House of Commons committee, or the joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons in Ottawa, dealing in the matter of food prices. As a result—and I think it would be fair to say as a direct result of the public scrutiny of food prices before that committee—there has now been a substantial reduction in the province of Ontario, certainly in the city of Toronto, in the prices which are charged in the stores which have a substantial concentration of the power over the food industry in the province.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Do not be so naïve.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Let me clear up a point. Is the hon. member saying that food prices are lower in Toronto than they were six months ago?

Mr. Renwick: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, that is good, I want that on the record.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): The price of hogs has gone down.

Mr. Renwick: I am not going to refer to the newspapers which publish the facts, but facts have been published that in the four major food chains prices are substantially lower within the last month than they were prior to that time. There is also the report which was recently tabled about the drug industry, and the prices which are charged in that industry.

My understanding of what the economic council of Canada said is that it has very real doubts as to whether or not—apart altogether from this inapplicable criminal law field—the federal government has any real power to institute a method by which prices as such and the methods by which they are fixed or established throughout the economy is within the jurisdiction of the federal government. The jurisdiction is primarily in the provincial government. I would think that the Ontario economic council should have a very definite interest in a method involving a properly constituted board—made up not of lawyers and judges but of economists and of businessmen and those who are knowledgeable in this area—before which certain important segments of our economy, where there is a substantial concentration of economic power, would be required to appear

and to explain publicly the principles and the bases under which they do establish their prices.

I am asking the Minister if we could, because we have suffered from this criminal concept applied to this whole area of concentration of economic power. We have not been able to deal effectively with the effects of such concentration on our economy. Indeed, we have been diverted from time to time by worrying about whether the concentration and the control and the administration of the price and the effects on our economy come from abroad, or come from within Ontario. I am simply saying I do not really think it matters where it comes from, but there is a very real public interest involved in the concentrations of economic power in the province of Ontario, which appear to rule out the so-called play of the market forces in determining prices.

Once that takes place in a society such as ours, then I say there is a legitimate role in a pragmatic intelligent way for this government to provide a method and a procedure by which the processes and procedures and decisions of such concentrations of economic power are in fact subject to some kind of public scrutiny, some kind of public explanation, some kind of attempt to bring into the considerations which are involved, the people throughout the community. Then we can get some intelligent knowledge of the criteria and the bases under which prices are decided, so that the Ontario economic council in making its judgments about what the economy should do in its performance, what its objectives and goals should be, can give some guidance and some indication of the part which prices as such play in the economic growth of the province of Ontario, or on the inability of the economic opportunity in the province of Ontario to occur in the way in which we think it should occur.

The other side of that coin, of course, is that we may very well have to take the position in the province of Ontario, and elsewhere throughout Canada, that there must be concentrations of economic power in order that we can efficiently produce the kind of goods which can be sold competitively in foreign markets. I am simply saying that the method which has been pursued to date has been a totally abortive method. It has been devoid of any useful information for anyone, other than a few lawyers who happen to practice in that field, with the result that there is no public dialogue and no public discussion of matters which are in my view of supreme importance to the functioning of the economy.

I would like to ask the Minister if he would choose to comment on those remarks.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I would be very happy to comment on the remarks.

First of all, I think perhaps we should comment on what the economic council said, as we understand it, because naturally we say this government agrees with the conclusions of the economic council of Canada which in its annual review last fall concluded that price increases were symptoms of problems in the economy and that government policy should be concerned with their causes rather than regulating the results. I think the hon. member is driving at the same thing. If we have got a problem, how did it come about? Can we investigate it and see if we can prevent it?

The economic council came out strongly against an income policy for Canada, and by implication, against bodies such as prices review and regulatory boards. The council recommended that the best government approach to the problem of increase in prices was a policy geared to promoting stable economic growth while at the same time attacking specific problems as they develop. The most important ingredient in the long-term growth policy is programmes that improve the productivity of the labour force and other factors of production. This is the policy which this government has been following.

To be a little more specific, last week I sat with a lady who had bought a Montreal newspaper and was checking the prices of a chain store that had just announced it was dropping trading stamps in this province in 44 of its stores. She went to the manager of the store and said, "I do not see any changes between the prices here and the prices in Montreal and you have done away with the stamps." He said, "Well, you know we have 40,000 items, it takes time to get the prices regulated." I would suggest to you that it is going to be very difficult to take each item on a grocery store shelf and find out whether you are getting a good buy or whether you are not getting a good buy.

I would also point out that I had some reservations myself about the combines legislation when I was in business. I think the combines legislation should be altered. I think it is wrong in its application in Canada, because you permit combines if you are going to export into a foreign market, but you

do not permit it at home. As hon. members know, in Great Britain manufacturers can get together and set marketing prices and the way they operate, and they can take them and have them approved by a board. They operate in the best interests of the industry without cutting each other's throats and throwing a lot of people out of work and causing bankruptcies.

I would think many of the problems we have had in this province and in this country in bankruptcy have been brought about by some of the difficulties we have had on the pricing situation that was set back in 1952 and I certainly know this applied in the appliance business. Insofar as how prices are set, I know only one way. You set them on material, labour and overhead costs and the profit that you can get on the market against the best competition. I think I pointed out to my hon. friend from Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) the other day, when we were talking about food prices, that when Canada Packers was closed down for four or five months, prices were considerably higher than they were after it got back to work. Again, I think a good, efficient producer is a man who can regulate prices in a competitive market.

Might I also refer, sir, to the fact that in General Motors I think they set the prices on automobiles in this country with the volume of business they do. They are the most efficient producers, they sell the most automobiles. If they have the right design, that is the kind of competition the other fellows have to meet, and I do not care what they do about their pricing, they cannot sell for more than General Motors in most cases, they have to sell for the same price. I think as far as regulating prices is concerned, it has been my experience—and of course I take somebody else's experience along with my own—that these are the factors that decide what the price is going to be.

The hon. member referred to the drug industry. There are some problems in the drug industry. I think the investigation there will perhaps make some very major changes as far as drugs are concerned, but keep in mind that I think the majority of drugs are imported. Most of the drugs we are talking about today are imported or they are under licence and the prices are not determined here, the prices are set in other parts of the world.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): They are set higher for here.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They may be. They may make an import charge, I do not know.

Mr. Bryden: No they just have got a monopoly.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They may not have. I do not think there are too many monopolies in the drug business today, or in any business, and I would suggest in trying to answer the hon. member's question that I cannot answer tonight. I will certainly say that as far as the Ontario economic council is concerned, we are quite prepared to look at any solutions he has to offer with reference to a pricing policy, or anybody else. That is what the council is for. But we are not like the economic council of Canada. I think that was spelled out in the last three years. This is an advisory body. This is not a policy-setting body, such as the economic council of Canada.

Mr. Bryden: It is not either. It is an advisory board.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is to a great extent; it is a policy-setting body and I would suggest that if the hon. member has any suggestions that we could work with, the economic council is quite prepared to take a look at them.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the Minister that I know that he wanted to answer the member for Riverdale. I did not want either one to get into The Combines Investigation Act or the criminal code, but I knew that these had been mentioned and the Minister wanted to answer. Of course, I would like to stay with the Ontario economic council.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, it is a very important aspect of the function of the Ontario economic council. It is concerned with studying factors which are of direct impact and bearing on the economic well-being of the province. Certainly the question of the concentrations of economic power in the province of Ontario is a matter directly related to the economic well-being of the province and is a matter which is fully within an area of study of the Ontario economic council.

I am not going to pursue the matter laboriously to some final conclusion. I am simply pointing out that when I speak of monopoly situations or situations of that kind, I am not speaking of the total monopoly situation. That is very rare in Canada and the only one to my knowledge that has ever been successfully prosecuted was the Eddy Match one. But there are many other situations in Canada

where the degree of concentration of economic power where its ability to provide the lead, or to insist that there be a parallel of prices throughout the industry, is now becoming more and more pronounced.

I agree with the Minister that you cannot have an economic council which is studying the price of every can of peas on every shelf of every store of the province of Ontario, but the economic council can certainly be interested in, for example, the price of newsprint; can certainly be interested in, for example, the price of steel; it can certainly be interested in the price of some of the major mineral products of the province of Ontario. It does not need to concentrate just on prices, although that happens to be one of the primary factors that are involved in relationships with the economy. It can certainly look at concentrations of economic power.

It can certainly ask, for example, whether an empire, such as the Weston empire, is consistent with the public interest in the province of Ontario, or do we just take it as an accepted fact that whether the government has any view or not, wherever there is that kind of a concentration of economic power this government says it is operating in the public interest. Surely with that kind of an empire—and we have all seen the diagrams of the control of that empire, and other such corporations, whether one calls them international corporations, large corporations, United States corporations, or whatever name one places on them—it seems to me regardless of the origin of the capital, regardless of where the control lies, there is a responsibility on this government to see that the corporations are acting in the public interest of the people of the province of Ontario.

I am not suggesting an inquisitorial procedure. As the Minister has recognized, I have been specifically trying to get away from this criminal law approach to the problem. But it does mean and convey to me that the economic council should start to initiate studies into this question to get the kind of information so that it can indicate whether it thinks such concentrations continuing as they will continue in this province are, in fact, in the public interest; or whether the more elementary view is preferred. I am sure the Minister shares the more elementary view involving by and large more competition in the traditional sense of the word competition—in the sense that the business that the Minister himself was engaged in before he entered political life, where he had the sensation of competition, the kind of competition between suppliers and sellers in his market, but where he knew that the fundamental bases of our economy are more and more in the hands of fewer and fewer people and we do not have to say that they are all good or all bad. All I can say is that there is a public interest which deserves the concern and the study of the economic council and that is the substance of my remarks, Mr. Chairman.

Vote 403 agreed to.

On vote 404:

Mr. Oliver: On vote 404, that is Ontario house, I would like the Minister, if he would, to give the House a breakdown of the activities of Ontario house and just what proportion of the expenditures involved are directed towards, for instance, immigration and how much towards agriculture. Just what is the breakdown in respect to Ontario house in London, England?

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I point out that the next vote is immigration. I will discuss immigration when we get to vote 405. We have broken out this year; we took it out of Ontario house because we have our head office here.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member bring this up in vote 405?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I will answer. The hon. member asked what do they do at Ontario house? They act as a source of information on Ontario, its opportunities and government policies; promote trade production development in Ontario; they foster good will between the people of Ontario and those in Britain and Europe; officially represent Ontario at United Kingdom conferences on matters of mutual concern; assist Ontario businessmen, students, and tourists visiting Britain; aid Ontario businessmen seeking export markets, British contracts, supplies, equipment, personnel, or establishing manufacturing agreements or branch plants; supply information on existing opportunities for trade, investment, immigration and tourism. Located at the Ontario house are the following offices: public relations, immigration, trade, industry and agriculture. The services of the public relations offices are closely coordinated with the work of the department, while immigration, trade and industry are directed by, and the work coordinated with, the work of the respective branches in the department in Toronto. The agricultural office is also directed by The Department of Agriculture and Food.

That is the list of things they do and let me say that their prime function over there is trade and commerce. It is not a diplomatic office, and we do not try to turn it into a diplomatic office. All our trade missions that go to the United Kingdom are handled through the Ontario trade and industry branch of the Ontario house and we have an agricultural man there appointed by The Department of Agriculture and Food. He has been there ever since the house opened so I think to my knowledge there are two or three people in agriculture.

Mr. Oliver: Could my hon. friend tell me how much of the expenditure is charged against Agriculture and Food?

Hon. Mr. Randall: None of the expenses on here are charged against Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Oliver: I notice on last year's public accounts there was $19,000 charged against The Department of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Chairman: While the Minister is looking it up I think it would be likely charged back from trade and industry on vote 406.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know, I will have to check it. I will check that out and let the hon. member know.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Could the Minister tell us whether the Ontario house has any branches in any of the other capital cities of Europe?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, Ontario house does not, but The Department of Economics and Development here does accept immigration in Glasgow. We have an immigration office in Glasgow which is directed by Mr. Donaldson, the director of immigration in the United Kingdom, and the other offices are operated out of Toronto here—that is Dusseldorf and Milan.

Mr. Ben: From what I was able to catch from the Minister's very rapid summary of what the Ontario house does, it is predominantly a trade centre. May I ask why the Minister is restricting his trade activities, insofar as this province is concerned, to the United Kingdom? Is not the rest of Europe recognized as being a market for Ontario products?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me point out that Great Britain is our second largest customer outside of the United States and we have had an Ontario house there since after World War II. I think that this is one area where this government can justify having a branch of the Ontario government, and that is in London, England, and we do have—

Mr. Ben: Would it not be best if you tried harder?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We will talk in trade and industry about this task force we are going to put out. We do have other trade offices as I said; we have a trade office in Milan and we have one in Dusseldorf.

Mr. Ben: Simply because Great Britain is second on the list and the United States is first is no reason to disregard the northern European sector. You talk about Milan and you talk about Dusseldorf. We still have the French market, we have the Dutch market, the northern German market, the Scandinavian market—at least we should have those markets. Is there anything wrong with expanding into those fields, or do those people not import anything?

Hon. Mr. Randall: As I said a minute ago, under the trade and industry vote we will talk about the task force —

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to the Minister that perhaps it will properly come under vote 406 when he is dealing with those other countries.

Mr. Ben: I was asking, Mr. Chairman, why should Ontario house not have branches in the capital cities of Europe.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have operated on different bases. We have operated with our missions directly out of here to those areas. We have had something like 80 missions out of here since May, 1963, so they have been well covered without having an office there and as you know we work through the federal trade offices in those areas.

Mr. Ben: Why should we pay transportation charges for these missions to travel from here? Why could they not be based in London?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The missions that go from here are businessmen; they are invited to go on a mission. We would not want to keep them there for a solid year when they have businesses to run back here.

Mr. Ben: That is fine for the "dine and wine" tours but how about permanent missions operating out of London?

Hon. Mr. Randall: As I said earlier, the trade and industry branch has a man, or

three men, located in Ontario house now, and they cover this area to set up the calls for the trade missions that go from Canada. In other words the man from London will go to Scandinavia, call on the federal trade offices there, arrange for so many contacts in all the major cities, and then when the trade mission arrives from here he is there to travel with it through that area. So there are contacts on the basis the hon. member is outlining.

Mr. Ben: I wonder if there are any Ontario information centres in any of the major cities in Europe, aside from London, Milan and Dusseldorf, where businessmen in those countries can go to get information on Canadian products?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is not an Ontario area. They go to the federal trade office where there is information on all the provinces. We send it to them.

Vote 404 agreed to.

On vote 405:

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, on vote 405, I might ask the Minister, in the work seeking immigrants throughout the British Isles and elsewhere, does the Minister try to attract agricultural workers specifically?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, The Department of Agriculture and Food looks after the attraction of its own workers; it knows where it can use them and the kind of workers it is looking for. We concentrate primarily on people with specific skills.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the Minister how successful he was in the tool and die industry in attracting workers to Canada?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I thought I had a list here; just a moment and I will see. I do not seem to have a list here but I would be glad to get the information. What happens in the tool and die industry is that when we run ads on immigration, we run them for specific manufacturers who pay for those ads. As as rule they have their own personnel officer there and they interview these people themselves. They do their own placement from our operation at either Glasgow or London. I do not have a list of how many they got but I would be glad to have it checked up and let the hon. member have it.

Mr. Newman: Actually the department acts only as a go-between for specific industries and industry does its own hiring over in Europe?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. But then we also run the immigration ads ourselves, and when people apply with various skills we point out the skills that are required here. Then if there are personnel officers from various companies in London at the time we let them interview these people or we get in touch with them through the application and advise people here that we have so many people with this skill who have made application to Ontario house. If they can use them, then we assist them in getting their processing set up so they can come here as a skilled operator.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister assist the individual in obtaining the necessary immigration papers and so forth?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we have been doing almost everything but the medical in London. The federal authorities were swamped and they suggested if we would look after the paper work they would send all the necessary papers down, but they looked after the medical. Outside of that, I think we have done a pretty complete job with them.

Mr. Newman: I thank the Minister.

Mr. Ben: May I ask the Minister why he has had difficulty in attracting miners to this country? There seems to be a shortage of mining labour.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member has touched on a very interesting point. As you know, there was a federal-provincial white paper on immigration a year ago July, and it was suggested that in view of the numbers of people coming here unsponsored, some with no education whatsoever, it was thought in the white paper that they should at least try to find out if they can people with a grade 10 skill or equivalent. A man could be in a position where he could neither read nor write but was a good miner, and to me that is an equivalent. But the federal authorities at Ottawa took a different attitude. They say if you do not have grade 10, they do not care if he is a miner, he still cannot come.

Some of the mining companies in the north went over to Italy and hired 250 Italian miners with grades 4 and 5, and I myself made representation in Ottawa and said these people should be allowed to come. Their attitude was, well, they get to northern Ontario and if they do not like working there they will drift down into the city. We said perhaps they will, but we are prepared to take that chance in Ontario. Mr. Marchand

so far has not seen fit to make any changes in the policy. It is something I think we want to talk to him about as soon as we can get the opportunity, because I think if people have an equivalent, at least they should be regarded as skilled persons and be allowed to come. From the last figures I have, I think we could use 6,000 or 7,000 miners in northern Ontario today, if we could get them. But we are not able to get them.

Mr. Ben: May I ask the Minister when he last made these representations to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, Mr. Cranston and Mr. Clark, our director of immigration, have been to Ottawa and talked to the officials of Mr. Marchand's department, and at the moment it is adamant, this is the way it sits. I think I will have to go myself and sit down and see if I can convince Mr. Marchand that perhaps we have to take a different approach to miners, and I fully intend to do it.

Mr. Ben: Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister takes the attitude that in most European countries the apprenticeship system plays a greater part than it does here—that somebody could have less than say a grade 8 education but a certain period of apprenticeship which would qualify him for a particular trade, but Mr. Marchand would still take the same attitude and not let this person come in because he did not have a grade 10 or equivalent?

Hon. Mr. Randall: At the moment that is the way it is.

Mr. Ben: I trust the Minister will be paying a visit to Ottawa soon.

Vote 405 agreed to.

On vote 406:

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, on vote 406, I would like to ask the Minister how closely he works with the water resources commission in relation to the establishment of branch plants in our province. The reason I ask this is because recently I had officials of a plant looking for a place in my area and we were successful in getting that plant into one of my communities. But I ran across the problem where they were looking at several localities and all of a sudden the problem of water and sewage—specifically sewage—came to my attention. This was in the automotive field with certain metals and chemicals that would go into the effluent. I worked closely with the water resources on this and it is quite evident that no matter where a plant locates in the province, this effluent is going to have to be treated and I think this should be understood by any industry. I just wondered if the department has a booklet or summary of our water resources regulations that it presents to industry, about what would be expected of the treatment of the wastes from its operations?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I can answer the hon. member—

Mr. Chairman: I think this would probably come under the estimates of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think I can answer this. I do not think we have the booklet. We can get booklets from any department affecting industry. I might say that our Mr. Radford serves on a water resources committee in order to assist. This is a man who does locate industry in the province of Ontario and he serves on that committee on water resources, so we are closely associated with the Minister of Energy and Resources Management on water problems.

Mr. Paterson: I think this is a very serious problem, especially to the smaller communities that are vying for this industry. The knowledge that this facility is going to have to be provided for the industry, puts them in a bargaining position. If everyone knows that they have to provide this and industry knows, then I think we would all be on an equal footing.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in looking over the public accounts book on page D-12, I notice $104,000 spent for travelling expenses. Does the department pay the travelling expenses of the various trade missions that go over there or are you reimbursed by the concerns that you take on these various missions to Europe?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The way the mission is handled is that we pay the economy fare transportation there and back and the man on the mission pays all his own expenses when he gets there.

Mr. Newman: So that they actually go to these various areas at government expense as far as air travel is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right, and I might say they brought back, in these 79 missions, roughly $150 million in sample orders. I do not know how much they bring

when they go back on their own. All I say is that our exports were up about 67 per cent last year and this is where we manufacture 52 per cent of Canada's goods. I would say these sales missions are a good investment for the province of Ontario.

Mr. Newman: How are the individuals selected who are taken on these missions?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have an application form that goes to many manufacturers after we have had our own man go through an area to find out what merchandise can most likely be sold. After checking with the federal authorities on what kind of people we should take on that mission, we come back and we contact the people in the various manufacturing companies which have an interest in exporting. Those people are graded by our men here in the trade and industry branch. We take 10 or 12 men on a mission at a time, each one representing a different industry. So when they get there they do not all call on the same fellow, they go 10 or 12 different ways.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, some of these concerns that would be going over there looking for bodies, for skilled tradesmen, would they be included and have their air fare paid?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, they would not.

Mr. Newman: Thank you.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to sort out some apparently conflicting figures. As I understand it, the Minister said that there were 79 missions last year.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I said 79 missions since May, 1963.

Mr. MacDonald: Since May, 1963. Fine. That reduces some of the discrepancy I was trying to cope with. May I ask the Minister, by way of a start on this, how much was spent on the missions last year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Our budget for the missions was approximately $100,000; $75,000 was the figure used for the missions last year, and there were something like 22 missions; 191 companies participated in 22 missions.

Mr. MacDonald: I happen to have what I assume are the 1966 figures in the December 26 issue of the *Financial Times*, indicating that there were 22 sales missions during the year, 14 overseas, eight to the United States, and 600 companies took part in the 73 tours organized by the province since the programme was initiated in September, 1962. That goes back to the initial year. But you state that there was $100,000 spent last year. The interesting thing is that the total figure given here is $12 million for sales.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Were what?

Mr. MacDonald: Twelve million dollars—the amount that was brought in from the sales missions, the total last year, 1966.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, last year.

Mr. MacDonald: A total of $12 million?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. We sent a total of $12 million. We were talking of $125 million to $150 million for all the missions to date, 79 missions to date.

Mr. MacDonald: Twelve million dollars last year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Twelve million dollars last year.

Mr. Bryden: Tapering off are you?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Fifteen million dollars is the total figure—$15,062,070.

Mr. MacDonald: The guesstimate in the middle of December was $12 million and it got up over $15 million by the end of the year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right, they were completed.

Mr. MacDonald: Another figure concerning which I want to resolve my suspicions, is for the window dressing that sometimes creeps into these pictures, these images. The missions are estimated to have produced or shown potential for about $130 million in sales.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: It produced $12 million in sales and I think it showed potential for $118 million?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would think in that order, yes. When you get your sample orders and you estimate what the market is, what they are importing, what our position should be, I would think that—

Mr. Bryden: But you have no knowledge.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I said they are estimated. That is what the man said. They are estimated. All we can do is estimate them.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman—I am just thinking out loud—frankly I am a little curious as to the real value in all of this. I must say that when I saw a headline, Ontario Missions Brought in About $12 Million, my first reaction was, that is a surprisingly small amount. Indeed, I would assume out of $12 million there would have been a profit for these companies of what, 10 per cent? A little over $1 million. So the government in effect is putting up one-tenth, $1 for every $10 of profit that the company is making. That is a fair amount of pump priming. Oh, I acknowledge there are wages and other economic activities that one should take into account—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You mean percentage on gross sales; not on the gross cost.

Mr. White: Better let the Ph.D. student do the criticizing.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder how about the half Ph.D. From him we get half an idea of what it all meant.

Mr. White: I am not a Ph.D. student; not a half Ph.D. even.

Mr. MacDonald: Well a quarter Ph.D. and some of the observations are not worth any more this year. I agree that the fraction may be a little high.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I just raised it to suggest to the Minister the figures strike me as being small. They have struck other people to whom I have drawn attention.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps he will move in and demolish it completely.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: He would try.

Mr. MacDonald: But does the Minister really feel that expenditure of public moneys to gain some $10 in profit is justified? You have to spend $1 to get $10 in profit; this is a pretty major subsidy for the conduct of private enterprise.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Where did you get the 10 per cent profit? There are not too many companies today making 10 per cent profit. Take a look at the balance sheets. Let me say this to you—

Mr. Bryden: On that basis, his case would have been stronger.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just a minute, do not get excited. Keep your blood pressure down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The figures I quoted you are sent to us by the people who go on the missions. Four months after they get back and have had a chance to assess the mission, they sit down and figure out what they can do in that market in that area. They fill in a form and send it back to us with their estimated sales in the coming year. They have been doing that for all the 79 missions. All we can do is take the man's own figures.

In fact, a case in point is a chap we took on the mission to eastern Europe. We came back in October and in December he had a Canadian Yugoslavian in there looking over the market. In January the man took up residence in Yugoslavia, to travel that eastern European market. He felt that his figures were very conservative compared to what he had been able to receive since the man arrived there and took up domicile.

So all I say is that the figures we have are not figures we have talked up; they are figures presented to us by the men who go on the mission and say, "This is what we estimate we can get out of this market in the next 12 months." Insofar as putting a finger on the dollar profits that these people get, I do not know how you can do that. I think it is very difficult. All we can do is be a catalyst. All we can do is to take these people abroad. Most of them have never been into foreign markets before, and as you yourself have said, why do not Canadians get off their fannies and get going and find new markets? This is what we have been doing. We have been getting men to these new markets.

Mr. MacDonald: So the pressure has increased up to the point—

Hon. Mr. Randall: As you know we have had over 600 of these individuals abroad who probably have never been there before. Now I am quite convinced that this is one of the best investments this government can make if we want to broaden our market for the goods we produce here. It is obvious to me that this is one of the greatest importing markets in the world, bar none, in manufactured goods, and if we do not find a market for some of our Canadian goods, we are going to have a good many of them coming out of our ears. Any money we have

spent on trade missions, to my mind—and I have had some experience not only here, but prior to coming into this business—this is the best money the government spends.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, is not the moral of this action that after all the tremendous statements we have had from this Minister and the Minister who preceded him about trade missions, actually they produce peanuts? I am not suggesting we should turn down peanuts, but let us be realistic for a change and admit that they account for a very, very small proportion of our gross provincial product—I think that is the term the Minister's department now uses. It was about $23 billion in 1966 and we brought in $12 million of foreign trade.

Hon. Mr. Randall: These were sample orders.

Mr. Bryden: You brought in $12 million that you know about. Then in the typical fashion of the Minister and his department, everything is multiplied by 10. Everything they know about is multiplied by 10 and then some is padded.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am an optimist.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, you are an optimist, but the only trouble is that one should not be, in analyzing facts. One should stay with the facts, not with the Minister's optimism. Is it true that export trade from Canada has been—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: A mighty poor salesman you would make.

Mr. MacDonald: You mean a salesman does not stay with the facts?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Bryden: I think the Minister of Energy and Resources Management is correct. The salesman must be an optimist but a Minister must be a realist and the trouble is that we just have salesmen for Ministers, instead of having policy makers and administrators. That is the difficulty. They are going around talking a great line of baloney but they have very little to back it up. Actually the trade missions have provided a useful function in an extremely modest way, extremely modest. But notwithstanding the type of statements we have had from the government opposite, they are a very, very small factor in our export trade.

The Minister mentions the trade missions, then he mentions the increase in Canada's export trade. Of course the increase in Canada's export trade had nothing to do with the trade missions. It had to do with the Vietnam war. That is what it had to do with. So you have got a few sales, in a few European countries—$1 million here, $1 million there. Again I do not want to say that we should not get them if we can, but let us get this down to its proper deflated level. When you take the Minister of Economics and Development, you have to have at least 10 times deflation before you even start getting into the realm of reality. I think the point we should stress here is that he again is doing a little bit of good on the margins of the issue and taking credit for everything that anybody does anywhere or that happens fortuitously anywhere. As long as we have that understood, Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to give the Minister the little bit of credit that he is entitled to.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do not give me too much.

Mr. Bryden: I will give him the little bit he is entitled to but certainly not the universal overwhelming credit that the Minister keeps claiming for himself.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will tell the hon. member that he never sold anything selling in reverse and what I have heard tonight is selling in reverse.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, you see, this is the difficulty. When one makes government policy it ought not to be a matter of salesmanship. The Minister in his statement really admitted the truth of what I said. Mainly what he says is that he—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Is the member not selling the NDP? Sure, he is selling it.

Mr. Bryden: This is a Minister and he is supposed to bring facts to this House. The Minister alternates between presenting baloney and hot air and I am suggesting that as a Minister he ought to present facts. As a salesman who goes off somewhere and sells, I do not care what he says particularly, but when he is talking to this House he should say something that has at least a remote resemblance to the truth. The plain fact is that anything he has said to this House has been so far removed from the truth that it all has to be discounted. We cannot believe anything he says, frankly.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Since when did the member develop any great affinity for facts?

Mr. Ben: I wonder if the Minister would tell me approximately how many people would the $15 million of sales last year employ in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have no idea.

Mr. Ben: Could the Minister give a guess?

Hon. Mr. Randall: All I know is the figures normally used. If you want to employ an ordinary workman it costs $10,000 to put him to work, and if you want to employ a man with some trade, some skill like a toolmaker, it costs $20,000 to put him to work.

Mr. Ben: That is roughly?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Roughly that is all I can give the member.

Mr. Ben: I just wanted to find out how many people the NDP want to throw out of work, that is all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Newman: May I ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, what percentage of the funds allocated for the trade industry branch is spent on promoting trade with the United States?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have two offices in the States, one in New York and one in Chicago, and the cost of operating those offices is approximately $88,000 each for their complement for the work they do down there. I might say that about 90 per cent of the firms which come from the United States, come through those offices to us here.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, should we not be paying more attention to our neighbours to the south of us, because we can definitely export more material and goods to them than we can to any of the European countries. I am not saying we should not follow through with the European but I think more emphasis should be put on business with the United States.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think to answer the hon. member's question is that we are doing that with this task force. We will have more men in the United States, maybe not with offices, but stationed in between those offices, travelling in the areas where we think we can get more business, and more firms moving into Canada and more capital investment from this. But I think we would be foolish to concentrate all our efforts in the United States for two reasons. In the first place, it is one of the most competitive markets we have because we made a survey here a few years ago, and we asked Americans why they did not buy Canadian goods and they said, "Well, what is the difference, they are the same as our own." Unless you make some different product, you get difficulty selling sometimes. However, this is our best market.

But we feel we should enlarge our opportunities in other markets of the world, and that is why we have been concentrating in these other areas to try and make sure that if the economic climb in the United States gets a little smaller, we have somewhere else to go. I think this is one of the things the federal authorities are interested in. Mr. Winters introduced his export programme here at the Royal York hotel a month or two ago with a telephone hook-up from coast to coast, to get people like ourselves and all the provinces interested in expanding their activities in all markets, not just the United States.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I do not for one minute suggest only the United States, but seeing they are our principal customer and the amount of business that we could do with them could be more easily increased than it could be with Europe, we should continue with what we are doing in the European market, but I think the United States provides us with more opportunities.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Eight missions out of 22 went to the United States last year, and we will have some of this new task force, so we are doing the thing I think the member says we should be doing.

Mr. Newman: I asked the Minister originally what percentage of his $2 million allocated in this vote was spent on promoting trade with the United States and he mentioned only about $85,000, and that is why I questioned him on it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I said each office cost $88,000 to operate, New York and Chicago, but on top of that we had eight missions out of the 22, which had nothing to do with the expense of those offices, it was paid for from here.

Mr. Newman: Even then, Mr. Chairman, that would be probably $200,000 out of a $2 million budget, so you would be spending more of your funds from this department promoting trade with Europe than with the United States.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We will be doing more next year.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate any representations to him with regard to the problem in the boot and shoe industry in Canada, or more particularly that part of it which is in Ontario. I had representations that were initially put to me by workers involved in these industries, contending that there were increased layoffs because of importation. I was rather curious about this and I inquired as to what further details there might be and was provided with a document that the shoe manufacturers association of Canada puts out. Apparently both management and union in this industry are standing shoulder to shoulder to face the problem.

The problem, to put it in a nutshell, is that in the last 15 years while the Canadian population has gone up 42 per cent, the amount of imports has gone up over 1,000 per cent. Whereas back in 1951 imports represented only five per cent of Canadian production, imports represent 47 per cent of Canadian production and most of this production—64 per cent—is coming from Asiatic countries, 19 per cent from Communist countries, and 15 per cent from European countries. I concede immediately that when one is going to trade with certain parts of the world one has to take imports from them, but I am curious to know why apparently the Canadian boot and shoe industry is increasingly not in a position to compete with imports and is losing a larger and larger share of the Canadian market. Has the government had representations, has it studied this problem, is it in a position to give me any guidance?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have had a watching brief on this. As you know, Mr. Cranston, who is chairman of the economic council, was in the shoe business for many, many years, and we are aware of the problems the industry has had. I think the hon. member put his finger on it when he said if we are going to do business with some of these countries, we have to take something back. In many of these areas where we are doing business, what they have to sell is the very thing that is making it difficult for the shoe manufacturers, particularly in the low-cost shoes for children.

The shoe manufacturers have sent briefs to me, and I have had discussions with some of their members. We are looking at it to see if we can find a solution but the solution is not easy when the federal authorities are the ones who set the quotas. The federal authorities set the quotas on goods coming from that area and so far we have, I might say, not complained to Ottawa about it, because I think it is a situation we have to live with until we can find out if there is a solution. What has happened here is that some of the manufacturers in the shoe industry have new materials that they are moving in on, trying to build a better category, better class or better quality of shoe, but this is a difficult area.

All I say is we have an expert in the department and we have as much interest in this as the people who are being affected on the labour market by it, but again it is a matter of the federal authorities either increasing or reducing the quotas. We should get busy and get down there and see if we can sell some more of our goods. As you know, we are selling items in many parts of the world that people said could not be sold. We are selling sports equipment in Germany and we are selling raincoats in Hong Kong and we are selling some of our children's clothing in the United States, so to me there is a market there for our goods and that is one of the reasons why I think in these areas where we are getting hurt we have to go there and see if we can get more business out of them with the things that we can manufacture here and reverse the trend. It may not be shoes, unless we build something entirely different.

Mr. MacDonald: By implication, the Minister in his latter remarks has been suggesting that there may be a foreign market for Canadian shoes. I was wondering if he really believes that that is the case, if our higher priced shoes cannot compete with the cheaper produced shoes from these other countries? Is there really a market, perhaps in the United States? And if there is, can he give me any indication as to the potential of the market, because of boot and shoe manufacturers being involved in his trade missions? Is there any indication there that they are attempting to develop the market, or are they the group who are "sitting on their fannies"?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not know. I would have to check and see whether there were any shoe manufacturers. The shoe business, you must recognize, is one of the most difficult and most competitive, because a shoe manufactured in almost any country can capture that market. For instance, I have seen Bata shoe stores in most markets in the world and it is pretty hard to compete against Bata right in its own market.

I know, for instance, in the west African countries they have a plant there where they

make ten million pairs of shoes a year. The shoes they make there are supplied in the African countries and it is pretty difficult to ship from here the same quality shoe into that African market.

If there is a market big enough there for a high quality shoe, perhaps shoes from the United States or shoes from Canada could fit. But I would think it very unlikely, from what I know about the shoe business, that we can go into those markets and capture much of the business with shoes manufactured here in Canada.

What I said earlier to you, I think, was that if we cannot sell shoes, we better look around and see what else we can sell to offset the difficulties we are having in the shoe business, so those people have a job somewhere.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 406 carried?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the Minister was discussing the areas where he is trying to sell through trade missions, including the United States and Europe, and I believe some other countries. We are talking about increases in exports and the Minister, of course, takes credit for most of the increase in exports of Canada, even though he has had little to do with them. One of the major increases in exports has been wheat.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I thought you would give me credit for something.

Mr. Bryden: Well, maybe you will take credit for this one. One of the major increases in exports has been in wheat sold to China. I do not know if the Minister claims credit for that or not. I will not go into the question, but this raises the question as to the degree to which we are trying to sell goods behind the various curtains. At this moment I would not recommend China as an area for trade missions. I think the fine gentlemen who went on such a mission might not come back, and that I would regret.

The Chinese are willing to take our wheat. No doubt in time, when things settle down a little bit there, they may be willing to take some other commodities from us. But there is that section of the Communist world that is now becoming almost respectable, eastern Europe and the USSR. To what extent is the department trying to promote the sale of Canadian goods in that market? It is, after all, a growing market, and it has now passed the point of basic capital accumulation and is developing into a consumer market. It is true that it is undoubtedly not an easy market to deal with, but then I do not think the United States market is a very easy one to deal with either.

The United States is a great country for taking people's natural resources, as long as they do not compete with any natural resources in the United States. But it is not a country that takes lightly to goods coming in from the outside which compete with domestically produced goods. So the United States market is not an easy one either.

I have no doubt the Soviet market is not an easy one, but what efforts is the government making, nevertheless, to find segments of that market where we might possibly be able to make some inroads?

Hon. Mr. Randall: All I can say to the hon. member is that we made our first trip into Communist China in 1964, as he knows. The opportunities there did not look too good for a number of reasons. First of all, they were desperate for dollars. They wanted to export; they did not want to buy the things that you could buy, the things that the average Canadian would not have a use for. Since that time the political situation has got out of hand, to a point where I think there is no opportunity for the western world to go in there and do too much business at the present moment.

In eastern Europe, I say yes. In areas like Hungary, Poland, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, there is an opportunity of doing business. They want to make licence agreements. They are quite prepared to make an arrangement whereby a Canadian will supply a part of something, they will supply a part, and both of us will sell it to a third market. They will work any way we like.

We are offered licence agreements by pharmaceutical companies, geophysical instrument companies, and at the present time they are not in the market for, let us say, consumer goods. They are hard pressed for dollars. Their dollar exchange is their problem. But in Yugoslavia, as you know, it was announced in the press the other day that as of January 1, foreigners can now invest in Yugoslavia, in restaurants, hotels, factories; anything they want to get into. And they are guaranteed their money back in 25 years.

I think this is one of the door-openers to eastern Europe. Roumania and Poland are talking the same lines and I am quite sure if negotiations continue as they are right now, we can open up a very vast market in that part of Europe.

Mr. Bryden: How about the USSR?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think it may be a little more difficult there because they have not changed as quickly to trading with the west as have the other satellite socialist countries. I do not think it is because they do not want to. They have had difficulties, as you know, with their exchange, buying half a million dollars of wheat off us. The same as China.

China and Russia are our largest customers for wheat. Was it not a few years ago we had wheat coming out of our ears, too? If we ever get back to that situation, we will wish we were selling bicycle chains in many of these markets. So that is the reason we should work harder now to find new markets for manufactured goods.

Mr. Bryden: You will never have wheat coming out of your ears.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not bank on that now. If Russia has a good crop, we could have wheat coming out of our ears.

Mr. Bryden: That would be a sad commentary if we did, with people starving all over the world.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I could not agree with you more. But it was not too long ago that we had this, as you know.

Mr. Bryden: That was just bad distribution.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Going back to Russia, we had meetings with all the major trade authorities in Russia. They all want to do business. They were back in here almost the following month. They came over here on this new Aeroflot flight, a month after I got back. They had most of their trade people on that flight. They are easy to talk to, but you have got to find out what you can sell them.

Some of the boys on this mission with us had successes in Russia. With building materials, or waterproofing materials, chemical fertilizers, there were some success stories out of Russia. But again, this is an area where you have got to go back and you have to work at it. I do not think you can take a mission in there for ten days or a week and come out and expect to get business. I think you have to have somebody there every day in the week.

This is one of the major problems of covering those markets, and the federal authority has recognized it. They have got maybe one or two trade officials in their office in Moscow. These lads have to represent ten provinces and thousands of manufacturers. They are interested in wheat, they are interested in wood, they are interested in paper and, we believe, in putting out this task force.

I am inclined to believe that they will recognize, the same as we do, that each province one of these days should have a man working in those areas, doing nothing but look after the province's interest and working with the federal authorities. I think there is business in Russia and in all those countries over there and we are already buying their machinery. We bring in a lot of stuff from those countries today, but everywhere you go they say: "We are buying your wheat, but you are not buying enough from us".

I just go back to Hungary. Hungary last year bought $26 million of wheat then she immediately exported it right out of the country. She did not need any wheat. But immediately they said: "We bought $26 million of wheat, now what are you going to buy from us?" It is a pretty good bargaining point.

As I pointed out to them: "You did not buy manufactured goods; you bought wheat and you transferred that right out of your country."

They said: "We spent $26 million in Canada, now what are you going to buy from us?" That is a pretty good argument on their part. I do not blame them. I would do the same thing.

But as far as we are concerned, we cannot do business with them on the basis of a dollar for a dollars worth of manufactured goods bought from them for the dollars of the wheat sold to them. One of the major problems, I think, in the areas where we are selling lots of wheat, is to try and give them some business out of Canada, and at the same time get them buying some of our manufactured goods.

Vote 406 agreed to.

On vote 407:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on vote 407, would the Minister comment as to why all the financing which has been done so far by the Ontario development corporation has been debt financing? This is probably the easiest way to open the question that I am interested in.

Hon. Mr. Randall: As you know, the Ontario development corporation was proclaimed about last August and these are the

people that have come to us for loans to date. It has been debt financing to date but we have other applications that will be other than debt financing. We are interested in both—not just debt financing.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I noticed in the list of the nine loans to which the Minister referred in his opening statement, that apart from one of the loans the interest rate, for example, was seven and a half and seven and three quarters per cent and the terms varied from three years up to, I think, ten or twelve years, again excluding the one loan.

Would the Minister tell me what he considers will be the policy of the Ontario development corporation now that the changes in The Bank Act have permitted the chartered banks to have more flexibility in their interest rates?

It would appear to me, as I understand it, under the Ontario development corporation one of the conditions of being considered for a loan is the inability of the industry concerned to obtain the financing from conventional sources. Well, everyone knows that up until the recent changes in The Bank Act, and with the high interest rate in the province of Ontario, nothing but the prime credit risks could borrow from the bank because they were the ones that were the best bank creditors.

Therefore, of necessity the Minister appears to have been forced into the position where the ones which the corporation have selected to advance money to are those which, I would assume, on the changes in The Bank Act would now be able to get financing from the chartered banks.

I am wondering whether the development corporation has discussed at all with the chartered banks, sir, the relationship between the corporation as a lending institution and the banks' policies.

Hon. Mr. Randall: First of all, let us get a clear picture of what the Ontario development corporation is trying to do. When people come to us for a loan we ask them if they have been to a private lender, and as a rule they have and the private lender for numerous reasons has turned them down. In other words we are the court of last resort.

Now when they come to us and we look after their financial picture, we advance the money, on the basis of the fact that we think, after analyzing their situation, that they can succeed; or perhaps they are overboard at IDB—they cannot get back to IDB—and we loan them interim financing.

Now in our opinion, insofar as interest charges are concerned, I do not think the change in The Bank Act is going to mean very much. If we can borrow money through the Treasury, which can borrow it from the banks for less, then we can lower the cost of borrowing to the individuals who come to us.

When it comes to financing bricks and mortar, the mortgage companies are not going into these areas. That is the only reason we are in there. If the private interests would go in and loan money for factories in these small areas there would not be any need for us. We are loaning money in those areas, on mortgages, at the interest rate that prevails in the city of Toronto, in the Metro area. So if the interest rate drops here and we can borrow money for less, we will drop our rates.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, everybody pays a great deal of lip service to the small borrower, and certainly through the debates on The Bank Act, and in the introduction of the bill to provide for this corporation the Minister had the same remarks about the small borrower. The remarks go something like this: "Smaller borrowers who do not have the credit standing to borrow from the banks at a six per cent rate should have a better opportunity to get loans from the banks instead of having to resort to other more expensive sources of credit."

Now it would seem to me that if the Ontario development corporation — regardless of the location in the province, because I am talking now of the banking system as such — the Ontario development corporation if it is really interested in providing the kind of funds which we believe that the corporation could provide, then it must have some relationship with the banking system. It must be able to say: Well now, all right; now that the banking rates are changed, these nine companies which came to us for funds and which we have charged seven and a half and seven and three quarters per cent, are they the kind of companies which under the changed banking situation could get money from conventional borrowers?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would doubt it, primarily because of their location, as I am advised. The reason they come to us is they say we have gone to the bankers, we have gone to the institutions and they do not want to invest their money in these areas. As I say we are not overcharging; what we are charg-

ing is the rate that applies here in Metro. I think that is a fair assessment.

Mr. Renwick: Well if a company comes to the Minister and wants to borrow, or comes to the corporation and wants to borrow funds from it, and says we have been unable to get it in the conventional market, first of all, does the corporation assist that company in looking again at the conventional market?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Certainly, that is one of the services I talked about the other day. There are many — I think we had a figure here; what was the figure we had, $4,900,000 last year? Altogether, since the corporation was formed as an agency and then as a corporation, we have arranged for almost $19 million of financing without the taxpayer having to put up a dime. This is the object of the exercise, not to loan any money if we can put them into the hands of a financial institution in that business; but where they cannot get money, after we have gone through their operation with them, if they cannot get money from the proper developer or private loaner and we still think they have an opportunity of succeeding, that is where we enter the picture.

Mr. Renwick: I want to try to get a clear conception of what the corporation is doing. The corporation is borrowing funds from the banking system—

Hon. Mr. Randall: From the Treasury.

Mr. Bryden: Which borrows it from the banking system.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The Treasury, as you will recall, last year gave us $7 million to start the corporation—at no interest. They bought the corporation, they loaned us $7 million capital; that $7 million was loaned out on the basis we have outlined here.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman let me clear up another point.

How much of the expense of the negotiation of an agreement and the settlement of all the factors is placed by the corporation on the borrower? In other words, what number of dollars, or what percentage of the amount he borrows is in fact lost to him immediately because of the expense of negotiation of the loan?

Hon. Mr. Randall: He gets the full amount of the loan. He just pays the legal fees on his part.

Mr. Renwick: Well I noticed, in perusing the agreements, that a number of the later ones are obviously lawyers' delights to work on, and they are becoming more and more elaborate as agreements go. I notice there is the appearance of special counsel for the corporation. Does this mean that it is going to be the practice of the corporation to retain outside counsel to negotiate these agreements or is the corporation going to have its own legal staff which should have the capacity to negotiate and phrase these agreements properly?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me say that the corporation counsel fees were charged until we got our own corporation legal advisor set up in the Ontario development corporation; which we now have and we are doing most of the legal work ourselves. You will recall, as I said earlier, the development corporation was only set up less than a year ago; and until we get the staff together to handle all this paper work, we had to get some outside legal advice. Now we have our own corporate lawyer and we handle most of it inside.

Mr. Renwick: Would the Minister let me know who the special counsel is? Was it one particular law firm that acted as special counsel for the corporation in four or five of the loans; and if so what was the expense ultimately borne by the borrower for the privilege of having the benefit of special counsel to work on the agreements?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I cannot give you all that financial information in that detail. I do not have it, but the two legal firms are Blake, Cassels, Fasken and Calvin.

Mr. Renwick: But my understanding from what the Minister says is that now the corporation has its own specialized staff that will be able to conduct the negotiations and draft the agreements and that it will not be necessary to retain special counsel unless there is a particularly complicated problem involved.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say that is a correct assumption, yes.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 407 carried?

Mr. Renwick: No, Mr. Chairman, you seem to be in somewhat of a hurry.

Mr. Chairman: I thought I saw you sitting down, I am sorry.

Mr. Renwick: Now in perusing those agreements, I find that the Ontario development

corporation appears to be falling into the same habits and the same trap that the industrial development bank fell into. The corporation, because the borrower cannot borrow anywhere else, automatically feels that we must have a very security minded attitude toward the company on whom we are conferring the benefit of providing the funds. So that what we take is the whole borrowing margin of that company with very minor exceptions.

Let me perhaps explain. If the loan is a capital loan and is for the purpose of paying for a piece of property and erecting a building and installing machinery in it, I notice in the agreement that the corporation takes a first mortgage on the real estate, a debenture covering all the machinery and equipment; and then I notice creeping into it this life insurance gimmick on the principal shareholders. I notice also creeping into it the personal guarantees of the principal shareholders in the company. And before long you find—and I noticed this in two or three of the agreements—that you have that company tied up so tightly it has not available to it any other single source of financing which might possibly be available to it had this corporation taken a junior position.

I would like the Minister to comment about this because I think it goes to the fundamental philosophy which the Minister expressed last year. I agreed with it; it appeared to me that the corporation was going to develop policies which were more or less flexible in the situation. But I found that as happened in the industrial development bank, you immediately get lawyers and accountants working on the financial picture.

They want to make certain that this corporation never ever makes a thing called a bad loan, and therefore you take almost total security and you eliminate the possibility of that company having any breathing capacity for borrowing funds. Whereas, it appeared to me from the philosophy expressed by the Minister when the corporation was up for development, that the idea was that you provided the kind of capital in such a way as permitted that company to get slowly onto its own feet by using other sources; by providing an area within which they could borrow. This is why I would like the Minister to comment about that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would be very happy to comment on that because let me first of all make this statement: I do not intend to loan the taxpayers' money to anybody unless I am well protected. And I have taken a look at all the risks because I got into this job when we had gone out previously and made loans to people on the basis of a fellow's hair being parted on the left instead of the right.

Now, you talk about IDB—one of the most difficult things with IDB is that they do not loan the man enough money to start with. If a fellow needs $100,000, they say, "I will give you $50,000", and by giving him $50,000 all they have done is kept him undercapitalized to a point where the $50,000 goes down the drain. He comes to us and says, "Look, will you give me $50,000 to keep me in business?" and you say, "Who else do you owe money to?" He says, "Well, I owe the bank $100,000, I owe IDB $100,000."

So we have taken a junior position in those cases and if the member would like to come up when this session is over, we will show him some of these cases we worked out. But I suggest to the hon. member that as far as we are concerned, we have even sent people back to IDB and told them to get IDB to accept payment of their loan, that we would loan them sufficient money to keep them in business and get them operating because we knew they could be successful.

If we are going to take that attitude with people—and our experience teaches us that most of them need this kind of advice—I think this government should take every piece of security they can get their hands on, as long as we have somebody watching that company and making sure that the man does not go out and do the things that have gotten most of them into trouble. You would be surprised how many have taken money, and suddenly the fellow winds up with a new car and a new cottage and he does not have operating capital or wages for his employees the next month.

When we found what was taking place, we immediately decided that we were going to go all the way; we were going to take all the collateral that was available. And I can assure the member, if anybody comes to us and we have all his collateral, we certainly will not see him go down the drain. But we are not going to loan money to these people unless we make sure that the government and the loaning agency is well protected. I think it is in his interest to make sure that he has us as a banker to keep him in business, not to go borrowing off IDB or some other source; the first thing is he gets so many debts he cannot pay anybody.

I think it would pay the member to sit down with some of our people one of these

days and find out for himself some of the cases that we have to deal with on this basis, where they have gone out and borrowed from others and got into trouble after we have loaned the money. We are going to adjust the security if it is necessary, but in the meantime we started off taking all the security we can get.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if you do not mind I will now bring the topic back into a perspective that we can have a useful discussion on. Nobody here was talking about lending money on the basis of which side of his head he parted his hair. It is quite possible for this corporation to advance the kind of money in such a way as to quite properly protect itself. Nobody is interested in this corporation being fleeced by somebody going out and buying a car which he needs, or anything else. Let us see, Mr. Chairman, if we could not just bring it back into a proper framework of discussion.

What I said was that the Minister's corporation appeared to be headed for the identical situation that the industrial development bank was in, and the Minister's answer was, "Well, what we are saying is the industrial development bank's failure was not in tying the man up tighter than a drum; the industrial development bank's failure was in not lending him enough money and therefore we are not going to lend him enough money to do the job."

My opening question to the Minister was: You are using only debt financing; what are your other methods by which you are going to provide the kind of flexible incentive and financial support to industries in Ontario which are not going to be able to borrow from conventional lenders, for whatever reason? They are all not in the situation where the Minister has to take a strangle hold on everything they have. I am suggesting that the Minister should start to think about getting away from that pattern of development. That is not playing fast and loose with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. White: Oh, come on.

Mr. Renwick: Excuse my sense of exasperation at the Minister's reply to my remarks.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, the member can get exasperated if he likes, but we are going to run it this way. It has been successful.

Mr. Renwick: But the Minister's object, as I understand it, is to assist.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, we have.

Mr. Renwick: But does the Minister not understand that if a person comes to you he cannot get the money elsewhere?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sure, I know.

Mr. Renwick: All right.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is why we loan him.

Mr. Renwick: Is it possible that there might be a situation where the Ontario development corporation would on a joint basis with one of the other lending institutions work out a joint loan? Has that been done? Is it being done? In what case was it done?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not like to mention names.

Mr. Renwick: I do not ask the Minister to mention any names.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can talk about a company up in northern Ontario that had $400,000 from the Bank of Commerce, and $400,000 from IDB. They were burnt out and they needed $200,000 more to get back in business and we acted as the link in putting up $200,000. At this time the management situation has deteriorated and we have just made a deal with one of the largest pulp purchasers in the country to transfer the management of that company over to a large corporation for him, so he does not lose everything he has.

We have been dealing with this fellow for the last three years. We always leave room for the bank, we always leave room for anybody who wants to come in and take a position. We are quite prepared to move off if a private developer or private individual, after he has borrowed from us, feels that he wants to get off his secured position with us. We are quite prepared to let him go somewhere else; we do not hold him. We are not holding him indefinitely like a finance company.

If the man says, "I would like to get off my loan with you; if I bring in the banking situation or bring in a debenture, can I get off?", the answer is yes. But as long as we are the only creditor, as long as we are running his business and our money is in there, we are not going to play fast and loose with all kinds of people moving in and loaning him money and taking a chance that he will go down the drain.

Mr. Renwick: Does the Minister concede that the corporation could perhaps take a junior position on part of the money?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have. I have been trying to tell the member that; we have been taking a junior position.

Mr. Renwick: Of the nine loans which have been made, on how many has the Minister taken a junior position?

Hon. Mr. Randall: With these last nine we put all the money in. In the agency, in the guaranteed loans, we have taken junior positions.

Mr. Renwick: I am not talking about the agency.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member is not talking about the agency, but listen for a minute; just listen. The last nine loans we made are the ones we have been talking about tonight. The member asked if we had taken a junior position and I just simply said to him yes, when we had the agency we had a junior position in many loans we made through the agency. Now, is that clear?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is all right. Some of them are still outstanding; we still have a junior position. We will take a look at it. When we set up the corporation we said that we can do two things: we can loan money from the development corporation or we can guarantee at the bank as we did when we had the agency.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the Minister doing any more of that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If we need to, we will. But we have not had any need to since we started the corporation.

Mr. Renwick: How many applications would you have in various stages of processing in the corporation at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think I mentioned about 14.

Mr. Renwick: And what would be the total amount represented by those applications? What would it be roughly?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think, roughly, over $4 million.

Mr. Renwick: And what is the range of the rate of interest that would be being considered for those loans?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Seven and one-half per cent, roughly.

Mr. Renwick: Are any of those for which applications are being processed any different from the format which has developed for the nine loans to which the Minister referred? Is there any indication in those 14 loans of a flexible approach, an approach tailored to a particular situation; or is the Minister going to follow this same pattern of debt financing, fully secured and no other participation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We look at every application on its merits. We are flexible, we will work any way we can to assist a client and help him stay in business. Our policy is flexible, we have no hard and fast rule. I just simply suggest that if there is collateral there, and we are the ones who are putting up the money, we want the guarantee, at least we want the security.

Mr. Renwick: Are all of the 14 applications that are presently under consideration simply debt financing, with the traditional method—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not know yet, I could find out and let the member know.

Mr. Bryden: The Minister has his advisor right in front of him.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They do not come to me until after they are approved, that is why we have an advisory board.

Mr. Renwick: Would the Minister again without any endeavour on my part for the disclosure of any names that are involved in it, could the Minister indicate in what general field those loans were made, the nine loans which have been made and the 14 for which applications have been received?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

One was a ski resort; another was a tourist centre up in northern Ontario. I mentioned two in the sportswear and textile business in Glengarry county last week; and I think there is an electronic company here too within the 14 which are under consideration right at the present time. There are six manufacturers and three tourist establishments in that 14 that we are talking about.

Mr. Renwick: Well Mr. Chairman, I think I have commented all that I want to, I just want to point out to the Minister that I would think he should avoid, if at all possible, just getting into this dead pattern of taking a mortgage and security on everything.

I would think there is room for participation, I think there is room for this Minister

and for that corporation to persuade other institutions to go in on a joint basis with them. I think there is room in this institution for part of the moneys to be lent in some kind of a junior equity position.

I am not talking about taking over control of them. Maybe the conditions could be such that if you had to take over control you could, put some portion of the money lent, by way of junior security, put some portion with someone else; so that the endeavour would be made to tie that company back into the conventional system just as quickly as possible. In that way, it would appear to me, not only would the corporation be repaid in time but it would be fulfilling its function, rather than to have a repetition of loans by the companies which could only borrow from a Minister.

Hon. Mr. Randall: To finish this off—and I appreciate what the hon. member has had to suggest tonight—may I suggest when he gets a free day, give me a call and come on up. I would like to go over some of the financing we have done for some of these companies in the past. Perhaps the member has some ideas we can use. As I have said, in all our programmes we are quite prepared to listen to anyone who has an idea.

Mr. Oliver: You cannot get a better invitation than that.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us why the Ontario development corporation would refuse an application of a loan to an individual wishing to construct a warehouse—being in the furniture business, in the retail furniture business?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know the particular case to which the member is referring; I think he brought this up the other day. I would have to check out the details.

All I would say to the member is that the corporation is endeavouring to assist industry in small areas and I think we had quite a discussion on that last year. Would the money be used, say in the city of Toronto or are we going to use it to help industry in the small towns? We have tried to concentrate our efforts in getting industry diversified into the smaller areas.

In warehouse financing, if it is in the city I would assume that we have looked at it and there must be some reason why we turned it down. I do not know what the reason is, unless I have the specific case.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I will turn the name over to the Minister later and then possibly his department can give me an answer. The individual is in business today; he is successful in business and simply wished to extend the warehouse facilities which would have meant increased employment. It had been turned down; after trying to get funds through the normal sources, he was unsuccessful. Does the department provide loans to individuals in the hotel business? They do?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have done it in the tourist business, motels. Not in the city!

Mr. Newman: Not the tourist business, the regular hotel business.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, we have not.

Mr. Newman: Not at all?

Hon. Mr. Randall: As I think the member knows, hotel financing is a very critical business to get into. It is said any hotel has to go broke a couple of times before it can operate. I think this has been the record of a lot of hotel businesses and we have not gotten into hotel financing. We have helped some of the motel operators where they have a tourist association.

Mr. Newman: I will turn over to the Minister the name of the hotel that I have in mind because the individual has operated most successfully for perhaps 20 or 30 years now and has applied for a loan and was turned down by the ODC. But I will turn the names over to the Minister.

Vote 407 agreed to.

On vote 408:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, what I really want, in discussing vote 408 for a little while, is to elicit some information from the Minister if I could. That is the primary objective of those of us in this party, to sort out some of the details of the HOME programme, so that we fully comprehend all the implications, figures, numbers, and so on. The Minister will admit there has been a plethora, and I venture to say before the night is over, there will be a good many more.

Perhaps my departure point, Mr. Chairman, and easiest for the Minister, would be his own HOME programme statement of March 17 in which there were certain references to undertakings about which perhaps he is now in a position to offer clarification. He said at the time that he would like to advise the hon. members what lots will be placed on the market this year under the

HOME plan in time for summer construction. What is more, lots will be made available not only in urban areas but also in smaller rural communities of Ontario wherever a need and a demand is established.

Might he now, some three weeks later, be in a position to tell us which lots are to be placed on the market this year, how many they number and what the breakdown is between urban and rural communities?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I can give the member that information. Perhaps I can give you a statement, it might be a little lengthy but it will cover Metro as well as rural areas. I think first of all we should talk about starts.

Mr. Bryden: But we were talking about lots.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well all right. You have got to have lots before you can get starts, and you have got to have starts.

Now we were talking about—

Mr. Bryden: May I ask the Minister, just so we will be clear, how does he define starts? Anything that is started either on a lot that you will buy or that you yourself start?

Hon. Mr. Randall: A lot on which we are having a house or a unit built, is a start.

Mr. Bryden: But that might be built privately.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it could be built for us, but not by the Ontario housing corporation.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, but this is what I want to get clear.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have a builder proposal on a start.

Mr. Bryden: But the point is, under the HOME programme a lot could be made available for a private builder.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right.

Mr. Bryden: When you talk about a start you are including both the starts of private buildings and your starts?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I am talking about what the Ontario housing corporation is going to do itself.

Mr. Bryden: Oh; this is a very important question! It is not the question the member for Scarborough West asked. He asked what lots you expected to have available.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me see if I can answer his question my way, and then we will go back and answer it—

Mr. S. Lewis: Maybe I could indicate. I work on that naïve assumption that there is a difference between a lot and a start. You have implied that they are one and the same. Now is there in fact a difference in the figures you are going to give us?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I did not say that at all. I think you have to recognize—I know what you are coming at, I know the information you would like to get.

Let me see if I can give you a complete answer instead of a part answer.

Now from January 1, 1965, until March 31, 1967, we have started 3,656 units, either started or built. In other words we got the start and we completed houses on these lots.

Now before the end of 1967, that is from April 1 to the end of 1967, there are another 6,443 starts in Ontario. That adds up to 10,099 starts; houses and starts up to the end of this year. So in three years we are talking about 10,099 starts with houses.

Now let me go to senior citizens. Up to March 31, 1967, there were 928 starts. There were 111 in 1965, a total of 693 in 1966 and 124 in the first three months of 1967. That is 928, and there are 1,582 more that will be started between now and the end of this year. That is a total of 2,510.

Now in student starts, there are 2,150 between now and the end of the year for married students. That is like building a complete apartment for a married student.

There are also 3,132 places for beds, if we referred to them as beds people would not know what we are talking about. We are talking about student accommodation, where the food and facilities are down on the main floor. That is 3,132.

So in total we are talking about starts up to the end of this year of 10,099 family housing units; 2,510 senior citizens, 2,150 student self-contained units and 3,132 place beds. That is a total of 17,891 units, either built or started by the end of this year.

Now I should also comment on the fact that in purchasing, we have purchased since December 1, 1965, 2,968 family units and 16 senior citizens' family units, for a total of 2,984.

Mr. S. Lewis: Just a minute; can you take those again?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. Family housing purchases up to the end of this year, we estimate will be 2,968. There are 335 to be bought this year, for which we are negotiating now. Sixteen senior citizens housing units were bought, for a total of 2,984.

Now is that clear?

The point I want to make here, before I talk about lots, in talking to my hon. friend from Woodbine today or yesterday, I forget which, time flies so fast, we pointed out that we had lots on which we would be in production this year. We have something like 5,500 acres owned by the federal-provincial partnership in the province of Ontario.

We have, at the moment, 1,657 lots in 20 municipalities, on empty land; what they call federal-provincial—

Mr. Bryden: Out of 5,500 acres you have 1,657 lots?

Hon. Mr. Randall: On federal-provincial lots. These are federal-provincial lots—we have 1,657.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is in your 5,500 acres?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, no! That is some of them.

Mr. S. Lewis: But to all intents and purposes, of the total 5,500 acres thus far, you have 1,657 lots in 20 municipalities that are serviced.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me say this. There are now 1,657 in Ontario that we can start building on immediately.

Mr. S. Lewis: Serviced?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Serviced, ready to go, and we are negotiating for 4,000 now. Four thousand more lots!

Mr. S. Lewis: Serviced?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well yes, they will all be serviced this year. Some of them are serviced and we are negotiating for serviced lots. We figure that 4,000 will be available and ready for us this year.

Mr. Bryden: Well, are any of them within the 5,500 acres?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, no. These 4,000 lots are lots that we have been negotiating with builders for since we announced the HOME programme.

Mr. Bryden: Are they already serviced?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Some are.

Mr. S. Lewis: How many?

Hon. Mr. Randall: About 1,500 immediately and the others are on their way for completion by mid-summer or fall.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is fine.

Mr. Bryden: You raise as many questions as you answer.

Mr. S. Lewis: I have one more just in relation to this. Does any of this lot information relate to the Malvern project at all?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No.

Mr. S. Lewis: None of it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is in the 5,500 acres I said that the federal-provincial partnership owns.

Mr. S. Lewis: It is not part of the 1,657 lots?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, are any of those lots in the northern part of Etobicoke?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes they are. I could just mention Thistletown as one area.

Mr. Bryden: That is an old chestnut.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well no, that was in phases. The land is there and it is being built in phases. He asked the question and I said yes.

Mr. Bryden: It has been announced every year for years.

Mr. Braithwaite: And how many of these lots would be new lots under the new plan? How many would be old lots under the old Thistletown project?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think I can give you that information. I can get it for you. I do not have it here. I would have to check it.

You are just talking of Etobicoke?

Mr. Braithwaite: Yes, Thistletown.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not have it broken down in Etobicoke, I will be glad to get it for you.

Mr. Braithwaite: Can you give me a rough estimation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The lads here advise me roughly about 270, but they want to check it out.

Mr. Braithwaite: Two hundred and seventy of which?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Lots in Etobicoke.

Mr. Braithwaite: Are they old or new? I am wondering how many of these lots are under the old Thistletown project and how many are—

Hon. Mr. Randall: They are on the west side of Martingrove. Do you know where that is?

Mr. Braithwaite: That is right. But how many would be under the old project or are there any that come under this new HOME plan?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well yes, we are negotiating for some areas.

Mr. Bryden: But of the lots you now have.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are negotiating with some areas in Etobicoke for lots at the present time. In fact, at the moment we are negotiating with a builder who built 300 units in Etobicoke on a condominium plan. Now this was all new. This was in addition to what I—

Mr. Braithwaite: All right.

Now, what I would like to know is: First of all, if we stay with the Thistletown project are there any additional lots, have any additional lots been created or purchased above and beyond what was originally set for the Thistletown project?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, we are negotiating for some, but we have not bought any as yet.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am talking just about the Thistletown project. They are all on the old plan, is that right? The old project?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, no. Thistletown is the old project.

Mr. Braithwaite: Let us call it west of Martingrove.

Hon. Mr. Randall: West of Martingrove will be serviced this summer. Now that is the old FT.

Now your second question is, are there any other lots in Etobicoke? I say yes, we are negotiating for further lots in Etobicoke.

Mr. Braithwaite: All right. Now could you tell me how many lots there are west of Martingrove?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is the question I answered a few minutes ago. About 250.

Mr. Braithwaite: About 250. You say there are about 300 units you are negotiating with a builder right now, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Randall: This 300 is a builder proposal, where he has the lots already available and is prepared to build.

Mr. Braithwaite: Now could you tell me whereabouts in north Etobicoke that is?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I am going to be very careful on that because we are negotiating. I think that is competitive information and we do not want to release it at the present time.

Mr. Braithwaite: And this is about 300 units we are talking about?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Approximately 300 units, yes.

Mr. Braithwaite: About how many acres would be involved?

Hon. Mr. Randall: About 20 acres.

Mr. Braithwaite: About 20 acres—could you tell me if this is between Martingrove and Kipling?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No answer.

Mr. Braithwaite: Well no, I want to know, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me just make this clear. I am negotiating for the Ontario housing corporation and I do not think that we should release this information to competitive bidders.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am not a competitive bidder.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I know you are not, but if I tell you it is in public and I am just putting myself in a position where all the real estate operators move in and buy the property.

Mr. Braithwaite: Well now I want to assure the Minister, Mr. Chairman, I am not in the real estate business.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not say you were.

Mr. Braithwaite: There is a lot of land between Martingrove and Kipling—there is a lot of open land! All I am asking you is if it is not west of Martingrove! Is it between Martingrove and Kipling and north of Rexdale Boulevard? There is an awful lot of land in there.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me say it is this side of the airport.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am sorry, I did not hear you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: This side of the airport. Frankly, I am not trying to be facetious. If you come to me tomorrow I will give you the information confidentially. I am not going to disclose the information publicly, because if I do it is in the books here and people can read *Hansard* and we place ourselves in a very uncompetitive position. This is the thing, I think, that the members have to recognize.

Mr. Braithwaite: All right. Would the Minister then tell me whether the land lots, or this area he is talking about, this 20 acres, is east of Islington Ave? Now that gives you all kinds of room.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say it is northwest and it is this side of the airport.

Mr. Braithwaite: Northwest of where?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is northwest and it is this side of the airport.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am afraid the Minister is being facetious.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I am not. I am not going to tell you where the lots are because we are negotiating for them. If you want to come to me tomorrow I will give you the information confidentially, but I am not going to make it known.

Mr. Braithwaite: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if he has assembled lots in the city of Windsor for housing under this same HOME programme and how many and where?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I understand in the Sandwich East project there are about 250 lots that are being assembled now.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, that has been there right along. That has been assembled years before. It is nothing new at all. I am just wondering—

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is being serviced now.

Mr. Newman: It is beyond the service stage. People are living in homes in the area, Mr. Chairman. Are there any other land assembly projects under consideration in the city of Windsor other than the one that we are talking about right there?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am informed that we own land in Windsor proper. It will be serviced after we are finished with the Sandwich East properties.

Mr. Newman: Where are they located in the city? You apparently own them then—where are they located?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am trying to think of the name. Riverside—is that an area down there?

Mr. Newman: Riverside is the community there.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it is where the land is that is called Riverside area.

Mr. Newman: It is Riverview. You are talking about a hospital.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No.

Mr. Newman: That is quite all right. Are there plans in the department for condominium construction in the municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, yes. We are quite prepared to see condominium construction, anyway, and I said in my comments the other day that the Ontario housing corporation was also interested in condominiums. So I would think if any of the builders want to build condominium in Windsor they can do so. The mortgages will be accepted by central mortgage and housing and as we get under way we are interested in condominiums ourselves in some areas.

Mr. Newman: Are the housing authorities considering the purchase of unserviced land and putting in the services so that land will be available for housing in the not too distant future?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is what this land is at the present time, and the objective of the housing corporation and the HOME plan is certainly not to go out and buy land from a builder who has it serviced and wants high prices for it. We want to buy cow pasture too, and we want to service it. We want to get the price of a lot down to a point where we

can build the kind of homes we are talking about. I might say that in the last two months we have talked to the people about roughly 15,000 acres within a 50 mile radius of this city.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, when I asked the first question, the land we referred to was already serviced and that is why I had asked the last question, because there are large tracts of unserviced land in the former town of Riverside and in the present town of Tecumseh. May I ask the hon. Minister why it took so long to eventually arrive at a new rent scale for the geared to income homes and to other—

Hon. member: Federal government.

Mr. Newman: It is quite all right to say federal government. It is well over a year ago; in fact, I think it was February 2 a year ago that I originally asked the Minister this question concerning the geared income rentals. Surely it does not take one year for this government to pressure the federal government to come through with some type of geared to income type of scales. After all, what you have done is actually overcharged individuals. If you are going to lower rentals, you have overcharged the rentor twelve months' rent, so if you are going to decrease rents by X amount of dollars that person has paid you 12X dollars too much over the course of the year. Will the Minister kindly answer that first question please.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am informed that when we submitted the information to central mortgage and housing, from the time we submitted it and they had a chance to work over the formula, we got an answer back in eight months. Now there were some discussions back and forward—we do not blame it on central mortgage and housing. They wanted to come back and check our figures, our suggestions, and we also wanted to check theirs. And as I said the other day, the official release of the rent geared income scheme came through on March 3.

We will have it in effect on May 1 and I do not think there is any major hardship on these people because, as we said yesterday, there are 8,000 people involved. If we started this in bits and pieces across the province—if we did not start it in Windsor and we started in Chatham—then I think you would have reason to criticize us. But if we started in all areas together I do not think anybody is hurt on this rent geared to income scheme. By starting it as of the first of May, it is much easier bookkeeping-wise and certainly does not place anybody in any difficult position financially through waiting two months or one month; that is all it is.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the first of May is a firm date now for the new scales? The Minister had mentioned that it took eight months before he got a reply from Ottawa. Mr. Minister, you are a salesman; it does not take you that long to convince them to reply, or surely you would have pressed them more. I know you would not wait that long for an answer. You would hound them much more so than that—there must have been a little foot-dragging on the part of your department.

Also there is the fact that you did not get the reply quickly enough, because I can recall last May hearing that we would have an answer within a month, and last May is 11 months ago. So it took you well over 11 months, or well over 10 months, after you were pushed last year. I think there was foot-dragging on your part also.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will accept the rebuke as foot-dragging. I sent a reply—I think there were discussions and phone calls going back in the meantime, but even Paul Martin got into the act to try to get the thing finalized at the end of the discussion period.

Mr. Bryden: That is what held it up.

Hon. Mr. Randall: As I said when I started off, I do not think anybody is particularly responsible. I think it was a negotiation that had to go through their board of directors. It had to be approved by their Treasury board, because keep in mind they have to pay 50 per cent of the subsidy. They have a right, as we say, to drag their feet to make sure the schedule was right, and we do not criticize them.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the Minister if he has pursued any plan on requiring industry to provide housing? I can recall a press release issued by him when the Cabinet had gone up to northern Ontario, and there was quite a spiel about housing for industrial workers, sort of requiring industry to consider the construction of homes for workers, getting financial assistance from CMHC in addition to OHC.

Hon. Mr. Randall: What has happened in the HOME plan, as you know we have two areas there, community planning—homes in a community—and industrial homes. Now, industrial homes are where we have a one-

industry town like Elliot Lake or the Griffiths mine way up in the Red Lake area. This is an area where, if we put homes in, which we are quite prepared to do, and central mortgage and housing will finance them and assist in the purchase of the land, it is guaranteed by the one industry in the area, in this case the Steel Company of Canada.

They are quite prepared to guarantee central mortgage and housing and ourselves in purchasing homes in that one industry town, which is the way it should be. We will either rent them or sell them, depending on what the worker or the tenant wants.

In communities where they are short of homes, and let us take the member's own city of Windsor, if there is a situation where builders are not taking advantage of the fact that people are working and want homes, the kind of priced homes we are talking about, this is what the HOME plan is for. We have some towns in Ontario now which have already made application for us to come in and build homes in their area. Where we will fit into that community and that programme, is primarily where industry does not want to get away from the corner of King and Yonge, to use an expression.

I can think of an area where we built a high school and there are 20 teachers there who need homes. If we are going to have a high school there, it is obvious we are going to have to have homes. Private industry will not go in there and build homes, so we have been asked if we would put up 20 homes in that area; and the answer is "yes".

If private enterprise does not want to build homes for high school teachers who can pay a profit rent or who can buy a home, then the Ontario housing corporation tends to fill that bill. So this is the way we are providing homes for industrial workers, whether it be a one-industry town or several-industries town.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, earlier the Minister made a statement concerning the building industry not wishing to build homes in the city of Windsor; did he really mean that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I did not say they would not build in the city of Windsor; I said if they are not building in there, if there is some reason why they are not building them—and Windsor is a bad example because I am sure there are a lot of builders down there who if they have mortgage money available, they are going to build there if they can get lots—I am talking now about some industrial towns where private investment will not go.

Let us take some of our towns in northern Ontario; Timmins is a good example. Here they have the richest find in the world and yet there is very little new housing going up in Timmins. We have a resolution from Timmins to build housing up there. I think this is the best investment the Ontario housing corporation could make. I do not know why private enterprise does not do it, because those people are going to have a job, at least for 100 years. They are more sure of a job than the people are in the motor car industry in Windsor, I would say.

Mr. S. Lewis: I do not understand it either.

Mr. Bryden: It goes to show there is no use leaving it to private enterprise.

Mr. Paterson: I would like to ask the Minister what length of time does his department take once a small community makes a request for a land assembly programme. I am specifically thinking of my home town of Leamington, which has requested such a move. I am just wondering how the Minister's staff moves into that picture along with the central mortgage people. Is it a matter of weeks before there is staff available to do this or does it drag into months?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No; I think I can answer that. When we first set up the housing corporation we had to build up a staff, as you know. The housing corporation has always been under pressure because we have taken on the student housing project, this has been a big programme that we have had to get going with. But the minute we get a request from a municipality we have sufficient people available to get in there, within two or three weeks anyway, and discuss it with the council. This is a survey of needs, and then it is a matter of going back and finding out if the project is right for building houses or whatever they want to build there.

In that survey of needs we also have to look—we have had towns come in and say we want you to build 50 houses, when all they need is 20. In their interests we have to analyze and point out to them they do not need 50, they can get along with 20.

I can think of a town just north of Orangeville where we got a survey in the other day. The mayor was in to see me and he said "I guess we miscalculated, 20 homes

are not going to be enough". And he may be right. So we have gone back for another survey. In this case we have made two surveys; perhaps that has taken longer than the normal course of events.

Mr. Paterson: I know in this particular case we have had surveys for our housing needs and approximately 20 homes were approved a year, or possibly two years ago; yet no homes have been built because we cannot get contractors to build them. I believe a request for a land assembly programme has gone in to the department or to central mortgage. If this can be done within a matter of weeks—

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I just clarify that?

Up to the HOME plan, the only responsibility, the major responsibility, of the department was to provide homes for people who had to be subsidized, that is public housing. Now the HOME plan goes a step further; the very example the member gives here. There are many people improperly housed because housing is not being provided in the areas that the member talks about. We have taken the attitude that if public enterprise will not go in and build these homes, why should the housing corporation not go in if central mortgage and housing is quite prepared to finance us?

Again, perhaps this is a good point to bring out a fact that has been overlooked. I have noticed on some of the criticism on the HOME plan, that they say: "You are taking care of the millionaires". I just say to look at your income tax form today, and if you have $15,000 net income you will find that $4,000 goes to pay your income tax. So you are talking about a man with about $11,000 and this is the fellow to whom you are selling a $35,000 or $40,000 house.

Take a man with a $6,000 net income and he has $1,300 or $1,400 taken off his pay envelope. At lot of these people do not want subsidized housing, they do not want the Ontario housing corporation to subsidize them. What they want is a house they can afford to move into, they can afford to buy, they can afford to rent. That is the reason we say—let us assume that lower one-third have to be subsidized; the second third can take care of themselves, but they can only take care of themselves if there is something with which to take care of themselves. At the present time nobody has been providing homes for these people in that middle one-third.

Mr. Bryden: Nobody has provided homes for the lower third, there is such a pitifully small number. You move off into another area when you have not even scratched the surface in the area where the Minister himself agrees that he has the prime responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not agree with the member, we are not moving away from the lower one-third, we told the member the programme will go on unabated, we will build homes—

Mr. Bryden: It is an unabated nothing!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh no, just a minute now, do not write off 17,000 starts, you cannot write that off.

Mr. Bryden: Just a minute, we will get into those 17,000 starts a little later.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, no.

Mr. Bryden: Because you see this is another typical Ministerial inflation. The Minister has not 17,000 starts or anything resembling it in that field; he is including dormitories for students, including 3,132 beds, that is part of the 17,000.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Where are they living now; out on the street?

Mr. Bryden: I agree that we should have a student housing programme, but let us not say the student housing programme does anything at all for the lower income families. They are a totally different group and we should deal with them as a group.

The completions to date under the OHC for that group has been less than 2,000 on the figures the Minister himself gave. In a matter of over two years less than 2,000 units have been produced. The surface has not been scratched in the field; and why the Minister goes off into these other fields when he has this enormous responsibility that he is not meeting is beyond my comprehension.

However—

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is not beyond mine, because the member has his facts wrong. Let me just say something to the member and maybe when he goes back to get his Ph.D. this will help him. As long as you have one-third, the middle one-third, waiting for housing, the lower one-third who are in the grey area for housing will never get housing.

Mr. Bryden: Now do not give me the old flim-flam—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let us not kid ourselves that these people who are getting into Ontario housing with an income of $5,000 or less are going to get any less; they are going to get more, we recognize that. We also recognize that if a house becomes available the man who is just over $5,000 is the fellow who is going to get it, whether it is an old house or a new one.

Mr. Bryden: Houses will not become available under your programme. You are not geared up for expansion. You are—

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is your opinion.

Mr. Bryden: It is not my opinion at all.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You are ignoring the facts.

Mr. Bryden: I am not ignoring the facts. You are not producing anything to speak of at all, even for the—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Look at the programme!

Mr. Bryden: Even for this so-called middle group. It is not a middle group. You are talking about the $8,000-a-year man. He is in the upper quarter of the income scale.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Where is he living?

Mr. Bryden: The trouble is that prices are so desperate that it is even hitting those people.

But what is it doing to the people down in the bottom half, not third, but the bottom half? It is driving them into the slums and driving them into the situation where they have nothing. We now have even the man who is making $8,000 and $10,000 a year priced out of the housing market. That is how desperate the situation has become.

I am not objecting to your efforts to assist that individual, but to suggest that that is really hitting the main responsibility is totally wrong. You have simply failed in your main responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You are ignoring the fact that we are still going to build public housing. Why do you not recognize it?

Mr. Bryden: I have recognized fully what little you have done—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do not be so stupid—

Mr. Bryden: I have recognized that you have built less than 2,000 units of public housing in over two years.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh nuts!

Mr. Bryden: Now those are the facts.

Hon. Mr. Randall: What have we bought?

Mr. Bryden: That adds nothing to the stock of housing at all.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes it does.

Mr. Bryden: When you buy and pull it out of the private sector, you create a problem then for the other man.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh no you do not—

Mr. Bryden: Yes, you do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: The Minister can talk in his patronizing way about what work I may or may not be doing in the university, I would suggest to him that the muddle-headed nonsense he has produced would not pass muster in public school.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The hon. member should shut up.

Mr. Bryden: If you go out into the market and buy units, that reduces the number of units available in the private market.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If Mr. Smith sells to Mr. Jones does that reduce the number of units?

Mr. Bryden: It reduces the number of units available in the private market; and so therefore, you have taken units away from the $8,000 people that you are now worrying about.

Well now, Mr. Chairman, it now appears that we are up against total stupidity.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right, on your part!

Mr. Bryden: Now look Mr. Chairman!

These housing units that you have bought were available for rental on the private market before you bought them; is that true?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not necessarily; they may have been owners.

Mr. Bryden: Well they were available for people in the private market, is that true?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say they were available.

Mr. Bryden: Well all right; and you removed them by buying them. Therefore I say that that is a matter of simple arithmetic.

You intensified the shortage in the private market, and we admit there is an acute shortage even there. Now you move in through your so-called land rental programme, and the more I see of it, the more I wonder what it is supposed to contribute.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is a good job you are going back to school if you cannot understand it.

Mr. Bryden: The trouble with you is you do not begin to understand the problem. You come in here with totally phoney figures and then you come in—

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is your opinion!

Mr. Bryden: —with smart cracks to conceal your own ignorance. You just denied an obvious fact.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Who makes more cracks than you?

Mr. Bryden: You denied an obvious fact about one minute ago; namely that when you bought units, you were taking them off the market.

You obviously were taking them off the market, and yet you say yourself that there is a shortage in that middle third that you are talking about. Some of those units would otherwise have been available for your so-called middle third.

It is more like the upper, shall we say the second quarter from the top, or somewhat higher than that.

It does not matter who it is for. You intensified the pressure in that market and you have built less than 2,000 units. You have contributed less than 2,000 units of housing stock in your two and a half years of operation as OHC.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do you want me to remind you about Saskatchewan? Do you?

Mr. Bryden: Well now we see the total irresponsibility of the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now you are getting mad. Do not forget I have just come back from the socialist countries and I have seen the housing over there too.

Mr. Bryden: Well you obviously have no answer about the situation here—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Certainly I have.

Mr. Bryden: —when you go in for that sort of diversion.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Certainly we have. What would you do in the first year of forming a new corporation? How would you get houses built?

Mr. Bryden: Well now let us not suggest that this government—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do not knock yourself out, just answer the question.

Mr. Bryden: —came into office two years ago. You have been in power since 1943, or the Conservative Party has.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I took on housing, I started the housing corporation, in late 1964. We started building houses in 1965.

Mr. Bryden: And you have built somewhat less than 2,000 since then; that is correct.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Look at the starts.

Mr. Bryden: Well let us get on with the starts.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am talking about the starts.

Mr. Bryden: Let us start to talk about them then. You said that between January 1, 1965 and March 31, 1967, there were 3,656 starts, if I got the figures down correctly, in the family housing group, which is what I am interested in for the moment.

Now how many completions have there been in that period in that group up until March 31, 1967? You say, 3,656 starts; how many completions?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I gave you the figures the other day on what the completions were.

Mr. Bryden: I just wanted to confirm them. It was something less than 2,000—it was 1,780 or something.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right.

Mr. Bryden: How many then, about half of those—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The seed has been sown so we are now building.

Mr. Bryden: All right. That is fine. So about half of the ones that were started are completed.

Now when do you expect the balance of those 3,656 units which were started will be completed?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We will have 10,000 in—

Mr. Bryden: No, I want to know when you expect those will be completed?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That depends upon the builder, but I want to assure you we will have 10,000 in '69. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Bryden: We want to know—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do you want me to say tomorrow?

Mr. Bryden: No, I want you to tell the truth for a change.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well I am telling the truth. Ten thousand in '69.

Mr. Bryden: No you see, again you evade the issue. You produce these—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now you are confused.

Mr. Bryden: You would be a master at confusing anyone; but I can tell you, you are not confusing me a bit. I am just asking that you answer a simple question. You started—

Hon. Mr. Randall: You will not take a simple answer.

Mr. Bryden: Oh yes, but you did not answer my question.

Now I will state it very slowly, Mr. Chairman, and ask the Minister to answer it to the best of his ability. The OHC up until March 31, 1967, started 3,656 units. It has completed in the same period approximately half of that number. Now all I want to know is when does it expect that the rest will be completed? That is surely a straightforward question that deserves an intelligent answer.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think the intelligent answer, as I gave it to you a minute ago, is they will be finished the rest of this year.

Mr. Bryden: You expect they will be finished the rest of this year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: Where are the ones that are now in process, that have been started and not finished?

Hon. Mr. Randall: All over Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: And are there any major projects in which they are located? Could you name some major—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes I could. Belleville, Cochrane—

Mr. Bryden: How many in Belleville?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Forty. Thirty in Cochrane; 10 in Fort Frances; 46 in Hamilton; 30 in Kingston; 10 in Listowel; 20 in Ottawa; 447 in Metropolitan Toronto; 18 in Oshawa.

Now this was in 1965. Now let us go to 1966.

Mr. Bryden: No, I am just talking about the ones that are in process, not completed.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am giving you the starts. This is what you—

Mr. Bryden: I know, but you see you deliberately confuse issues by citing different figures on the same point.

You gave us starts. Now starts mean one thing, but completions are also a significant figure. You have not given us completions and I am trying to get at the completions.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Can you get a completion without a start any more than you can get—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I submit to this House that we are entitled to more sensible answers than that from the Minister. He has given us the figures on starts. I am trying to get figures on completions and I expect completions.

One of the great troubles with this department is that it is a past master at the art of window dressing. It puts together statistics that really mean nothing. They require analysis. It is unfortunate that we have to undertake the analysis on the floor of this House, because a responsible department would give us the information in such a way that it could be analyzed without spending all this time.

However the Minister, so far at any rate, evaded giving meaningful answers. He says he expects the 1,800 will be completed by the end of this year, the 1,800 that were started in the first two and a half years and are not yet completed.

He said that of the number in process—or did he say this, it is very difficult to say—he said that of the number that are started but are not completed, four hundred and some are in Metro Toronto. Is that correct, is that what he said? Or did he go in for another diversion?

Well of the roughly 1,800 that were started as of March 31 and are not completed, how many of those are in Metro Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Perhaps my associates will look it up while I just clear another point with you. The starts, as I said before, are

spread over a period of months, as you well know.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, that is what we want—the figures on the completions as spread over a period of months, as you well know.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can give you the information. I will be glad to have it in your hands in the next week and give you all the starts, when we started; and the completions, when we are going to be completed; so you will have weeks, days and months because we have this from the contractors. I do not have it here now, every project is different, but I am just pointing out to you that you cannot have a completion unless you have a start.

Mr. Bryden: I sort of grasped that, Mr. Chairman, I sort of grasped that. The only thing is the Minister cannot grasp anything more subtle than that.

That is his trouble, he cannot see anything beyond that. I will say this to the Minister, that our office has been trying to get out of the Ontario housing corporation meaningful figures for several months with almost total lack of success. The most we were able to get, and it was produced for us after a long period of time—just after I had finished making my comments in the introduction of the Minister's remarks, and it gave us the figures on starts.

Any statistician who got past grade 1 would recognize that that is very incomplete information and does not necessarily mean anything. Some of these starts may not be completed for two or three years. As a matter of fact, the overwhelming majority of the starts the Minister is talking about have not been started at all. He hopes they will be started, so he says.

The total actual starts that he has shown of his 10,000 is only 3,656. Then he says there are 6,443 which he hopes will be started between now and the end of this year. What kind of units are these? Will any of them be completed by the end of this year—any of those 6,443? Probably not. Will any of them be completed next year? If so, how many?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think the answer is very clear. We started 447 in Metro. You asked about Metro—now let us stick to Metro so we will not get confused again. 447 in 1965; 1,213 in Metro Toronto in 1966—

Mr. Bryden: Just hold it a minute, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Randall: And 97 in 1967 to date.

Mr. Bryden: Let us take it to March 31 to stay on a comparative basis. How many to date?

Hon. Mr. Randall: 447; 1,213; and 97.

Mr. Bryden: I take it the 447 are all completed, or are they?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would assume they are. Yes, they are completed and people are living in them I presume. Sure.

Mr. Bryden: The ones in 1966—twelve hundred and something; I did not get the number—

Hon. Mr. Randall: One thousand two hundred and thirteen.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, how many of those have been completed?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I understand substantially most of them.

Mr. Bryden: Substantially—most of them—where are they? It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister ought to be able to say how many have been completed and where they are.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Can I get the information for you? I do not have—

Mr. Bryden: I have only been asking your corporation for several months for this information, or our office has been, and they cannot get it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If they ask the right questions they will get the answers.

Mr. Bryden: I do not have the correspondence with me, Mr. Chairman, but I can tell you we have asked for this information in a number of ways, including a listing of project by project of what is started, what is in process, what has been completed. But we cannot get anything. I take it that the building you are doing does not consist of single family dwelling units in Metro.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right.

Mr. Bryden: Your building consists of major projects; groupings of certainly tens and perhaps even in some cases of well over a hundred or two hundred houses.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Town houses.

Mr. Bryden: So that it should not be difficult to tell us where they are. I am not asking if you have some project somewhere

with 10 or 15 units in it. I am not asking for details on that, but surely you can tell us where the major projects are; what you have brought into operation in the past year. How many units are in them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can give you any information you want but I cannot give it tonight. I have not got it written out but I will get it for you.

Mr. Bryden: Well, you see it is—

Hon. Mr. Randall: You see nothing. Do not be stupid. You are asking questions that people cannot give an answer to.

Mr. Bryden: We have been asking the questions for months.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Your wife has been in there a dozen times. She has all the information she wants.

Mr. Bryden: She has not got any information. This is the kind of information she tried to get and could not get. The only information she got after weeks of asking was this listing of starts that you gave tonight, which anybody should really recognize is only a very small part of the story. If you will give us the information we want we will be glad to get it, but we have not been able to get it outside the House or inside. And if the Minister himself does not know I can only assume that he does not know anything about his programme. It would appear that way. You envisage for the whole of the province between April 1 and the end of this year 6,443 starts. Now how many of those will be completed, (a) in 1967; (b) in 1968; (c) after 1968?

Hon. Mr. Randall: How long does it take to complete a house—about six months to a year?

Mr. Bryden: It depends on what you are constructing—an apartment building may take 18 months. An ordinary house, but I do not think you are building many of them, would take less. But I am asking you. You surely have figures on this. In asking the question I recognize that you are at the mercy of many uncontrollable factors in getting completion, but you surely have target dates by which you hope they will be completed.

Some things may go wrong and you can understand that, but surely when you let a contract you have a completion date that is agreed to with the contractor, and that is all I am looking for. It should be simple if you had any figures at all.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is not that easy for me. Maybe I am just not as bright as you. I would simply say that if it was a single house we are talking six months. If it was row housing—

Mr. Bryden: What are you talking about? You say 6,443 starts—

Hon. Mr. Randall: We could be talking row housing, we could be talking garden court housing.

Mr. Bryden: But surely you know what comprises your figure of 6,443. Do you know?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do not stand there and be so dumb and stupid.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this abuse by the Minister does him no credit. Look, you gave this House a figure. Now you should know how that figure was made up. If you do not then you do not merit the position of Minister, or if you do not have people who can tell you. The figure can mean nothing unless it can be broken down in a meaningful way.

Hon. Mr. Randall: From four units to 400. Does that satisfy you?

Mr. Bryden: Well now, Mr. Chairman, how many are single family units?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know. I will get the information and give it to you.

Mr. Bryden: You do not know anything about this figure; you just brought it off the top of your head. Do you mean to tell me that these experts in front of you do not know either?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Certainly they know, but they have not got all the parts with them here. Why should they have them?

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest it is time that the Ontario housing corporation ceased treating this Legislature with total contempt, because that is their attitude. They do not tell us anything. We merely happen to be the people who are elected to represent the people of Ontario, but we are not important for them to waste their time over while they muddle the issue worse and worse.

I am suggesting to the Minister that his performance is pitiful and that of his officials is worse. The questions I have asked are questions they ought to have been able to answer without any difficulty at all if they are on top of their jobs. As a matter of fact,

the Minister is now playing stupid and he plays the role with great conviction. I admit Mr. Chairman, that I do not believe he is that stupid. I think he knows the answers to the questions but he is not willing to give them because they do not make his figures look very good.

I am sure we will find that of his 6,443 starts he boasted about for this year starting April 1, none will come into use this year, very few next year, and perhaps not all that many the following year. That is what he does not want this House to know, or the people of Ontario to know. That is the only possible explanation of his refusal to answer perfectly straightforward questions. However, Mr. Chairman, I now would like to take a look at—

Mr. S. Lewis: Just a minute, I feel my colleague has let the Minister off a little lightly in this area and I would like to pursue it still further. The Minister has already accepted the appellation of a charlatan and a mountebank at this session so I imagine this may characterize his position—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I was told when you get into politics—do not have a thin skin.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, let the Minister not reach the ignition point quite so readily.

Hon. Mr. Randall: And the member does not do too badly either.

Mr. S. Lewis: What the Minister is saying, Mr. Chairman, and he cannot have it both ways, is that he has completed 1,793 homes between January 1, 1965 and March 31, 1967. And he tried to suggest that 1,757 of those were in Metro by using the phrase "a substantial number of the starts that were begun in 1966 have been completed". And inevitably the figures become confusing and distorted and misleading and unreal because they are always modified by adjectives such as "substantially", or "as far as I know" or "what we are able to see" or "approximately".

Mr. MacDonald: Calculated confusion.

Mr. S. Lewis: And the figures mean absolutely nothing. And it is really very interesting, Mr. Chairman. Because on the basis of what has been completed, from the start between January 1, 1965 to March 31, 1967, the additional 6,343 units slotted for this year will not be completed until the end of 1969 at the very earliest.

And that means in a period of five years, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969, the Ontario housing corporation will have built 2,000 units of public housing a year. That is a travesty, Mr. Chairman; it is absolutely preposterous that a government should pretend to be seriously coping with the problem of low-income families and builds 2,000 units a year. And no matter how many starts there may be, that is the effective completion time, and that is the only thing that is relevant, when putting forth its progress. That is really what we say to the Minister and he need not be very obtuse about it; he understands the point we are making very well and he simply does not want to accept it. Now, are we in disagreement on that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we are in disagreement. The member said they would not be finished until 1969. Is he a betting man?

Mr. S. Lewis: Well now, perhaps—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I tell the member they will be finished before 1969. Does the member want to bet?

Mr. S. Lewis: Five minutes ago the Minister did not know the answers.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Put your money where your mouth is. The member is making all the charges.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, rarely have I seen such a performance by a Minister of the Crown. We ask for information and he wants now to make bets on whether or not he is telling the truth.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The members are making the accusations, I am just saying—

Mr. Bryden: As a matter of fact, there would be no use betting with the Minister on something to pay off in 1969 because we would not be able to find him in 1969. In any case, I want to put this on the basis of facts, not on this childish game-playing of the Minister. It is not a mater of whether I bet him or do not bet him, or anybody else does, as to how many of these will be finished by 1969. We want to know how many he has set completion dates for in 1969 or earlier, and this he refuses to give us.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have not refused to give it. I said I would get it and give it to the member, but I do not have them here tonight. I just simply say that we have this

many starts and we will have these completed before 1969. The member for Scarborough West said he does not believe they will be finished even by 1969. I am just saying they will be finished. It is my word against his; am I a liar?

Mr. Bryden: The Minister should have given us the figures a long time ago.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. S. Lewis: We need not let the debate deteriorate in this sense, Mr. Chairman. I do not much care, from the point of view of impact on the housing shortage, whether they are completed by the end of 1969 or the end of 1968. Even if they were completed by the end of 1968 it would be effectively 2,500 units of public housing in Ontario per year right across the province and that is pitiful. You cannot pretend to foist on this Legislature the contention that you are seriously interested in the so-called lower third, if you are going to build approximately 2,000 units a year. That is simply absurd. And the Minister cannot persuade anyone of that.

When the Minister suggests, as he has in the alternative, that he cannot accommodate the lower third until he begins to accommodate the middle third, to use his words, then you have to look at the other part of the programme and that will bring us back to the number of lots and the serviced lots involved and we can get some details on that. But, Mr. Chairman, I simply do not want to leave this portion without pointing out and reaffirming what my colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine, has raised, namely, that in the field of public housing the HOME programme is an entire failure and the Ontario housing corporation is reduced to travesty. None of the members of the Cabinet take low-rental, low-income housing seriously, none of them. Their attitude towards this area of social need is, to say the least, contemptuous and contemptible, and frankly, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to get anywhere here. And the Minister need not pretend that any of these starts is in terms of the impact on the need.

For instance, has the Minister ever assessed the total need in the province of Ontario for low-income families? Is he aware of the waiting list that presently exists in Metropolitan Toronto? Is he aware of the influx of immigration per annum? Is he aware that many authoritative people have suggested the requirements are 20,000 units of low-rental housing per year in Metropolitan Toronto? And he is building an average of 2,000 across the province. Is the Minister seriously suggesting that that is a dent on the housing crisis?

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, we do not have to reduce the debate that way. If the government wants to make an issue of its HOME programme, and we want to have an interesting exchange over what constitutes a modest income family and whether or not there will be an important number of lots contributed over the next few years, we could debate that. But let us not even try to pretend that any contribution is being made to the needs in the public housing area at all. This plethora of figures, this bandying about of 17,000 units, is a pretty shabby façade and the Minister should not allow himself to be dragged into it. If his private entrepreneurial convictions make him demean the concept of public housing, then let him have the social conviction to get up in this Legislature and say so and not try to establish this pretence on the floor of the House.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If the member is all through, perhaps I can say a word.

Mr. S. Lewis: Okay, sure.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member is talking about public housing for the low-income families. Let me just go over the facts and figures again so there is no misunderstanding of this government's intention. There were 1,093 starts in 1965 and 111 for senior citizens. Right? Now, let us go to 1966; the programme is just starting to roll; we have just been in business a month; there are 2,250 starts for public housing, 693 for senior citizens. You cannot write that off, no matter what you do. And then we come to the first three months of this year; 323 for the first part, the first three months, and 6,443 for the balance. That is three times as much as the year previous, that is almost six times as much as the first year.

Mr. Bryden: Except that they have not been started yet.

Hon. Mr. Randall: All right now, give us a chance to get started. We do not have any magic wand, we never said we did. Be honest with yourselves.

Mr. Bryden: Where are you building them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are building them all over Ontario and I will give the member a list of them just as fast as I can get it out of the office tomorrow. Let me give the list of them here. I started to read a few minutes ago and was interrupted so let me read these for the members.

Let us take 1965. Where do we start, Belleville—

Mr. Bryden: No. I think I have the same figures as the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Randall: All right, does the member have 1966?

Mr. Bryden: I was looking now at April 1 to December 31, 1967. These are the projected starts—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Three hundred and twenty-three?

Mr. Bryden: Under family units, this is where your big figures come in, 6,443. I tried to find, unsuccessfully, when the Minister hoped to complete those units but I cannot get that information so I will give up on it. But of the 6,443 that the Minister expects to start in the last nine months of this year, 3,837 are in Toronto. Where are these in Toronto? Could the Minister say, regarding some of the major projects where they are in Toronto? I am not going to ask the Minister to account for every last one but some of the major ones.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Is this Metro Toronto?

Mr. Bryden: Metro Toronto. The figures are given by Metro Toronto; I know there is very little in the city.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There are three areas here. There are 455 in Pelham Court, 450 in Blake and 230 in Donmount and the men are trying to think of some of the others.

Mr. Bryden: Are you expecting the 230 in Donmount are going to be started in this coming year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is what I am given to understand.

Mr. Bryden: And the 450 in Blake? They are all ready to go?

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): How about that? Disappointing?

Mr. Bryden: No, except that I think it is far from the truth.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I understand Donmount starts next week and Pelham starts next week.

Mr. Bryden: But of course, when there is any sort of a start on the project at all, then you take all of the units as having been started, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would assume so. They will be finished.

Mr. Bryden: Then, when do you expect that Blake and Donmount will be completed?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Again I—

Mr. Bryden: You see, these are the type of projects where all the units come into use at pretty well the same time.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am advised that all three that I mentioned will be finished in 1968.

Mr. Bryden: So they will contribute nothing to this year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know, maybe some of them will be finished before, who knows? It depends on the delays.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with interest to the rather weak answers, in fact extremely weak answers, that we have been getting from the Minister of this department. When we were dealing with another section of his estimates I pointed out it is hard to believe that a businessman could talk in such hazy terms, because again, when a businessman is on the job, he has to be exact. This Minister has given us nothing but hazy answers and whether we are to take the figure that we have had 2,000 or 2,500 starts in public housing here in Ontario in the last year or two. It just does not begin to meet the problem, even begin in some instances in the larger centres, to meet the problem of the houses that are being torn down.

Just to give you some idea of the enormity of the problem, Mr. Chairman, from January 1 of 1966 to the end of last December, 12,282 families applied to the Toronto housing registry for public housing. Of these, only 2,080, or 16.9 per cent, were eventually given housing.

Now where in the world are the other 9,000 today in the city of Toronto? They are obviously living under very substandard conditions. If you go in some of the areas—in fact, this evening I was down there at a meeting having to do with our housing prob-

lem and I was in an area that has pretty shocking circumstances. So that when the Minister gets up and brags that he has got 2,000 starts, or even 2,500 starts, he is completely missing the point.

Again, right now the housing registry in the city of Toronto has a waiting list of about 6,000 families. This is in the city proper, not in Metro. It has 6,000 families and this means that almost 15,000 children are without a permanent home. Now this has become a major crisis here in the city of Toronto, and certainly under these estimates there is no indication that this is going to be solved.

Now the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) was here shortly, even in his area they had huge signs up across the main street: "We need houses." If you have ever been to Hudson you know they need houses, and I am sorry to see that that Conservative member who has now been elected is not speaking up on this housing situation. Whether it be the city of Toronto proper or the town of Hudson in northern Ontario, it is simply obvious that the 2,000 or 2,500 units, and there is a very generous estimate to say those are being built, it is by far an exaggeration to say that this Minister begins to meet the problem with them.

But to me what is a façade and makes a mockery of his entire estimates, is for the Minister to come before this House and say this corporation has only been in existence for two and a half years. This government, regardless of the fact that it has been in power 23 years, as long ago as 1962 came out with a pamphlet, the new plan, setting out all the things that they were going to do. And what have they done? Very, very little!

Yes they had 12 points, setting up nine committees; and then a committee that more or less analyzed what the other nine committees did. Well this is what this government calls a housing programme, and this is what the Minister is calling a housing programme.

They bring out another fancy pamphlet called HOME, of about 38 pages—and you know there are more pages in this book than they put up housing units in the city of Toronto proper. They have been using figures of about 400 some odd units in Metro Toronto; but as far as the city of Toronto goes where the main demand is for public housing, there is nothing. Literally more pages in a pamphlet than there are housing units, whether you go back two and a half years or you go back six and a half years.

So the record of this government is literally a fraud on the city of Toronto and the people of the province of Ontario. Being a Torontonian I may emphasize what the situation is in this particular area, but I have been out in the rural areas as well and I know that this government simply is not making nearly the effort that is required. What is literally happening here tonight, Mr. Chairman, we have seen a Minister who either does not know the answers; or I think knows the answers but knows how bad they are and makes no real effort to answer them.

He does not have the units, he does not have the plans to build the units and this is why he cannot give the House the answers.

What are the causes of this crisis; the causes with which they simply refuse to come to grips? Well again I will use Toronto, where there is a population explosion going on. The population of Metropolitan Toronto increases by 1,000 per week, not counting the natural increase, so that we can see that any housing programme we have here, whether it be public housing, housing for senior citizens or housing for the middle income group, simply is not coming to grips with the situation.

In the city of Toronto proper we have a vacancy of one per cent of our entire housing stock. It is the lowest vacancy rate in North America. Is it any wonder that houses in Etobicoke have gone up in ten years from a cost of $15,000 to almost $30,000?

So again, whether we are dealing with the lower income group or the middle income group, we are putting housing pressure on all these families; and it is a pressure that is going to increase, because the building of housing units is falling down very badly.

Yet in the core of the city of Toronto, where I was this evening, we are tearing down 12 houses for every one that is built. Now where are these people going? The answer is not found in the explanations we have had from the Minister this evening. He simply is not making the effort.

Suppose he does have 1,700 acres in Malvern; how is the township of Scarborough going to handle the education costs?

Mr. S. Lewis: He does not have to worry about that.

Mr. Trotter: Well supposing he did—we have seen no evidence of it—but whether he did or not there is simply no way of assisting an area like Scarborough in handling the

education costs and in taking care of these costs that are added to a local municipality.

A housing authority study here in Toronto of 411 families in need of housing indicated that two-thirds of the homeless families have an annual income of between $2,000 and $4,000. Eighty-seven per cent of these 411 families paid over 50 per cent of their annual income in rent.

So as Robert Bradley, the head of the Toronto housing authority said, for some families there is a choice between eating and paying their rent. Now this is a fact that is with us today and it is a fact that this government has not faced up to. So that it is a farce for the Minister to go through the performance of smart Alec remarks which he made this evening to the member for Woodbine.

The figures that the member for Woodbine had were the closest and similar to what I have seen. They are obviously right and yet the Minister, with all his staff, coud not give us the answers.

The only reason he is not giving us the answers is that he is trying to do a snow job of the work he is doing. We are seeing once again, Mr. Chairman, what we saw in 1962, prior to the 1963 election, one more pamphlet but hardly any housing units. The promises and the pamphlets are bigger this year, but so is the façade and so is the snow job that the government is doing here in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 408.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves that the committee rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development and if time permits probably get on with the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.55 o'clock, p.m.

No. 59

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 11, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 11, 1967

Niagara Parks Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, first reading 1987

Questions to Mr. Wishart re coroner's inquest, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Renwick 1988

Questions to Mr. Dymond re abortions, Mr. Trotter, Mr. S. Lewis 1988

Question to Mr. Welch re the Riverside hotel in Eastview, Mr. MacDonald 1989

Question to Mr. Dymond re the price of quinidine, Mr. MacDonald 1990

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Dr. Morton Shulman, Mr. Trotter 1990

Question to Mr. Dymond re workmen's compensation board hospital, Mr. Renwick 1991

Questions to Mr. Simonett re blood worms in Toronto harbour, Mr. Smith 1991

Question to Mr. Gomme re guard rails, Mr. Farquhar 1992

Questions to Mr. Gomme re Niagara parks commission, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald 1992

Statement re The Corporations Amendment Act, 1966, Mr. Welch 1992

Statement re agricultural manpower, Mr. Stewart 1992

Question to Mr. Rowntree re The Insurance Act, Mr. Renwick 1994

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 1995

Recess, 6 o'clock 2025

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 1967

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Thomas Blakelock high school, Oakville, and Runnymede collegiate institute, Toronto; and in the west gallery, St. Richard's separate school, Scarborough, and Our Lady of Wisdom separate school, Scarborough.

There is a group of young ladies in the Speaker's gallery, but I regret I do not have the name, and we also welcome them to the Legislature this afternoon.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, they are a group of sailor girls from the town of Orillia.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE NIAGARA PARKS ACT

Hon. J. N. Allan (Minister without Portfolio) moves first reading of bill intituled An Act to amend The Niagara Parks Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, the amendments will have the effect of providing the requirement that the commission will be responsible to a Minister; also that the changes require the appointment of provincial members to the commission for staggered terms of three years and provide for the remuneration of members of the commission.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on a point of personal privilege. I am advised by two of my colleagues that the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) today on the steps of the Legislature advised a group that I had advocated raising the sales tax in the province of Ontario to nine per cent. May I advise the House, sir, that at no time—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr Speaker: The point of order will have to come at this time.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that one can use the period before the orders of the day to answer alleged statements made in some other place? I would like to state, Mr. Speaker, that I was present on the occasion referred to and the hon. member for York South did not say what was attributed to him.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He certainly did.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I did not!

Mr. Bryden: He did not say it. He said this was an inference that he drew and that is quite a different thing; that this was the only interpretation he could put on the member's remarks, but he did not attribute that—

Mr. MacDonald: I said the Liberal Party promoted the sales tax and is that not true? Is that not true?

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member if he would speak to this point of order.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Oh, surely not, why does he have to speak to a point of order?

Mr. Singer: That is not a point of order at all. Mr. Speaker, I was advised—and I will mention my colleagues—I was advised by the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Racine) and by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter)—

Mr. Nixon: Both honourable men!

Mr. Singer: —that this was stated today on the front steps of the Legislature. And I want to say this, sir, that if the hon. member for York South said anything like this—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I categorically deny the assertion that he has made with regard to what I said and therefore he has no further point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The member categorically denies he made the statement and the member has no choice but to accept his word.

Mr. MacDonald: I did not attribute anything of that nature to the member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: All I was going to say was this, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for York South said anything remotely resembling this, he is talking in his usual irresponsible manner.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, the denial is ridiculous. We heard it; the two of us were standing right there—ridiculous.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I can say I heard the remarks made by the member for York South.

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest the members settle this argument among themselves elsewhere, about what they heard and what they did not hear.

An hon. member: Will it be in *Hansard?*

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed with the questions.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General, notice of which has been forwarded to him.

Is the government of the opinion that a judicial enquiry into the dismissal of former chief Metro Toronto coroner, Dr. Shulman, may delay the inquest into the death of a man in the workmen's compensation board hospital fire; and if the Minister feels that no delay is necessary, can he assure the House that the inquest will start as scheduled?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, it is my desire that the inquest should proceed promptly and as planned. I think, however, the matter should wait until we have had an opportunity to discuss the question of its proceeding with the commissioner who I expect will be appointed very shortly.

Mr. Nixon: Is there a possibility then that this may be considered a matter that is *sub judice* as far as the commission is concerned and therefore the inquest could not proceed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well I should like to discuss it with the commissioner and I shall do this at the very first opportunity.

Mr. Nixon: You feel that there is a possibility that this is so though?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I would not say that I feel that way, but I would like to have the commissioner's views on that.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I had a similar question. Would the Attorney General allow a supplementary question to the question that I would have put along the same lines? Is it intended that the inquest will be conducted by Coroner Cass?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I said that yesterday.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health: Can the Minister verify whether or not 12 abortions were carried out last year at the women's college hospital, only one of which can be legal under Canada's criminal code? And if the Minister does know of such cases can he tell the House whether or not he agrees with the practice?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I cannot verify this report that 12 abortions were carried out at the women's college hospital. I only have the newspaper report of the hospital's annual statement.

I do know, however, that therapeutic abortions are performed and are recognized by every good practitioner. As a practitioner of medicine I agree with the practice of therapeutic abortion since I believe the doctor has a responsibility to his patient transcending all other considerations and determining at all times that the patient should be given every benefit of the best medical practice of which he, the practitioner, is capable.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would permit a supplementary question. In view of your remarks, which I am happy to hear, would you make some effort to have the Attorney General use his good offices to have the criminal code improved so this could be proper? It is common sense what they are doing at that hospital.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have discussed this with the Attorney General and I believe he has done whatever he can in this regard. I will leave him to answer that, but we did make this a definite topic of discussion at the level of the national health council, which includes in its membership every provincial Deputy Minister of Health.

At Ontario's suggestion or recommendation this was a topic of discussion at the last meeting of council and it was my understanding then that the Minister of National Health and Welfare undertook to relay our submissions to the Minister of Justice at Ottawa.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could follow on this, since my question relates to the same matter.

First to the Attorney General: What representations, if any, has the Minister made to the federal government to have the criminal code amended so as to broaden the grounds for the granting of therapeutic abortions?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member on that question is as follows: This subject was discussed at the conference of commissioners on uniformity of legislation in Canada in 1966, and the conference at which I was represented approved of the principle that the law should be clarified and extended to permit therapeutic abortion to preserve the health, as well as the life, of the mother. I support this principle which has been submitted to The Department of Justice through the facilities of that conference.

Mr. S. Lewis: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I take it then that the Attorney General does not intend to undertake any legal action in the interim while the federal government is making up its mind?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps the hon. member would advise me whether the law should be enforced as it is on the statute books or not.

Mr. Bryden: It ought to be changed.

Mr. S. Lewis: I would like to suggest that the law should not be made an ass in this fashion.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am glad to have the hon. member's views.

Mr. S. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Would the member accept the Minister's answer to the previous question, as being sufficient for this question as well?

Mr. S. Lewis: No, I do not, sir. Will the amended Public Health Act provide for instructions to medical officers of health to view the problem of abortion as a public health hazard? If so, what procedures might they follow; if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, there will be no direction to medical officers of health because they are specialists in their own branch of medicine and are quite well skilled in the practice of medicine in their own sphere. There is nothing in The Public Health Act amendments referring to instructions to medical officers of health concerning abortion as a public health hazard. Many medical officers of health, just as many private practitioners, are very much concerned about this and are doing whatever they can by education and pressure for changes in the law to bring this matter into more clear focus.

Mr. S. Lewis: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Ask the Minister.

Mr. S. Lewis: Yes, I see. In view of the fact that abortions are the greatest single cause for maternal mortality in the province of Ontario, does not the Minister think that his Public Health Act should somehow incorporate this area as it has now incorporated the dissemination of birth control information and procedures?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would like to give that question a little more mature consideration.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions, my first to the Provincial Secretary. What explanation is there for the Ontario liquor licence board cutting in half a two-week suspension which was imposed on the licence privileges of the Riverside hotel in Eastview?

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, Mr. G. T. McMichael, QC, a lawyer in Ottawa, appeared at a board meeting on Wednesday, April 5, 1967, with his client, the proprietor of the hotel in question, of the city of Eastview, and also present with him at this time was Mr. P. Bourque. At a previous hearing, on March 30, 1967, Mr. Gagne alone was present. He had been advised of the hearing by letter of the board dated March 22. This letter indicated that an inspector had observed liquor being served to patrons after the regulation closing hour, liquor being served in a dining lounge without meals, and of overcrowding of the premises. Details of the infractions were given to Mr. Gagne at the board hearing. He directed some questions to the inspector, but agreed that the observations of the inspector were factual.

Every licensed room contains a capacity card, and one reason for this limitation, of

course, revolves around possible panic in case of fire. On one occasion on a Saturday evening, the inspector reported the dance floor was filled and one could hardly walk around for people, and on several occasions there were more people present than were permitted, although not to the extent of the occasion just mentioned.

Mr. McMichael then appeared at the subsequent hearing of the board and pointed out that the staff of the hotel, depending on the sale of liquor, numbered 99 and that these had been suspended. Mr. Gagne had not made any mention of this at the first hearing. Mr. McMichael also submitted that Mr. Bourque had loaned money to the hotel and had become a 50 per cent owner of the hotel and would take an active part in the management of this hotel.

After these submissions of Mr. McMichael had been made, the board decided to reduce the two weeks' suspension to that of one week, on the undertaking of Mr. Bourque that the 50-cent buffet meal be discontinued, that dances be held in the dining lounge and that they would be strictly supervised, that food orders would be taken immediately after the service of a drink and that one of the dining lounges would be converted to a lounge.

On two former occasions the board had warned the hotel as to the presence of minors in the licensed portions of the hotel and Mr. Bourque stated that if there was any trouble with minors, the licence would be surrendered. On the basis of the submissions made at this second hearing, the suspension was reduced to one week.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister of Health. Northern Drug Company in Sudbury, during the month of March was still charging $12 for quinidine, in spite of the Minister's contention that prices were $12 a year ago and were now approximately one-half that amount. What sections of the province have benefited from a quinidine price reduction and what sections are still paying exorbitant prices?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer the hon. member's question, since I do not have any way of determining drug prices across the province. As I stated in my answer to his question the other day, the prices I checked were in the local area, as I did last year.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Attorney General.

The first one is: Is the Minister aware that mail addressed to Dr. Morton Shulman, former chief Metro Toronto coroner at the Lombard Street coroner's office, has been opened by officials of the supervising coroner's office? If Dr. Shulman's mail is being opened by the provincial officials, does the Minister feel this is an invasion of privacy?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The processing of any mail received related to either Dr. Shulman or the office of the chief coroner, is being dealt with as directed by the postmaster for Toronto. We will follow his direction, which is that mail addressed to Dr. Shulman by his former title will go to the successor in his office, namely Dr. Cotnam, who is supervising that office until an appointment can be made. Mail addressed to Dr. Shulman in care of that office, or marked personal, will be sent to Dr. Shulman. I do not consider there is any invasion of privacy here at all.

I should like to read the direction which was sent to us by the postmaster for Toronto. He sent to my Deputy, Mr. Dick, a letter dated April 10 and received on April 11. This is a ruling from the post office headquarters, which is as follows:

> Mail addressed to any person by his former title as a public official or by his former title as an official or officer of a company, business concern, institution, or any other organization after he has severed his connections therewith is to be delivered to his successor in office. Mail addressed to such an individual, care of a company, business concern or other organization or mailed to his address marked personal is to be delivered to the person addressed.

That is the ruling from the post office authorities and is in quotation marks in this letter. The postmaster continues:

> It is the intention of this office to handle mail for the chief coroner's office in accordance with this ruling. Dr. Shulman is also being advised of this ruling in writing.

It is signed by J. D. O'Connell, postmaster for Toronto.

I would just add that, certainly, if any mail, even though it may be addressed to Dr. Shulman as coroner, upon being opened is seen to be personal, it will be immediately sealed and delivered to him. There is no thought of invading his privacy, no wish to at all.

Mr. Trotter: Would the Minister permit a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Trotter: When the Minister retires from this office and he gets mail sent to Attorney General Wishart, does he expect someone else to open his mail?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I certainly would.

Mr. Bryden: Not if it is lilac scented.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If it is addressed to Attorney General Arthur Wishart I would expect it to be opened because it probably would relate to public matters and I should think it should be opened. If it is private, it should be delivered to me.

I would say further that there may be mail come into the coroner's office addressed to Dr. Shulman as coroner. It might be very urgent public business and it should be dealt with. Otherwise, it should be looked at to see if it is official business, and if it is personal, certainly it should go to him. I cannot think of any other way. This is the way the post office rulings indicate all these matters are handled in every case.

Mr. Trotter: I would not want you going through my mail.

Mr. Speaker, I have one more question for the Attorney General. Does the Attorney General know whether or not any Ontario car dealers have used electronic eavesdropping equipment in sales booths? If he does know of such practices, what action if any does he intend to take?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I know of no such practice. I did see something in the press, that is all I know.

Mr. Trotter: I was wondering if he would answer a supplementary question. If the Attorney General does learn of it, what action would he take?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is speculation. I will deal with it when I face the situation.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. When will the Minister table the fifth annual report of the Ontario police commission?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In a matter of days.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Is the workmen's compensation board hospital at Downsview a hospital under The Public Hospitals Act or a hospital under The Private Hospitals Act, and if not, what statutes of this province are applicable to it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the hospital in question falls within the terms of neither Act, but falls within the purview of the workmen's compensation board itself.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) whom I note is not in the House, but I would like to put it on the record.

Is the workmen's compensation board at Downsview owned or occupied, or both, by the workmen's compensation board and if not, what exactly is its status?

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

It is in three parts: Would the Minister advise the House what his department intends to do about the statment that bacteria which causes a serious form of blood poisoning in humans had been found living in worms in Toronto harbour?

Does the Ontario water resources commission know whether or not these bacteria could get into the water supply of Metropolitan Toronto?

And third, what action, if any, does the Ontario water resources commission intend to take about the allegations that the red worms are so thickly concentrated in Toronto harbour that they colour the bottom of the harbour?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): The answer to questions one and three: Blood worms have been used for many years as one of the number of biological indicators of water quality and the Ontario water resources commission conducts such biological surveys each year in many areas of the province.

The discovery of bacteria living in worms in Toronto harbour is something new, however, and staff of the OWRC will investigate this matter.

The answer to question No. 2: The water supply for Metro Toronto is taken through submerged intakes well out in Lake Ontario and at a considerable distance from the area affected by blood worms.

In view of the full treatment which this water supply receives, including filtration and chlorination, there is no danger involved.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to the three questions that were asked me at the end of the week.

One by the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar): "In view of the fact that six persons died in Halton county in the past two years when their cars were speared by guard rails, what steps, if any, does the Minister intend to take to rectify this situation?"

During the past eight months, the department has designed and installed on a test basis a number of guard rail terminal treatments that eliminate the spear end to the approaching traffic through the provision of a ramp section that allows ground burying of the guard rail end and the curving of the end section away from traffic to provide additional clearance. From these tests, installation standards have now been developed for use in new construction and in the modification of existing installations.

Then I have a question by the hon. leader of the Opposition: "Is it the intention of The Department of Highways to construct a four-lane highway through Victoria Park in the Niagara parks commission?"

The answer is: No, there are some modifications to the road system suggested by the city's consultant but this is not a Department of Highways responsibility.

Then I have a question from the hon. member for York South: "Can the Minister clarify details in connection with the proposed location of a four-lane highway through the Niagara parks commission territory?" And the answer is the same as to No. 2.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I am pleased to inform the House that regulations under The Corporations Amendment Act, 1966, have been approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. As this House already knows, certain sections of this Act and The Securities Act, 1966, come into force on the first day of May. The regulations which have been approved apply to Ontario companies and are complementary to the regulations passed recently under The Securities Act, 1966, which will apply to companies incorporated in other jurisdictions and which are listed on the Toronto stock exchange or subsequently issue equity shares by way of a prospectus in Ontario.

The Corporations Amendment Act, 1966, Mr. Speaker, coupled with the regulations, sets a new standard for financial disclosure for companies in Ontario, a standard higher than that required by any other jurisdiction in Canada and, I understand, in the world.

The Act and the regulations together require that there be the solicitation of proxies and the supplying to shareholders of extensive information on the stewardship of the officers and directors of the company. As the hon. members will see from the reading of the regulations, an exceedingly high standard of disclosure is required.

The regulations provide the form in which insiders of companies incorporated in Ontario shall report any trading in the securities of their company.

The first returns under these provisions are to be made by June 10 next. To make certain that Ontario companies are aware of the requirements of the new Act, a letter is being sent by me to all Ontario public companies which are required to comply with the statute. Further, and for the assistance of the public, office copies of the regulations are now being printed in quantity and will be available later this week to the public at The Department of the Provincial Secretary.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a statement of interest concerning agricultural manpower. Mr. John Krauter, the farm manpower development officer with our department, has just returned from the United Kingdom where he has been on a recruitment mission for farm labour. I am very happy to report that he has prospects for 150 permanent farm help to come to Ontario immediately. Some of them are already here or on the water or ready to come.

In the course of his mission, he had indications that many more farm workers were interested in coming here. And it is our intention that as soon as this 150 are placed we will then engage in bringing over the rest of them. Arrangements for this mission were made in very close cooperation with the officials of The Department of Economics and Development. We worked very closely with them both here and overseas and we are pleased with the cooperation that has been afforded our department by The Canada Department of Immigration in cooperating and bringing these people to Ontario to meet a very real need.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is just another clear indication of the interest of this government in developing the basic industry of agriculture and food in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege arising from statements in the Toronto *Daily Star* and the *Globe and Mail* of yesterday attributed to the hon. member for Riverdale, in which he is

said to have accused me of slyness in introducing amendments to The Coroners Act last year.

According to the newspapers, he stated it was for the purpose of being able to dismiss Dr. Shulman as coroner this year. If he is reported accurately, the hon. member is making a base and snide accusation which is a reflection upon his own knowledge of the law and, more importantly, Mr. Speaker, a groundless attack upon the administration of justice which he purports to serve as a member of his legal profession. The hon. member is reported to have said that one of the amendments I introduced gave the government the power to dismiss coroners by passing an order-in-council and that previously coroners could be dismissed only on proof of misbehaviour.

This is a complete misstatement of the law. I read from the *Globe and Mail* of April 11:

> Mr. Renwick accused Mr. Wishart of slyness for introducing legislation a year ago which gave the government the power to dismiss coroners by passing an order-in-council. Before that, he said, coroners like other judicial officers could be dismissed only on proof of misbehaviour. The new law, he charged, enabled the government to dismiss Dr. Shulman arbitrarily and capriciously.

The coroners, Mr. Speaker, are appointed under section 1 of The Coroners Act and prior to 1966, prior to the amendment, it read as follows:

> The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint one or more coroners for Ontario or any part thereof.

Section 21 of The Interpretation Act reads as follows:

> Authority to the Lieutenant-Governor to make an appointment to an office by commission or otherwise shall be deemed authority to appoint during pleasure.

Section 27, subsection (1) of The Interpretation Act reads:

> In every Act, unless the contrary intention appears, words authorizing the appointment of a public officer or functionary, or a deputy, include the power of removing him, reappointing him, or appointing another in his stead, or to act in his stead from time to time in the discretion of the authority in whom the power of appointment is vested.

So there was no need of the amendment of last year to dismiss a coroner. Now Mr. Speaker, the only amendment made to section 1 of The Coroners Act in 1966 was to add to the operative part of the then section the words, and I quote:

> who, subject to subsections 2 and 3 shall hold office during pleasure—

That amendment did nothing more than reaffirm the law as it stood on that date, as interpreted and applied by the court of appeal for Ontario. I would refer to the case of Clark against the Attorney General for Ontario, Miller and Creba, 1964, No. 2 Ontario Reports, page 209, the judgment of Mr. Justice Campbell Grant; and it was affirmed on appeal.

For the hon. member to suggest or to infer that this was deceptive or a deceitful ploy by a responsible Minister is a gross and complete distortion of both law and fact.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The Minister is speaking on a point of privilege, I think he should be given the opportunity to state it. Order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Are hon. members afraid to hear what I have to say?

Mr. Speaker, I really do not believe that the hon. member for Riverdale believed that, if he said it; and if he said it, I think it was a cowardly thing to say outside this House. He should have said it right here; and if he did not believe it, it was a despicable thing to do.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has completed his point of personal privilege and having stated it I do not think perhaps we should allow the matter to go into a debate.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the member's point of order; I will hear your point of order.

Mr. Bryden: I am rising on a point of order, sir.

I wish to call to your attention, the fact that the Minister abused his privilege even to the point of applying the words "cowardly" and "despicable" to the hon. member for Riverdale. Knowing full well that the hon. member would have no chance to reply, he took this cowardly advantage.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The member is getting out of order now.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member to take his seat now.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, he called the member cowardly and despicable and I would ask that he withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Order!

Mr. Bryden: This man should be instructed in his duties. He obviously does not understand them.

Mr. Speaker: The member must remember that the sergeant-at-arms is within his right to approach a member if the Speaker has asked him to take his seat and he does not.

Mr. MacDonald: The first time it has been done in ten years!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the sergeant-at-arms may approach a member only under the direction of the Speaker—when the Speaker directs him.

Mr. Speaker: The member will please take his seat.

Mr. MacDonald: Only under your direction does he move.

Mr. Bryden: He has no business intervening at this stage at all.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to ask that the Minister's point of personal privilege be given further consideration. If the member for Riverdale wishes to ask the Minister to retract any statement he thinks he said that is out of order or non-parliamentary I will afford him the opportunity.

Mr. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I certainly think that what the Attorney General had to say was out of order for the following reasons: The government yesterday successfully exercised its gag on public debate in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: If the member would simply pinpoint the remarks and ask the Minister to retract such statements that he believes were not parliamentary. Just pinpoint them and do not elaborate.

Mr Renwick: Mr. Speaker, the only matter that I would ask the Attorney General to withdraw is the statement that I had any opportunity in this Legislature, due to the action of the government, to comment at all yesterday on what took place. I ask him to withdraw that remark and anything that followed from it.

Mr. MacDonald: Right! You use the rules of the House for closure.

Mr. Speaker: No, I do not think that statement comes within the compass of what I thought the member wished the Attorney General to withdraw. I do not think the Minister has to withdraw anything except the personal remarks directed to the member.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and a point of information, I would like to know whether or not in the rules of this Legislature there is going to be any opportunity other than in the innocuous Budget debate to debate the matters which the Attorney General has purported to put before the House as a matter of law. He knows that the appointment of a coroner is the appointment of a judicial officer and that he cannot remove that officer by the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council without having been sly about what he did.

Mr. Speaker: I would say that perhaps there will be an opportunity to arrange for some debate—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: No, the member has spoken on his point of order, he cannot speak again.

Mr. Renwick: No I am not speaking on a point of order, I—

Mr. Speaker: The only way the member can rise at this time is on a point of order, and he has already spoken on a point of order, so I will have to ask him to take his seat.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, this is on an entirely different matter. Before the orders of the day I was going to ask the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs if he had replies to the questions which I gave him on Friday and on Monday.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister wish to give the answers at this time?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Yes, with respect to the proclamation of certain sections of The Insurance Act, the various provincial authorities are endeavouring to achieve as high a degree of uniformity in these matters as is

possible. Certain of these provincial governments have yet to enact this similar legislation. I hope that when this is done that we will be in a position then to proclaim the sections to which reference has been made, certainly some time in the current year.

There was another question with respect to an inquiry—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would ask the House to give the Minister order.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There was a question from the hon. member for Riverdale having to do with an inquiry into certain penny stock operations which was brought to my attention when I returned to my office this morning. I know nothing of this matter but I shall inform myself as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twelfth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT
(Continued)

Mr. Chairman: Just before calling the vote, I know members would want me to tell them that entering now in the gallery are several students from the Midway high school, Middlesex North.

On vote 408:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, this vote 408 is on housing. In the submissions drawn up in the accounts for 1966 and the ones we have in the estimates for 1968, it is pretty hard to discern what we are talking about insofar as what expenditures are concerned, but I think if the Minister should take a look at the record insofar as doing a job for the outlying parts of the province, the majority of the moneys are spent in the city of Toronto.

We are spending in the first part of grants to Metropolitan Toronto housing, $394,000, and the city of Toronto limited dividend housing corporation, $233,000. Nothing else is shown for a grant for the rest of the province. I can tell the Minister if he goes to the outlying parts of the province, so far as the lackadaisical plans for housing are concerned, he will get a good picture of the good guys and the bad guys in this housing picture, because if there ever was a bunch of bad guys so far as housing is concerned, it is shown in the job that this department has done for housing in Ontario.

We have a picture in Owen Sound. In the most important department of housing, touching millions of people in this province from pre-school to the elderly, we have a sick and critically inadequate record handed down in the past three years which is simply outrageous. We made application in 1963 for a housing project and today we are just breaking ground on the project in Owen Sound now. And the officials in Owen Sound—the municipal officials elected and appointed and department heads—will tell you that it is the fault of the department insofar as the red tape, lack of planning and coordination.

We started a housing programme three years ago for low-income families and it is now just being completed to be opened on June 1. A housing-for-the-elderly survey started four years ago is now just breaking ground in Owen Sound. Officials there will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that it is lack of continuity in your department, which is repeated when they pick up the threads again to start negotiations to get this programme going and they find the personnel has changed.

There is an old saying that if two people agree on everything there is no need for the other party. The Minister takes the attitude that everything is roses in this great problem facing Ontario people.

You recall, Mr. Chairman, January 23, when the Toronto *Daily Star* broke an exposé on the housing situation in Ontario, showing that people had to have up to $10,000 down payment for a $30,000 home for the moderate incomes. It looked as though the majority of our people in Ontario would never be able to have their own home. This broke on January 23 in the metropolitan press in the Toronto *Daily Star*. On January 24 the Minister pulled out of his back pocket a programme called HOME. I charge that this Minister and this department had no programme of housing, because the newspaper had a reply on January 24 and the Legislature heard about it on January 25 in the Speech from the Throne.

It is a pretty serious situation when we have to get public attention to the need for this in the Legislature and the press sees what is happening but nothing is done about it. In this House we should debate such issues as this, for this is what this House is

set up for. When these parties are not divided on such issues as this, then we are in trouble. Parliament tends to become a mere legislative rubber stamp for administrative decisions and represents little or nothing but the claims of rival politicians to the loaves and fishes of office. When such a state of affairs exists as it does today, the people of this province lose interest in politics and we grow politically lethargic. As a result, it loses momentum and ceases to govern itself and is governed by the civil servants.

Here we have a case in point today, in that we think we are going to settle a housing situation by debating it here in this House and everything is done by the civil servants. Although the civil servant, as constituted in this province, is a most admirable and efficient lieutenant, it is a bad master. It can count and reckon but it cannot rule. Mr. Chairman, somewhere along the line someone in this province has to recognize that the Minister of Economics and Development in this government—for all his charm and for all the salesmanship he gives us about the job he is doing—is giving absolutely the minimum effort on this most important subject. This province needs men, Mr. Chairman, accustomed to thrash out this great issue, to open debate, and to let the public know exactly what is going on.

Civil servants, by the very nature of their employment, do good or do harm by stealth. Our elected statesmen in a democratically mature nation like Canada or in Ontario are there to ensure that nothing which vitally affects the interest and the honour of the country is ever determined by stealth. I say this word "stealth" is put in its broadest terms because we have people drawing salaries from the public purse who are there to do a job, and I suggest in the strongest way I can that the Minister, his department and this government have conned the people of this province by saying they have a housing programme which we at municipal level know, Mr. Chairman, is nothing but a big show job. We have no housing programme.

In the presentation to the people of Ontario through the HOME programme, the first clause says:

> The purpose of this plan is to assist those in the moderate income group who desire to purchase their own homes.

What about the great majority of our people who cannot afford these great down payments? Every member of the House has received this week, I hope, a letter from Alcan designed homes, and these are beautiful low-income homes, in the range from $10,000 to $15,000. This price includes everything including the price of land. I would like to ask the Minister before I go on, what steps has he taken in this very important study, to inculcate into this programme such things as shell type homes, as instituted by the province of Newfoundland, or prefab jobs, to give us immediate housing at the earliest possible moment? What plans has the Minister along that line?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Chairman, trying to answer the hon. member's question, we do not refer to them as prefab, we refer to them as factory built, or pre-built homes. We have had two or three groups in who will prebuild homes and move them to site.

One of them of course is Alcan. We have been working with Alcan for the last year. We have had a number of meetings with Alcan and you are quite right, I understand they are building a very fine home in the United States, in some areas, for $10,000 completely furnished. Now we have not seen any in the United States. We have seen a few they had on display up around Highway 7. They are talking of homes running anywhere from $10,000 to $15,000. As you know this does not include land.

Now there are two other companies that are interested in coming into Ontario. We have been discussing with them the possibility of prebuilt homes and we are quite interested in assisting them in entering into the HOME programme. If they have a prebuilt home that meets national housing standards we have already talked to central mortgage and housing and they are quite prepared to finance them.

Mr. Sargent: Well Mr. Chairman, this brochure says that they have federal approval. It is a shocking thing to me, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister does not know about this.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They just do not have a factory operating—

Mr. Sargent: You say now if they come to you, you are going to see if you can get them into your programme.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I did not say that at all.

Mr. Sargent: What did you say?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I simply said we have been negotiating with them because they

want to start building these homes now in Canada. They made an announcement the other day, they are putting up a $1 million plant in Woodstock. Now the plant has not been built there, they have not dug the hole for it yet. Until they start building the homes we cannot buy any. We are interested and we have been assisting them in their programme.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): There is no housing in Woodstock for them.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well they will build them.

Mr. Newman: I know, but it still shows—

Hon. Mr. Randall: There is lots of land there.

Mr. Newman: I know, but it still does show that you people have been asleep at the switch. Back in 1962 you had a glorious programme; what happened to that programme?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: That was a very worthwhile contribution.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): There is a considered view!

Mr. Sargent: I think that the Minister is carrying too big a portfolio there. He will not admit to the magnitude of the programme —at least the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) will not—because they will not appoint either a Minister of housing or a commissioner of housing, either one. They try and dovetail this into the promotion department with economics, which we have tried to establish does nothing at all for the people of Ontario, other than members of the Tory party.

To back that statement up, the Minister might bear this out that for this Ontario development corporation's big loan fund there has never been a loan approved in my part of the country where a Liberal is a member. They just do not happen. They have all this money available for small business, but the loans are not forthcoming in an area where there is a Liberal member. Now he can prove the truth of that by giving me figures to that effect, Mr. Chairman.

Now it says in this HOME plan brochure that the Ontario housing corporation will purchase land in areas where it is considered that a lack of serviced land at a reasonable cost is impeding the proper development of the municipality and inhibiting home ownership.

Now that is good. But we had the land in Owen Sound four years ago and we are just getting the ground broken now because your department will not inculcate and make this thing move.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): That is par for the course.

Mr. Sargent: So you come along and tell us in these brochures, in the big yellow brochure you gave us last week, that you have these plans.

Now I want to ask—I asked about two months ago, Mr. Chairman—in view of the Minister's statements that the department has set aside land for the HOME programme in various parts of the province, and the fact that the builders did not know about this; would the Minister inform the House where this land is situated, how much of the land is available, what did it cost and from whom was it purchased?

I realize the Minister has had a tough go, being in the hospital and all that, but I think the Minister should have sufficient staff to give basic courtesy to a member who represents about 50,000 people, to let me know what you are doing about housing.

The Minister cannot even answer a simple question like that. You are asking us to spend millions of dollars in housing and we cannot even get basic information. Can you give me the answer to that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

I must apologize to the hon. member. I did not know until he mentioned the other day that he had not got that report. It had been prepared and it was sent to me from the Ontario housing corporation and I had it in with my other papers. When the member asked about it the other day I was going to tell him that the information was already tabled.

I checked again through my own papers. My people said, well you have it. I looked in my papers and I found it and I think it was yesterday, or the day before, that the information was tabled. I am sorry, it was my error, but the information was ready three weeks ago.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister about the geared-to-income housing, and first about the rent scales?

What does the Minister mean by immediate future? In one of the press releases, the

hon. Minister said, and this goes back to February 8:

> Mr. Randall went on to say that the new scale will be put into effect in the immediate future.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May 1.

Mr. Newman: From February 8 to May 1 is the immediate future?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If you will recall I answered the question the other day. We got the final official signature from central mortgage and housing on March 3.

As I pointed out to you, we could not put it into effect across the province before May 1, so we could put them all in together. There are over 8,000 houses affected under this rent scale and I advised you that as soon as we could put it into effect throughout the entire province, we would have it into effect by May 1.

Now that is the immediate future. I do not know how much closer you can get than that.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, this was a press release issued jointly by you and the federal people for the immediate future. So any time we hear something from the department concerning immediate future, we know exactly how to deal with the thing. It certainly is not the immediate future at all.

May I ask the Minister if he has made any recommendations to the Treasury board concerning the abolition of sales tax on building materials to expedite housing and to lower the price of housing?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have had discussion, but nothing has been settled as to whether there will be any changes. We also have a federal sales tax which is under discussion. Our economists are looking at the sales tax factor to see what it does to the cost of housing. We pretty well know it is about a 16 per cent increase, but at the moment there has been no action taken.

Mr. Newman: Does the Minister not think that it would be advisable to remove both the provincial and the federal sales tax on building materials?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is a matter of opinion. I suppose in my position in housing I should say yes; but on the other hand the minute we say yes somebody else says well we are entitled to have it removed also, so where do you go from there?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I happen to be dealing with the Minister in the housing vote now and I want the answer on housing. Does the Minister not think it advisable that the sales tax be removed on the provincial level first and then on the federal level, or both at the same time, to not only expedite housing but to put it within the reach, or almost within the reach, of the average individual?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would like to be safe and see both done at the same time.

Mr. Newman: Is the Minister in communication with Ottawa regularly concerning the elimination of the sales tax on building materials?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that is a matter for the Treasury department to discuss with them. I have discussed it with Mr. Nicholson, but Mr. Nicholson also has to discuss it with his Treasurer.

Mr. Newman: Has the Minister recommended to the Treasury department that the sales tax be removed?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have had discussions on not only sales tax but all things that affect the price of housing.

Mr. Newman: All I ask is has the Minister recommended that it be removed?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I have not recommended it.

Mr. Newman: In other words, he would still like to see the sales tax on building materials?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not say that, I said I have not recommended it.

Mr. Newman: Well then, if the Minister is not recommending it the only thing we can conclude is that he still insists on having the sales tax on building materials.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If that is the member's opinion, he may have it.

Mr. Newman: The Minister has as much as said that; by not recommending it he does not see the value.

Has the Minister considered the use of mobile housing as a substitute or as a remedy to accommodate the need for housing? One year ago I recommended the use of 10,000 trailers in this province.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister without Portfolio): Two years ago; and three years ago.

Mr. Newman: The Minister said he would study the suggestion. Has the Minister anything to report at this time?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I take it the member's question is will we finance mobile homes on wheels? The answer is no; and central mortgage and housing will not finance it because they do not meet the building codes in the various municipalities. That is one thing.

But further, I think it would be a difficult arrangement to make with central mortgage and housing to give us 90 per cent of the money on a mobile home.

Mr. Newman: Does the Minister see some value in mobile housing as a remedy for the housing situation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have not studied it, but we could take a look at it. I would not be particularly in favour of it, no, I would not think that solves the housing problem at all.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, one year ago the Minister said he would study it then, and now again he says he will study it. Can we take him at his word or not; we asked him a year ago?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think we had a look at it and decided it was not feasible because it could not be financed. Now that the member has brought it up again I would be glad to have another look at it.

Mr. Newman: I would like the Minister to look at the idea of mobile housing because I think mobile housing has some part to play in relieving the housing situation. It may not be a complete answer, but it is a partial answer and it will work in some communities, it may not work throughout all parts of Ontario.

May I ask the Minister if in the awarding of contracts to builders for homes under the Ontario housing corporation or CMHC if the housing contract specifies the time at which the builder must start construction.

Hon. Mr. Randall: When a contract is awarded, yes; there are commencement dates and projected finishing dates.

Mr. Newman: I am very pleased to hear that from the Minister, because I was led to believe that there was no time, or no starting time or no completion time at all. I know we had an unfortunate thing in our own community where one of the builders received a contract and he hemmed and hawed for six to eight months before any construction actually had taken place. The individual who had been awarded the contract could have had housing in the area before the date at which he actually started had there been some pressure from this department for a date on which he must start his construction plus a time or a date at which the construction should be completed. I think there should be some starting date and some completion date.

There may be some allowance given to the individual because sometimes unforeseen circumstances may prevent the completion of a contract, but by not insisting on a starting time, or a starting date and a completion date, I think you leave it too much to the contractor himself. He may come along and start the job, move to another community and another municipality and, play around with housing there; in the meantime he has the contract in his hand and he completes it when he feels like it, when he wishes to complete the thing. I think this is one place where the department could insist that anyone awarded a contract complete the job within a specified time.

Likewise, one of the recommendations made by the building trades back in my community concerns the prequalification of contractors in the home building field, those who are going to build homes for CMHC and OHC. Does the department require prequalifications?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We require them to get the necessary bonding, yes, before they get on their way. We want to know that they can finish the job and that is all checked into before they get the contract.

Mr. Newman: Are the prequalification requirements as stringent as they are in The Department of Highways?

Hon. Mr. Randall: As I understand it, we do not have a pre-performance specification. They must be able to acquire a bond and be able to complete the job on a performance basis, that is all we have for them.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the hon. Minister then if the press report that states brakes are to be put on Ontario housing corporation housing in the city of Windsor is true? This quote is attributed to a Mr. Bradey who said that no further rental units would be built for a while in the city and that the Ontario housing corporation would reassess the need for housing early in 1967.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We carried out, as the member knows, a very comprehensive survey

in Windsor and his own council down there has asked us to supply certain units of housing. We carried out all the commitments the council asked for. Now, if there are further resolutions going through council and they are sent to us we will build more houses. There is no limit to what we can build if we get the resolution, if they will tell us what they want.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have the Ontario housing corporation report, the analysis of the Windsor housing market, June, 1966, here before me. Since that time—and this is as late as February of this year—Ontario housing corporation asked to review home need. The Ontario housing corporation has been requested to review the present housing needs in Windsor and to consider constructing more governmental units in the city during 1967. Has the Minister been requested to consider more housing in the Windsor area?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, since the report, they have advised Windsor that on the basis of this report they will take another survey in Windsor in cooperation with Windsor officials to see what other housing is required.

Mr. Newman: A survey is planned? How long would the survey take?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It will update the survey Windsor now has.

Mr. Newman: All right, how long will that take?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say it will be in the next month to six weeks.

Mr. Newman: The housing situation is very acute in the community, and if we do not have housing we are going to hinder the economic development of the whole region. It is unfortunate that people in the last three years have had their rentals tripled from $60 a month to as high as $180 a month. It is a shame that an individual would have to pay that much rent under these conditions. The only reason they have to pay such a high rental is because of the lack of housing in the community.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Chairman, some of the hon. members are leaving an erroneous impression that the province is to blame for the province-wide housing shortage. I would like to make just one or two comments and then ask the hon. Minister a question.

It is my impression, Mr. Chairman, that various reasons, such as lack of mortgage funds, the high interest rates, the complete fluctuation in the mortgage market where lending institutions will lend like mad for six months and then completely cut off funds, the tax on building materials that has been mentioned here today, certain municipal restrictions in requirements as to services for example; there is a serious lack of municipal planning in many areas of the province; and as also mentioned by one of the hon. members, there is a lack, shall we say, of modern methods of home production.

Now we have a situation, for example in Burlington, where that municipality has put a lid on home construction because there has been such a great deal of construction in the last few years. It is aggravating the school tax on home owners. The reason for this is because neighbouring municipalities, such as Hamilton and Oakville, have failed to keep up. They have not provided sufficient housing in those communities and therefore we in Burlington are becoming what you may call a dormitory town.

I think the hon. member for Grey North mentioned his own community of Owen Sound. Now the hon. member for Grey North was the mayor of Owen Sound. I might ask what did he do as the chief magistrate of that municipality to provide housing in his town. Did he think that he should rely entirely on the provincial government or on the Ontario housing corporation?

Burlington did not. They went ahead with the combination of private enterprise and direction from the municipality. We have homes, more than we need. Now I might ask the hon. Minister, how many municipalities of which you are aware have delayed or turned down OHC projects which have been suggested by this government during the past two or three years? If you have a very rough idea, possibly you do not have those figures.

And second, the suggestion that was made by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville regarding sales tax. Do you think, Mr. Chairman, that it might be an idea that if a builder built a home say in the fringe range vicinity of $14,000 or $15,000 where there is a shortage in a great many municipalities in the province—and I am not trying to oversimplify things here—could there be a possibility that the provincial sales tax would be rebated either to him or to the purchaser? Something like a bonus, like the winter works bonus. You remember the $500 winter works bonus which was a federal scheme. This has been cut off, and of course this further aggra-

vated the housing shortage. Could we use this type of bonus scheme to encourage low-cost housing?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know if I can answer all your questions or not. I would say that basically we get good cooperation from municipalities – those that understand the housing programme and those that want housing. But keep in mind there are many municipalities in Ontario that have sufficient housing and they are not under the pressure that, for instance, they are in Windsor. My friend left before I could answer him, but there is more public housing going up in Windsor per capita than any other town in Ontario and I think perhaps in Canada. It still is not enough because as my friend has pointed out there is a shortage of homes in Windsor and an increasing population. You get the same problem in Metro.

But in many of the other communities in Ontario, I think the municipalities in general understand the programme. If they need housing for senior citizens or low-income families they get in touch with us and ask for a survey; as quickly as we can complete the survey, we go on with the housing. I do not think we can do any more in these areas to make the tools available for the municipality. If we have had any delays in the past, they have not been lengthy delays and due to the fact we have been building up our staff to handle the municipal work.

I would think in the coming months that now the HOME programme has been announced there are two things that are going to happen. We have always been associated with building homes for modest-income families. If we consider the HOME programme for towns where private development is not building homes, let us take the town of Woodstock. I do not say this is true, but if Woodstock is not getting homes built for the workers who could afford to pay rent or buy their homes, it is obvious there are two things lacking. If they have made a request for homes for modest-income families and we are not building and they have started to get builders to build homes for private sale and they are not building, their housing problem is multiplied.

I think under the HOME plan, we can go in and if they have both problems—whether it be homes for those who can afford to buy them or rent them at a profit or an economic rent, and those who want them for public housing—we can fill that bill. If we pick up the land, we can service the land under the HOME programme and provide the facilities. If we pick up a parcel big enough we can parcel it off for commercial purposes in the same way as any developer, and use the rest of it for residential homes whether it be homes in the $15,000 or $16,000 bracket or the $10,000 or $11,000 range as we go along with the HOME programme.

Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, I know of at least two municipalities in my bailiwick where the town council, for example, has approved the idea of an OHC project and where citizens in these areas have not been happy with the idea that there would be a medium-cost or low-cost housing project in a particular area. I may be wrong but this sometimes involves the Ontario municipal board, and then you have a hearing, and it seems to me many times a handful of people, contrary to their own council and to the wishes of many people in the area, can kill a very worthwhile low-cost housing project. This is why I realize my question was not fair to ask you how many projects have been turned down. But in many parts of this province it seems to be a problem that you are faced with.

Whether or not there is sufficient liaison between your department and Municipal Affairs or the community planning branch I do not know. We cannot touch the OMB, but there seems to be a collision course here where you are doing your darnedest to build houses and there seems to be a lot of restrictions and regulations at the municipal level over which you have no control and over which we in this government do not appear to have any control. This is why I was wondering if some impetus or some encouragement, such as relief by sales tax, could assist your department in answering a certain amount of criticism.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring a few points to the attention of the House in connection with housing. I think in the rural area we are not so much interested in these $15,000 and $20,000 homes because our people do not make that kind of money. But they are interested in having good, modest-priced housing. I want to commend the Minister and the department for senior citizens' homes that they have assisted in developing, but I mentioned it last year and I would like to bring it up again that I think we would have more of these if the municipalities would get the full share of taxes on these homes.

After all, I think one of the most critical things that we have to look at at the present

time is tax rates. When they get up around 114 or 115 mills, which they are in Stratford, this makes a problem for every citizen. At the same time I know for sure that we would have more of these senior citizens' homes if the taxes on these properties were brought up the same way as other residential taxes. I think this is a deterrent and they are actually needed in most places. We have to commend those who have taken part in different service clubs and other groups who sponsor these things. If anyone has paid a visit to some of these senior citizens who are living in these low-cost rental homes, they would be very happy with the result, I am sure.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. members of this House a group of students sitting in the east gallery from the fine city of Windsor. We have approximately 75 students from Walkerville collegiate institute. They have been accompanied by two members of the staff—Mrs. Shirley Meal and Mr. George Wortley. They have come to the city of Toronto to see not only the Legislature in action but also to take in the Royal Ontario museum. This is an educational trip for them and I know that they will have found their day most worthwhile and we wish them well on their way home. Thank you.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I am not going to the Centennial museum.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, the question was asked of the hon. member for Grey North, by the gentleman who just spoke a little while ago from Burlington, I believe, from Halton, and he said, "What did you do as mayor of Owen Sound for the senior citizens or housing?" I did not intend to get into this debate at this time until that question was asked.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) would remember, as I do, a visit to Owen Sound back in 1951. I happened to be the warden of the county of Welland at that time and we were invited by the mayor of that city, who is now the member from that area, to visit a housing project that they developed with his prompting of the people on the council of that area. They came together and built three units, three apartment buildings, and if I recall rightly at that time in 1951 you could rent these senior citizens' homes, and veterans' homes also, for the amount of $27.50 for a one-bedroom apartment with a stove and a fridge, and no more than $40, I believe, for a two-bedroom apartment. I think these units in Owen Sound still exist. They have a little garden behind them, they are beautifully landscaped, so this man not only did something for the benefit of that gentleman who stepped out. He is on the right track, he knows why and what you ought to do.

I might say, too, if I may pursue this a bit further, that he, the mayor of Owen Sound of that day, was invited to Montreal. Many hundreds of units have been built since from the very plan that this gentleman instigated. Now I know he, being a modest man, would not want to say that on his own behalf. I will say it for him.

Mr. Bryden: Good for you.

Mr. Bukator: He did an excellent job. I can recall it as though it happened yesterday.

Mr. Bryden: He is blushing modestly now.

Mr. Bukator: I doubt very much whether you would make him blush. I did not look back.

The other question asked by the hon. gentleman from Halton of the Minister was about the problem that arises between the Minister and municipalities who sometimes refuse to build the necessary homes for housing, and then you have a problem with the OMB. You have had this on many occasions, no doubt? I ask the question rather than tell you, Mr. Chairman.

The city of Niagara Falls recently applied to rezone an area for housing for an apartment building. I understand that the city of Niagara Falls agreed to these apartment buildings. They had a hearing of the OMB but they for their own reasons turned it down. Often the Minister finds himself, I suppose, on the same side of the argument with the municipal representatives, but the OMB, for their reasons, have turned units down. Why they do this, I do not know, but it is another holdup.

While I am on my feet I would like to ask a question of the Minister; we have heard quite a bit about it. No doubt this question has been answered and I may not have been in the House. We think about the possibility of a lot on which a house is built, the government may buy it and rent it, the same as the building may be bought and rented also until the people can find the money.

If this is going to come about, can the Minister tell me when an individual can buy a house on a rented lot that the government will provide for them? When will this come into effect?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have already surveyed the lots we have available. We have land we are putting into service and as these lots are serviced we advertise them as being for sale and anybody can make application for these lots, whether it be an individual, a builder or cooperative, as pointed out in the book here. As soon as the lots are available, the HOME plan is available to them the same as anybody else anywhere.

Mr. Bukator: Let us put it this way. Does it apply to lots on which houses are already built by a builder who has built them on speculation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No.

Mr. Bukator: The down payment on these lots, in other words, will be $4,000 to $5,000. And so people of that particular area that have built homes, and I speak now as a real estate broker in the Niagara peninsula—

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, we would not be buying builders' homes that are already up at $25,000 to $30,000 and put them on a rental basis, no that is not the object at all.

Mr. Bukator: The hon. Minister can distort things. I said nothing about $25,000 or $30,000 homes. I was speaking of a $13,000 to $14,000 home on a lot that cost from $3,500 to $4,000; so that makes the house about $18,000 to $19,000, or in that neighbourhood. The monthly payments would be about $130. A working man in that area can find $1,000 to $1,500 down but he cannot find the $5,000, nor can he pay the $2,900, or $129 a month. What are you doing for the people that come into that bracket and below it?

Apparently the rich can have houses, the people in the middle class can have houses, but no provisions are made for the poor man who needs the housing and needs it badly, as I see it. Now if that provision is made I would like the Minister to tell me just when that has come about, or if it will come about if ever.

I doubt very much whether this government has thought about it from that particular angle. I have not heard an argument by the government telling us that housing will be provided for the working man who is carrying a lunch pail and is making in the neighbourhood of $80 to $90 a week.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think you are speaking of refinancing housing that is not built; the answer is no. We are not in the business of refinancing housing for a builder. We are in the business, I hope, of buying cow pasture if necessary, and servicing it at the lowest possible price in order to rent it at a price that the average moderate income family can afford.

Let me refer you to the example at the back of the book, here. All I have ever read about in criticism of the HOME programme and in the press, is the $15,000 home with a $9,000 piece of land, and we simply put that in there as an example for those who are interested, on a 25 and a 35 year basis, using a $12,000, $13,000, $15,000 home with land at various prices, what it would cost to operate.

We have borne some criticism. People would say: "Who can afford $190 a month," but if you will look at the $12,000 home, even on a 25-year repayment plan, it is $127 a month including everything. As you go through the scale to 30 and 35 years it is $122 and $120.

The only way that we are going to be able to provide homes at the prices we are talking about here, for the modest income families, is to provide our own lots as cheaply as we possibly can—for two reasons. In the first place if we service the lot we will rent the lot at our book value and the selling price will be at the selling price at market value. That means that if a man moves onto a lot the selling price is $6,000 today—he is paying rent on a $4,000 inventory value for that lot so it brings him into the category where he can afford a 25 or 30 or 35 year plan.

Mr. Bukator: That answers my question, Mr. Chairman, in part. It appears that these lots that we speak of will eventually be available to the purchasers. They are not here yet. You are going to buy this cow pasture, you are going to put in services as cheaply as you know how, and then if possible at that time, you will rent these lots to the people who will build their houses on them. But that is not today, tomorrow or possibly two years from now. It all depends on how long it takes to put the services in.

The other question, through you, Mr. Chairman: There was some talk, in my few years in this Legislature, about the government going into the second mortgage business; and they have done in the past. To this day that particular project, that particular bit of business of the government has been very successful. Very few people have been delinquent in their payments when it comes to paying off their second mortgage.

If the government will not go into an area such as purchasing houses already built on $3,500 lots, would the Minister tell us if the government is thinking very seriously of what our leader asked, a few days ago, about the possibility of the province going into the second mortgage business. This would assist the working man at least to get into that house without the $4,000 or $5,000 that at the moment, he cannot get.

Are you going back into the second mortgage business, as some of the members have mentioned here in the House? Would you go back into the second mortgage business to allow the people to purchase a home with a low down payment, even though their monthly payments might be a little greater than some of them can stand?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I think the land lease plan does exactly what you are talking about. I think the thing you have to keep in mind is what happens if a man has to make a $5,000 down payment in cash and he has not got it. As you know under the NHA schedule—and again it is not our schedule here—the annual income required is laid down in a schedule by the central mortgage and housing corporation, which states a man should not pay out more than 27 per cent of his annual income in rent.

But I understand 50 per cent of the people financing homes today, had to go out and borrow second mortgage money at anywhere from 8 to 15 per cent. Now if they close their eyes to the fact that they are borrowing second mortgage money at 8 to 15 per cent, I think there are a lot of people undercapitalized in homes at the present time.

Now we have not gone into this second mortgage field. Perhaps we will take a look at it as we unfold the HOME plan and people come to us and say, well you can do a better job if you do this, we will take a look at it. But as you see we have got down payments down to $600. And $1,200 is the tops on this land plan here, on a $12,000 house. So if a man buys on a leased-land basis, we have solved the second mortgage problem. Keep this in mind: whether we go into the second mortgage business or not, he still has to pay off the second mortgage. Now he may get it at a lower interest rate, but it is possible it will not be an interest rate as low as he can get the land for.

This is the thing we had a look at, and since interest rates are dropping, perhaps as we go into the future he can get second mortgage money a lot less than what he is paying for it today. But from my investigation, as we look to this programme here, one of the difficulties today in owning a home, is getting that down payment. And if you have to go out and pay that kind of money for a down payment, this is where most families get into trouble.

Mr. Bukator: Again, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister speaks about a $600 down payment on this HOME plan that will come into—

Mr. Bryden: He is only talking about some special areas.

Mr. Bukator: —that may eventually come into existence. I speak of the problem today, Mr. Chairman, as it exists in the Niagara peninsula. Many good builders have built homes that could be purchased by the working man if he only had some assistance with the second mortgage.

The mechanism would not have to be established by this province. It is already in existence. The provincial bank has loaned money to people on second mortgages. All I ask is that they assist the people with the money as far as the second mortgage is concerned, which would help them with the down payment.

Let me tell you something in my experience. One should not speak, I suppose, of his business in this House, and yet I do not believe that any member here would buy a house from me, so I am not selling them.

But we have open house. Many people come in. We have as many as 250 people through our houses on a Sunday. They look them over; they could afford to pay the monthly payments. They ask what the down payment is and it runs from $3,500 to $4,000. They have said to me, "I have $1,500, I have $1,000, but I do not have $2,500. If I could raise that money somewhere, I would immediately buy this home."

I would think that all the government would have to do then, Mr. Chairman, is open the door to them; loan them that money on a second mortgage; let them get in with their $1,500 and a home would have been sold. It is remarkable at this time, when houses are so scarce and people want them so badly, to see houses with signs on them for sale, and people cannot buy them because they do not have that $3,000, $4,000, $5,000.

All I am asking the government to do is go back into the business that it originally started. It was not profitable to them, but at least did not cost them anything. So all they

have to do is go into the second mortgage business. We are selling houses for the people who can now afford them, providing the down payment was not as great as it is today.

I thought the alternative might have been for the Minister to buy these lots that are already serviced, and there are many, and rent them to the purchasers.

Hon. Mr. Randall: But I thought you said, buy them with houses on them.

Mr. Bukator: I would like to know what the difference is.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There is quite a bit of difference.

Mr. Bukator: There is no difference.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If there is a house on a lot, it is already mortgaged.

Mr. Bukator: Right. That part is true. And that is where you come into the second mortgage field, as you have done in the past. I can show you hundreds of lots with sewer and water up to the property line, waiting for someone to build on. If the government will come down into my area—I have never invited the Minister, I know he is a busy man —I can show him many lots that are serviced today, on which they can build. I know that the people would buy them immediately if that lot was purchased by the government and rented to the purchasers in the final analysis.

So I make this point for you. I speak of the Niagara peninsula. This exists throughout the whole area. The houses are there. If they do not do it on the rental basis, then the government can go to the second choice, by providing the second mortgage money for them. As a matter of fact, this is too simple. This is not complicated. We may have to have another commission to investigate and bring in another report. But I see it very simply. All they have to do is provide the money and the houses are sold.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Has the Minister not got anything to say?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I was just going to suggest to the hon. member that if he is in the real estate business, and has got any lots to sell, come and see us before selling. We will be interested in talking to you.

Mr. Bryden: Do not sell them to him—do not buy them from him.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, it may well be that certain areas of the province will get housing along this line, that is single family homes. The HOME programme will help. But in the larger cities, in the metropolitan areas, this is going to solve no problems. We must face up to the fact that only multiple housing in very large quantities will do the job and will house our people.

As the Minister said a few minutes ago, they may have to buy cow pasture and get it wherever they can. I am a bit disturbed by that sort of an answer. I hope it is not typical of the attitude of the Minister. I would like to ask him where he is going to buy that cow pasture? Where is this going to be located? At the present time, we are now at the last stage of opening up the GO-transit line. To the north of us we have other railway lines, fanning out from this metropolitan area of Toronto. Around the other big centres, we have similar kinds of facilities, where rail transport and highways are available.

I can see where the Minister today is in a very serious situation. He must build houses on land that he now has, and get those houses up as rapidly as he knows how. This situation demands that kind of action. But is he planning ahead? Is the Minister looking forward five, 10, 15, 20 years? And is he asking himself, where are those cow pastures now located? Where will houses be built in five years, in 10 years, in 20 years?

And is he working with the Cabinet Minister who has charge of municipal affairs, for example? And is he working on a provincial plan, so that outside our great centres of population we will be establishing new centres where new towns can be established and those new towns can be self-contained units, with industry and housing and schools, and all the amenities?

Then, so that those new centres of population can be linked by rapid transit of the right kind, perhaps the new electric cars, the urbmobile concept will be the thing that he has to look at; that these will be linked with each other for rapid transportation of people between the centre and the new towns, and the new towns with each other.

Is the Minister thinking in these terms? Is he thinking of going out and purchasing land, and is he thinking in terms of Cabinet action to see that a provincial land use plan is now underway so that these plans can be made reality in the days to come? There will have to be cooperation with the municipalities and there will have to be real leadership

on the part of this government to get these things underway.

I would like to hear the comments of the Minister in this whole field of planning for the future, the location of new towns, the development of the whole concept of urban development for the days ahead, so that we are not simply spreading out the present concentrations of population, but are thinking of green belts in between; of proper location in relation to a rail line and trunk highways, and that we are thinking in terms of community amenities, so that people can live in communities that are built for people in the days to come.

I wonder if the Minister would comment?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I would be glad to comment. I think it is a well known fact in the United Kingdom today, that the reason they have satellite towns is they found it so hard to rebuild the old ones. Do you agree with that?

Mr. Young: Partly!

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think some of the experience we have had in our renewal areas right here in Toronto indicate that if you are going to wait for renewals to provide homes, you are going to have a lot of people looking for homes. Now it is obvious to me—

Mr. Bryden: The same is true if you are going to wait for satellite committees.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not necessarily. Bramalea was built out here in a few years. It is quite a satellite.

Mr. Bryden: In a few years, yes. You are not going—

Hon. Mr. Randall: You cannot drop them out of the sky, you know that.

Mr. Bryden: I know.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now, to answer the hon. member's question, we have looked at land over the last year and have made some offers for land, I would say, in the neighbourhood of anywhere from 12 to 15 thousand acres within 30 miles of Toronto. We recognize that the GO transport is going to provide fast transportation for a lot of people east and west. We also almost every day in the week get a letter from one of the railways saying they are discontinuing a railway line and our attitude is, do not tear up the track, perhaps we can use a commuter service even up to Owen Sound one of these days. I think I mentioned that when I was up with my friend at Owen Sound opening up a glass plant, one of the writers said to me, "Why would people want to come all the way up here?"

I said, "It is not too far from Toronto with the kind of roads, plus the fact that maybe we will have fast commuter service up here one of these days when some of these rail lines are available for fast transportation."

So we are looking at areas outside of the city proper. You have to if you want to get land. People have to recognize, and I am not trying to be facetious, that they are not going to live at the corner of King and Yonge. And if they are going to live in the city they are going to live in multiple dwellings and they are going to live in town houses, or garden houses, or what I described the other day as stratified title or condominium title.

I do not think there is any other way that they can live in the city of Toronto unless that kind of accommodation is provided. Now, insofar as Metro is concerned, there is land still in Metro as we all know. It is in the hands of people, some of whom we are dickering with at the present time, and I answered the member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) yesterday that we had negotiations going on for this land within Metro.

It is obvious that we cannot pay $400,000 an acre for land, as is being offered in Toronto, to build the kind of homes we are talking about and make it possible for people to buy on a HOME plan; or even to put low income housing there unless you want to write off the land costs completely, which we have been doing in urban renewal, but if you look at the locations of the factories that are moving out of the city or not coming into the city, it is obvious that the old cry that people do not want to be away from downtown because it is close to work is past. You will find the majority of people today, particularly the men who work in a plant, are working on the perimeter of Toronto. They are not working in Toronto. This is going to become perhaps more so in the future, as we get more manufacturing and the city becomes, as I say, a concrete jungle. If you do not agree with that I suggest you look at the big cities in the United States. The same thing has happened there, they have had to go to the outsides.

Mr. Bryden: Surely government should be doing something to prevent that development, that possibility, which I agree with you is a most serious danger. Unfortunately we have so much division of authority in this government that we cannot properly direct

questions related to that problem to this Minister. It comes under another department, even though the two functions of housing and urban renewal and development are intimately connected.

They are divided in this government, but I would hope that no Minister in the government would view with equanimity or with resignation the prospect of the downtown core of any city in this province becoming a concrete jungle. Admittedly we face the danger, but we should be doing something about it and right now. Perhaps that is all I should say, Mr. Chairman, on that point.

Mr. Chairman: Has the member finished?

Mr. Young: I have still a question on this same matter. The hon. Minister indicated that he is getting offers of land from all over the place, but my question is: Is the Minister deliberately going out and seeking land in places in which this government feels new centres ought to be established? This is the question. It is all right to say well such and such a land owner is coming to me with an offer, hodge-podge, higgeldy-piggeldy, across this province—but is there any study being made, any determination of where new centres ought to be built having relationship to the highways, to the railways, to the kind of amenities that may be there to make pleasant good living? Along our river valleys and that sort of thing, so that the river valleys can be reserved and yet people can live there and enjoy them.

Is this kind of searching being done? Are we looking for centres of new development where development ought to be taking place, and then are we consciously going out to seek land in those centres? I think this is the question that the hon. Minister ought to answer.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well I thought I had answered it a couple of times in the last few weeks.

The answer is, yes. We cannot build houses without land, and we have been assembling land with the federal authorities ever since the housing corporation was formed, and prior to that. Now I mention that we have something like 5,500 acres of land in Ontario now. Unfortunately it is not all in Metro Toronto.

I wish it were, and my problems would be solved. But we are now looking and have been looking over the last year at land that is available and it takes time to negotiate I can tell you. You might have banana republics in South America but what a lot of people do not realize is that you have banana republics right here in Ontario when it comes to holdings of land, and it is not easy to assemble this land, as the hon. member from Owen Sound will recognize when he gets that list of the land that we now own—

Mr. Sargent: Put some controls on it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Pardon me—just a minute now. Just a minute.

An hon. member: Was it a land owner or a municipality?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say it is a land owner. Now I would suggest that when the hon. member from Owen Sound gets that list I sent him of the people involved in assembling even small acreage, he can realize how difficult it is to make a deal overnight on land. We are negotiating on land within a 30 mile radius of this city, recognizing that transportation will be available. Yes, I agree with you that much more planning has to be done if we are going to move people into what we call satellite towns. I do not think anybody at any level yet has decided where a satellite town should be settled, but this is something that we have in mind and we recognize that it has to be done.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I just have one short question for the Minister. The Department of Municipal Affairs is developing a town site at Timagami and they are supposedly going to have serviced lots available this summer. Have they been in negotiation with the Ontario housing corporation in order to provide homes on that townsite?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Suters informs me that the department has had discussions with him with regard to leasing of land in that township you are talking about.

Mr. Smith: In the town site. There is no township there.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, the area you are talking about.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I do not think for one moment that any views that any one of the Opposition has about the need for housing is going to change the picture one iota insofar as getting housing in Ontario and I wanted to suggest and thank very much the hon. member for Niagara Falls, for his remarks. He thinks that I have knowledge

on housing. I had it many years ago and my interest has grown throughout the years and I see—with all regard to the great personality we are talking to and I do respect him as a man—his department is doing a pitifully, woefully bad job in getting housing to our people. He has great key men, but I think he does not have the kind of machinery that he would have in his own business enterprise to make it tick.

We are putting a man on the moon today in America, we are approaching this thing like it is the Normandy invasion when it is simply a case of getting our people better housing than we are giving our horses. I have not seen a horse in Ontario have such bad housing as our people. There is not a horse, Mr. Chairman, in Ontario that I have seen—in our family we have some horses—and we do not see horses that are housed as badly as people. I think it is a sad thing that we cannot have it. The member for Yorkview said we have no plan, there is no visionary plan here.

It is a great opportunity, Mr. Chairman, for the government and for the Minister to do a great job on decentralization and diversification.

For instance, we are spending $600 million in Pickering for a nuclear power plant. We need that like we need two heads. The Prime Minister says we are pioneering for the world, no other administration in the world has such a programme of developing nuclear power. He says it is going to give us another six Niagara Falls. We need that like nothing; but we need housing for our people now and this project we are doing for nuclear power pioneering would give us 60,000 homes, which would mean 250,000 people would be properly housed.

We are doing a very haphazard job where we cannot get housing into the hopper. After making application four years ago we see them breaking ground on housing. Either this is a reflection on the government view of the need for it or we need more personnel; or something, but I know he would not run his own business enterprise the way he runs the housing picture.

I say that the *modus operandi,* the method of operation is pitiful, and for us to have to wait in our area for another housing project —we set the framework up in 1951 for this, using 75-15-10, the city putting in 10 per cent, the province 15 and the federal government 75 per cent. We had the framework there. We got our housing within ten months of the start of operation because we were running the show but now the government is running the show nothing happens. I think it is pitiful.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I ask the member a question?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member was the mayor of Owen Sound and if I came into Owen Sound and said, "Just move over, I am going to build houses whether you need them or not," I think the member would tell me to take my hat and run. We have built all the houses in Owen Sound that the municipal council has requested us to build. The only delay that I know of in Owen Sound was a shortage of serviced lots plus the fact, I believe, in one area where we had a difficult job getting a builder to build a senior citizens home. I am surprised—as far as the housing corporation is concerned, since it was formed and started operating early in 1965, municipalities know if they make an application we are quite prepared to give them a survey and build the homes. We do not go in and go around town ringing a bell and saying, "We are here to build homes; let us know what you want and we will build them." But we have never turned down any municipality.

Mr. Sargent: I apologize to this House for bringing Owen Sound into the picture, but I do want to say that all parts of the province are very important and if we are having trouble they are all having trouble. I can tell you that I was the one who in 1962 launched a survey on more need for housing for the aged. The survey came through about a year later and today we are breaking ground on that project. There has been no stem-winder in the Minister's department, because everything we get we have to work at to get it to be operative, there is no initiative.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member's other expression was much more colourful.

An hon. member: Time on your hands.

Mr. Singer: Somebody to wind up the clock.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I do want to say in reply to the hon. member for Niagara Falls in talking about financing, it is time that we had somebody in charge of this department who had a heart, because people do not have the money today to make these down payments for houses. The party that will have a heart in this matter and will give housing to our people—which we give better

to animals—will have the support of the people of Ontario.

The Minister very kindly said he had tabled a reply to my question. I would like the Minister, where is that report now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am sorry, I did not hear the hon. member's last question.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister said he had a reply to my question insofar as the housing facilities under HOME.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I tabled it yesterday in the Prime Minister's department and he puts it through, because he pushes us for the reports if they are on the order paper. I gave it to the Prime Minister's office. It should have been through.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I wish the Minister would send up and get that report now because I want to discuss that report before we leave this vote. I think it is good political manoeuvring on the Minister's part to have that come after he is off the griddle, as it were, but I want to have that report while we are on—

Mr. Bryden: That is the way they usually do it.

Mr. Sargent: It is pretty tricky stickhandling, I would say. But I would like to have that report. Send up for it now and get it back down here so we can discuss it.

I do not understand something in this vote. I see you are spending this year a total of $15 million in the Ontario housing corporation and last year there was an expenditure of $10 million—$3 million. In the public accounts of 1966, Mr. Chairman, we have only two items in the whole vote, grants and miscellaneous, for a total of $1,198,000, and then we have another item of $9,250,000, giving a total of $10,400,000. There is no breakdown of the $9 million. I would like to ask the Minister where that would be and what it would be.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The $9 million is 10 per cent of the capital grants that we match with the $90 million we get from the federal authorities in Ottawa to run the housing programme for that year.

Mr. Sargent: So in the public accounts we have six lines of type to explain the expenditure of $10 million, and I think that is an insult to the intelligence of the people in this House to ask us to vote $10 million when there is no breakdown of it. It is like Parkinson's law—

Mr. Chairman: The vote before us is not on that.

Mr. Sargent: I am on—

Mr. Bryden: Well, he is talking about the public accounts.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking on 408, Mr. Chairman. There is a total figure of $13 million in 408. Well then, is it permissible to talk about housing for the elderly?

Mr. Chairman: The grants for the elderly come under this vote, yes.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the Minister, first of all in the satellite cities or satellite towns we are talking about throughout the province, they can not get financing for housing because they have septic tanks. I am wondering if the Minister would tell me how we would go about getting speculative housing started in smaller towns, in satellite towns around the province, in areas where they have no sewage programme so they are forced to use septic tanks. This is a very big area for more houses but they are blocked because they cannot get financing. What would be the proper approach to that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think we found part of the answer last year when the hon. member for Grey South had a difficult problem in the town of Flesherton with a home for elderly people. We were able to get central mortgage and housing corporation to give us permission to build that home in there with septic tanks. That is a condition of CMHC on lending mortgage money, it is not our condition. However, let us recognize it, we are trying to clear up water pollution and we want to keep septic tanks out of it if we can.

In my discussions with central mortgage and housing, I pointed out there may be areas in northern Ontario where plants are opening up and we want to build houses almost immediately but it may be a year or two before they can get the sewage systems in there, can we put in septic tanks? The answer is, "You bring the project to us and we will take a look at it because we want to see the houses the same as you do. Provided you as the developer of the land will make sure that the septic tank is a temporary situation, we think we can make arrangements for you to borrow on a home with a septic tank." I think if the member has any areas,

he should let us know where they are and we will take a look at them.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about private builders doing speculative housing and they cannot get financing because the NHA will not lend them money on sites with septic tanks. And then along the same line, there are many people who have tracts of land along the highway but they cannot sell those lots because they do not have a registered plan. I think this is good, to stop this sporadic growth, but I think there has to be a meeting of the minds some place if we are going to have more housing, no matter how you get it. In my own home, I have a septic tank but it is not economically feasible for the city to give me sewage. So septic tanks are hygienic if properly laid and I think there should be an agreement some place between the Minister of Municipal Affairs and this Minister's department into asking the federal government to give this the same financing they give sewaged areas. Does the Minister agree on that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: As I say, we have discussed this with central mortgage and housing and I think, yes, I have lived in a home with a septic tank too. We never had any difficulty with it, up in York Mills. But I would think that with the new septic tanks that are available today there has been quite an improvement in septic tank operation. I think in some areas, sure, they should be acceptable and should be financed. But at the moment, it is a restriction of central mortgage and housing corporation, and until we can convince them they should change it that is where the matter stands. This is one of the areas we can discuss with them in the future if we run into problems through the HOME programme. Yes I am quite prepared to talk to them.

Mr. Sargent: If the Opposition makes a motion to this effect, will you support it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No reason why we shouldn't.

Mr. Sargent: We will try it and see what will happen.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few comments about this matter, principally in three areas. I hope that I have never been lax in my responsibility of bringing problems concerning my own constituency—the city of Sudbury, and I am a purely urban member — to the attention of the responsible Ministers of the Crown and this House. But very frequently I have felt obliged, and I have not shrunk from the task, to bring to their attention problems that face people who live in suburbia, and that is to say the inhabitants of the rural municipalities that surround the city of Sudbury.

I can claim more than a passing knowledge of the valley municipalities because about a year ago I was involved as counsel for what is now the united townships of Capreol-Hanmer in amalgamation proceedings before the Ontario municipal board.

The city council of Sudbury, I should say in passing, has expressed its annoyance with this Minister; and a good many people express annoyance with this Minister. My friend said he wished he had a heart. To that I would add I wish he had the capacity of comprehension which apparently he does not have. They recently expressed their annoyance with it, I am not going to dwell upon it. He has—

Mr. Chairman: Well I suggest the member—

Mr. Sopha: Well, it is on housing, it is on housing.

There is something about an allocation of 70 some odd low rental housing units that have just been announced for the city of Sudbury. The council was quick, one judges by the press, to indicate that that was less than satisfactory.

I am not going to intervene in that. At this stage it is a matter between the Minister and the council. It is a bad time to intervene. Three of the members of the council, and indeed the mayor herself, are seeking the nomination for the major parties for the House of Commons. So they are engrossed in extra-curricular activities. We will have to wait until that by-election is held there to determine which of the two is going to remain in the council. The other one is going to Ottawa.

I am delighted the Minister of Municipal Affairs is in the House, he is usually here. His attendance approaches the thousand mark now that we are in the baseball season.

He knows of these problems. Of course, he probably has been made aware that CMHC, central mortgage and housing corporation, laid down its edict some time ago, and the edict from CMHC has about equal validity to those messages received on Mount Sinai. So they give you the impression that they would not lend any more money on

property that was not serviced by water and sewage services.

Now let us go back a little while. Certainly in respect of the Sudbury Basin a great housing boom of recent years was in the period 1955 to 1958; and during that period the enterprises promoted by private builders appeared to meet the demand for housing. I can well recall ten years ago. The great activity—the fierce activity—there was in building houses in the Sudbury Basin, as well as I can recall how many of the entrepreneurs engaged in contracting met financial disaster. They went over like nine pins. One after another they filed petitions in the banks or bankruptcy courts.

We came up to 1958, and how well I recall in 1958 and 1959 in the valley municipalities and particularly in the township of Hanmer—which you may picture, Mr. Chairman, is to the north, directly north, of the city of Sudbury—where a number of enterprising people built a subdivision, the name of which escapes me for a moment, but it seared on memory because these people bought two full pages in the Sudbury *Star* and they depicted pictorially, the subdivision they had built. In capsulated, in bold lettering across the top, these words "John and Dave did this for you".

The John of course was the Right Honourable John George Diefenbaker, and Dave referred to the Honourable David Watson, then Minister of Public Works, who has now gone to the happy reward of all politicians who make it, he has retired to the Senate of Canada. So he can be in that sense, said to have arrived.

Well, that was just about the end. That was just about the end of the housing boom, and one is in some difficulty understanding whether John and Dave did this for you or John and Dave did this to you. I suppose either version would be correct historically. In the affluent society and here is the first point I want to make, that it certainly is an anomalous situation if responsible governments, whether the government at Ottawa or that here, put people who need housing into the position of the dog chasing its tail, which is the analogy that fetches itself to my mind.

They cannot get the housing to central mortgage and housing corporation because they cannot afford the service. Sewer and water. They cannot increase their assessment in order to afford the services or they do not increase their assessment because they have not got the housing. That puts these people, several thousand of them, in the circular position. There is no question of imposing the burden on industrial assessment because they have not got it and this government over here, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Prime Minister, has decreed that they have not got the municipal assessment and that is the edict.

That is the edict that we are going to have to live with so that this government is defeated. Until those things receive a fundamental change of approach, that is the position these people are in.

About a year ago, the month of March, I drew this matter to the attention of the House in one of the rare occasions when I prepared a written speech. I do not know why I did on that particular occasion, but I prepared my 19 or 20 pages. There was some danger that I would not get it read, because my friend from York South was on his feet after I had read about three pages and drew the attention of the Speaker to the fact that I only had a half an hour and he doubted if I could read 19 pages in half an hour.

That was in the private members hour. Well that speech of mine, which got wide publicity in the press in Sudbury, is the one which drew comment from the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) in his reply that appeared in the Sudbury *Daily Star*. They had each of our pictures, and they put over his: People in Valley Municipalities", they said "Don't Get Sewer and Water Services Because Sopha Never in the House", which is a strange syllogistic, non-syllogistic chain of reasoning. I have never been able to comprehend just what connection that had. Judging from the Sudbury *Daily Star*, if you see it from week to week you get the impression that I am here quite frequently.

Well, I stimulated something there and the Ontario water resources commission, that great empire that wants to control all the water in Ontario and harness it and sell it, they promised a study of sewage and water problems in the valley municipalities.

I went to the member for Wellington-Dufferin, who is vice-chairman of that commission, and I asked him point blank when will the study be complete, because this is a very critical matter in respect to the provision of houses in these municipalities. Blezard, Hanmer, Capreol. He said in December. Now mark you, that was the month of March. He said in December, to me, it will be completed.

Well December has fled. The robins have come back I am told. The ides of March are gone and we are approaching the ides of

April, and still the study is not extant. We do not know.

Mr. Newman: He did not tell you the year.

Mr. Sopha: He did not tell me the year. That is a very useful suggestion from my friend from Windsor-Walkerville. He did not tell me the year. But I inferred he meant December last year.

Mr. C. T. Rollins (Hastings East): You should have asked for it.

Mr. Sopha: So there we are, and those municipalities are still locked in that frustrating set of circumstances not of their making at all. Nothing they ever did or failed to do ever put them in that position that today they are unable to—any residents there or for that matter anyone else—are unable to get loans from central mortgage and housing corporation because they cannot provide sewage and water services.

At the amalgamation hearing of July last, held by direction of the Cabinet by the chairman and vice-chairman of the Ontario municipal board themselves, there were builders who came forward and gave evidence, generally in favour of amalgamation, saying that they hoped one of the fruits of amalgamation would be that the combined municipalities would be able to create a credit base of much greater magnitude in order to enhance their borrowing power so that these municipalities could get on with the matter of providing sewage and water services. But of course whether they can or not, as the Minister of Municipal Affairs well knows, I can picture myself now in the election campaign. With the Prime Minister, as far as I am concerned, the election campaign has started. Six weeks ago it started. I can picture my self out in Hanmer, Capreol, recounting to the ratepayers—voters—these very things I am now saying in the House this afternoon, and telling them historically what has happened.

They are waiting, they tell me. I was at the Sudbury and district municipal association about three Saturdays ago and they tell me that they are waiting for this report by the Ontario water resources commission before they are able to decide the avenues along which their plans will go for the provision of sewage and water services in the most populous parts of those townships.

Let it be marked about that commission that there is not in the government a more public relations conscience commission. Heavens, it is two or three times a week that we get a letter coming across our desks to the effect that a new pump has been installed at Ecum Secum Bridge, or they have discovered a lake heretofore unknown in the district of Patricia. They emit all sorts of inconsequential things like a veritable neo-Vesuvius eruption out of the office of that commission, because I happen to believe that commission is bent on empire building. There is no question in my mind about that. It is bent on empire building.

In the absence of the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers)—he too knows that it is election year, although presumably he is not going to run for this part of the riding; his riding is severed. It is advantageous that the vice-chairman of the water resources commission is in the House. I draw these things to his attention. I draw it to the attention of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in order to show the plight of these people.

Now, a good deal more could be said about the character of residential development in those two townships, but I will leave off.

The second thing I wanted to say is this, that I for one, as one citizen of Canada, who reflects upon these things, and to some extent has searched the writings of the greats, I for one am prepared to say that that business of money through a government agency of the federal government at 7.25 per cent, is nothing less than disgraceful. To that extent, I was more than a little ashamed to be a Liberal. More than a little ashamed to be connected with that government. At least it impelled me to this stage.

I am not often in my office. I do not really do any real estate or commercial law. But I called up the local manager of central mortgage and housing corporation after they raised that rate to 7.25 per cent and I asked, was my name on that patronage list of lawyers that they have, which the Conservatives developed to a high, fine art under CMHC.

He said, "Yes, you are one of 24 lawyers on that list." These are the people to whom the loans are sent, Mr. Chairman, when people apply. I said, "Take it off immediately; I do not want any more business from you people whatsoever." For one thing, I must confess I said to the manager, who is a very good fellow, that I was too busy to do it anyway. I do not do that kind of work.

"But what really impels me to call you," I said, "is that I do not want to be connected with you when you are engaged in usury, and to me it is nothing short of usury."

I was a bit startled this afternoon, when a Minister of the Crown got up as he did in this House and without blushing—he did not show any signs of dismay or regret about it; did you notice his blasé attitude—and nonchalantly talked about people having to get second mortgage money at 8 to 15 per cent. cent.

And there was no chagrin in his voice about it, such as I can easily stimulate into my vocal chords about it. Because I know, having studied economics, that money itself—let us, you and I, Mr. Chairman, remember this about money—money is barren and unproductive. To remember those words, I sent to the library and got the work of Hugo Gautios, who wrote learnedly on the subject, and he said a long time ago, more than two centuries ago, money is barren and unproductive. And of course it is. A dollar bill is an inert object. It only crystallizes into something, for want of a better word, when somebody takes hold of it, and through his own ingenuity, his own energy, his ability, his dedication, determination, transforms it into something.

So people who lend money at high rates of interest really are being paid for somebody else's ingenuity in respect of the use of the money. In this affluent society, it is my view that no government that has the interests of the common ordinary man at heart would permit money to be loaned at that rate.

A few months ago, they tell us there was some easing on the money supply. If you watch the *Financial Post* you get the impression that credit is going to become easier. But a few months ago, of course, the economics of the country was virtually in the hands of those who control large amounts of capital. Apparently, for quite a period of time, they could let the money out at virtually any interest rate that they determined, and this government had to go into the money market and pick the rates of interest for borrowing that were well above those that have prevailed for most of the century in this country.

To bring it back to this vote, I object to the lack of housing for our people in this affluent society and who are being tied to usury. I do not have much patience or tolerance for the usurers who deprive the honest, hard-working individual of decent living accommodation because of an insistence on a high rate of return for lending of their money.

One sees how the federal government got caught up on that. Instead of using the devices which they have perfected to a high art ever since 1934—when the central bank was founded—instead of using those devices, the federal government and Mr. Sharp, the Minister of Finance, are apparently content to take the money market as they find it.

So Mr. Sharp announces that money is tight, it is hard to get, interest rates are high, therefore, central mortgage and housing corporation must follow this lead in natural sequela, and has to raise its rates to 7.25 per cent.

It is difficult philosophically for a philosophical Liberal, whether big "L" or small "l", to tolerate a policy which permits the ordinary man to be victimized by the machinations of the money system, if I make my point with sufficient clarity. As a philosophical Liberal, I am ready to say that any man who works for a wage in this country, any man who gets up at seven o'clock in the morning in order to be underground at Frood mine at eight o'clock and work there until four, then the very minimum that he is entitled to is decent living accommodation for himself and his family. That is the very minimum that the system owes him, so it follows then, that as a Liberal of the strength that I position myself were in the Minister's shoes — I have left out the federal government and the part that they play — I would not hesitate to compete with the money lenders, which is what my friend from Grey North and my friend from Niagara Falls have been advocating. Government, in those circumstances, ought to compete and it should, with great expedition, go into the second mortgage field.

What can you expect, and I wish the people could see this in this election year, what can you expect from a Minister of the Crown who will with complete nonchalance and impunity get up on the floor of the House and talk about people having to borrow money at 8 to 15 per cent with no sense of shame or chagrin in his voice at all about it.

Apparently he is content that these people are to be victimized this way, and of course they do pay that.

Just recently I had occasion to look into the matter of a second mortgage on a house in Capreol township, a mortgage held by a large financial institution in Montreal. The interest rate set out in the mortgage is 16 per cent. There was a bonus on the mortgage and the interest is charged on both the principal sum and the bonus at the rate of 16 per cent.

Well, the fellow is paying $65 per month and I calculate it will take him and his descendents about 300 years to pay that off, if ever.

That follows the principle of some of the castes in India in that one of the legacies the son gets from the father is that he passes the debts on to him. This has been going on for about ten centuries and they have never been paid off. So apparently that is going to come into Canada.

But there it is, and I do not pretend, I know nearly as much about this subject as my friend from Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) does, or my friend from Grey North who has been involved in it personally and intimately, or for that matter the member for Woodbine.

The third point I want to make is that in this election year — you do not mind me mentioning that it is an election year, the election is about six weeks off, I would guess right now — this government makes a mistake if they labour under the misapprehension that political harm will come to them only from those who are without housing. If their statisticians and their pollsters have looked into the matter and they have said that at the most there are X number of people who are in need of housing and they are the only discontented ones who will vote against us, and they will not have much of an impact on us, then they make a fatal error.

I would judge that in this society, in the democratic way of our society, that whether a person is housed, has adequate housing or not, he is concerned about the welfare of his fellow citizen and the type of housing he has. I would think that whereas it might be felt very personally and very inconveniently as a great frustration to those who have not got adequate housing, to a lesser extent but to a very real one that lack of housing is felt by those who have. They feel the neglect that has applied to the individual without housing.

Of course, whenever, Mr. Chairman, you get the word that the Prime Minister is going to dissolve this House, or as some put it in the vernacular, he is going to pull the pun. It will be on a Friday afternoon at about two o'clock, probably April 28, that he will do it. Whenever he does it, this is going to be — oh yes, we know when it is going to be; it is going to be after he calls that Confederation debate — that is the signal. As soon as he calls that Confederation conference resolution then it is going to be the same week that this House will be dissolved, I would judge. See if I am not right on that score.

But really it is appropriate, I say to my friend from Grey North; it is appropriate, my friend from Parkdale, whom I am told made a tremendous contribution to this debate, that we have an early opportunity to put this issue to the people, those whom Frost always called the jury of the people.

And I am one of those. I am ready to face the people on this issue, and I am fed up with the flippant, nonchalant attitude of this Minister, who apparently, as far as I can see — and I am a Cabinet bench studier myself; I study them very closely, all of them — as far as I can see he never demonstrates those qualities of broad humanity, those qualities of intimate concern for the welfare of his fellow citizens. And of course that has meant that he always talks in terms of housing starts; so many housing staarts. Never hear about any completions, but we hear about —

Mr. Bryden: There was a great big row last night when we tried to get information about completions.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. I suspect that is so. We have had housing by headline in the province as one of the legacies of living under this government and this is going to be one of the things — before I sit down, I will make one more prediction and perhaps I will be wrong. But they are in for a rude shock, come June 7. I do not know the nature of it exactly, but it is going to be a rude shock.

Then there is going to be a return to the idealistic concepts of democracy and the dissemination of the expelling of that aura of the divine right to rule that they have built up, based upon longevity. "We have been in office 24 years, therefore we must be good. Because we are good, the people will elect us again." You see the way the syllogism goes? That is the syllogism of longevity.

I come from a community that has been very hard done by by them. The community is represented partly by a government member, and you would think they would do something for him. He represents one-third of the city of Sudbury but now in a cold-hearted fashion they are not ready to do anything for anyone in the Opposition, and they are not aware of the geography of the location of his boundaries. They have not been for the last eight years, nor was the senator who was here before him. You recall the senator who was here, he was elevated too. I know the word now about going to the Senate—it is not elevated, you are translated

when you go to it. Those, such as they are, are my views on this housing matter and having posited them let me say that I am not asking for a reply.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey South.

Mr. Sargent: Grey North. I wish I had the loquaciousness—is that the word?—to get across my thoughts that the hon. member for Sudbury has but—

Mr. Bryden: Loquaciousness does not get across thoughts, that is the difficulty.

Mr. Sargent: Well, he communicates and I think that that is the most important part in any part of selling, as the Minister of Economics and Development knows. He sold the people of Ontario last January 24 that he had a programme, and I read a long time ago that in selling, Mr. Chairman, no one gives a darn how good your programme is, or how good your product is, it is how good your product makes them, and your product is a pretty phoney one at this point, I would suggest to you.

I do thank the Minister for sending across the reply to my question and I read it thusly:

> In view of the recent statement that the department has land set aside for the HOME programme that the builders do not know about, would the Minister inform the House (a) where this land is situated, (b) how much land is available, what did it cost, and from whom was it purchased?

When the HOME programme broke it appeared that the Minister was off and running. As you recall the Toronto *Daily Star* broke this exposé of the great need and the Minister, from his back pocket, pulled this programme out. In fact he told the press that he had land set aside for this programme, that there were 6,000 acres set aside for the programme. I do not see the press gallery very full tonight and the press will not report what I have to say, but the Owen Sound *Herald* will, and this is a growing piece of salesmanship that does not have any worth in it.

The truth of the matter is—by this report that the Minister so kindly sent me—that there has only been one property purchased in 1967 and this property—6,000 acres that he so proudly brags about—has been purchased progressively and has been held in title by the CMHC in Ottawa. Unless he has some subsequent deal with them now, the land was purchased in 1955 progressively and there has only been one purchase of land in 1967, of this land set aside for lease operation in the HOME programme. The simple fact is that the land is not owned by the Ontario housing corporation but has been purchased over the years by the CHMC. It looked as if he had something to offer the people of Ontario, so we had in total some 6,000 acres of land here which over the years have cost the purchaser, or the federal government, $6,000,000, or roughly it has been purchased at the rate of $1,000 an acre.

It is a shocking thing to realize that there is no land reserve in Kitchener, Galt, Guelph, Ottawa, Owen Sound, North Bay, Fort William, Sudbury, Niagara Falls, Kingston, Cornwall, Sault Ste. Marie, Barrie, Orillia or Timmins, but he does have 1,770 acres up in Atikokan. That is up between Fort William and Winnipeg and he does have a total of 1,700 acres in the golden horseshoe. I think that the Minister, when he came to the public of Ontario and told them he had this land set aside for them, it was with tongue in cheek that no one would find this out, because in all truth this land does not belong to him, it belongs to the CMHC. Naturally if we are going to have a 90-10 deal he will have to enter into an agreement involving the province that the federal government would have to approve. So in essence it was available but there is no planned programme, Mr. Chairman, for a HOME programme.

This land has been sitting there since 1954 and so he pulled a feather out of the air and told the people of Ontario that he had 6,000 acres already set aside for the HOME programme. In view of the fact that a very small percentage of the people of Ontario are going to benefit by this programme—waste land—unless the government acquires new acquisitions in land that can be serviced or is serviced, I think that this whole programme hinges on a false preface because a very small part of the province can take advantage of the programme and the lease programme under this arrangement. Basically I would like to ask the Minister what lands has he bought since this programme started on January 23 to make this plan really worthwhile on a land lease programme?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me first clear up one thing. You talk about the federal government owning that land. It is a federal-provincial partnership in which we put up 25 per cent and the federal government 75 per cent. It is called a federal-provincial partnership so we are partners in the land on

the list that I gave you. It is not owned by central mortgage and housing corporation.

Mr. Sargent: Title is held by CMHC—

Hon. Mr. Randall: As tenants-in-common, yes, but we are partners in there and what happens—

Mr. Sargent: Just a minute. You mean that no one else can have access to this land but you?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. It is held by us as partners and if you will just wait a minute I will tell you the rest of the story. The land was developed by us. We put in the services required; we established it on a market value and CMHC advertises it. They do the advertising, we do the servicing and it is a federal-provincial partnership all the way through. You ask what land we have bought since January 1. We have not bought any. If you had been here yesterday, which you were not, you would probably have heard the other story. We were negotiating for land in the Metro area and in other parts of Ontario. Perhaps I could give you some idea where we are negotiating but I refuse to tell you or anybody else where these areas are because we are in competition with other builders. I think you can understand that.

Mr. Sargent: When had you bought them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just a minute. I told you I had not bought any. We are negotiating in the Metro area for these lots. I did not say we had bought them, I said we are negotiating for these lots and we will have these lots in this coming year as I outlined in the comments I made on my housing target. In Thistletown we have 230 lots which will be ready in the winter which I do not mind telling you about because it is our property that is up there now. I am not going to mention those. In the spring of 1967 in the west end of Metro we have 45; in the west end we will have 362; in north Metro we have 120—that is 529 lots.

Mr. Sargent: Have you consummated a deal?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just a minute; just a minute.

Mr. Sargent: If you do buy them.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. I told you we were negotiating, 529 I have mentioned in the spring of 1967 now being ready—

Mr. Sargent: How can you say that? You say you will have it, you are negotiating now.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I told you we were negotiating for it. Will you sit down and listen? If you want to answer the questions I will sit down.

Mr. Sargent: But you will have forgotten.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh no, I will not forget anything. You will not let me forget anything, believe me. In the summer of 1967 in this same area of Metro we are negotiating for 494 in west Metro; for 453 in west Metro; 500 in west Metro; and 200 in east Metro, or 1,647. That does not include the area that my friend from Parkdale mentioned, Malvern.

Mr. Bryden: Would the Minister clarify "in the summer of 1967". Does he mean the negotiations commenced in the summer of 1967—

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, we anticipate that this is what we will have by the summer. I broke it down into seasons, as the negotiations are proceeding. That is a total of 529 in the spring of 1967, 1,647 in the summer of 1967. In west Metro 1,711 units, 230 in Thistletown—which I mentioned earlier—and east Metro, 166, that is 2,107, for a total of 4,283 serviced lots we anticipate we will have ready in these three seasons.

Mr. Bryden: When will that last group the Minister talked about be available?

Hon. Mr. Randall: In the fall and the winter of 1967.

Mr. Bryden: In the fall and winter.

Mr. Singer: Is that Malvern?

Mr. Bryden: Regarding the ones you expected to have by the spring of 1967, I presume the Minister has them by now or almost has them because we are now in the spring of 1967.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They are coming.

Mr. Singer: But the Minister used the word Malvern.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I said we are not including Malvern in this.

Mr. Singer: Oh, the Minister has forgotten about it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, Malvern is land, not lots; we are talking about lots now. Serviced lots that have been offered to us by private developers.

Now, let us go to other Ontario areas. I mentioned 4,283 lots in the Metro area, serviced lots offered to us. Then we go to other Ontario areas. In Hamilton, in the spring there are 14, and 56. In Peterborough there are 55, in Cobourg 12, Cornwall 106, Goderich 4, Kirkland Lake 20, Michipicoten 62, Owen Sound 5—

Mr. Sargent: Are these in negotiation now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, these we have.

Mr. Sargent: Well, they are not on this list here. I asked for a list of what the Minister had.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It was on the list, I will check it. Will the member wait a minute until I get finished?

Mr. Sargent: Well, how many lists does the Minister have?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just sit down, just sit down, I will tell the member.

Mr. Sargent: I do not have to sit down, I am asking the Minister a question.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sit down. I will tell the member.

St. Thomas 99, Sudbury 48, Tisdale 32, Trenton 68 and Atikokan 132. In the summer of 1967, in Hamilton there are another 150 and 140, that is 290, plus the 56 and 14 that I mentioned.

Mr. Sargent: Do you own these now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have those now—Windsor-Sandwich, 100; Peterborough 183—

Mr. Sargent: When were these bought?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Will the member wait a minute till I get through? Be reasonable.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister gave me a phony list here—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not give the member a phony list at all. He asked for the list, I gave it to him. If there is anything wrong with it, we will check it out.

Mr. Sargent: When were they bought, the lots?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member has it there, look at it.

Mr. Sargent: Those lots the Minister is talking about.

Hon. Mr. Randall: —Windsor 100, Peterborough 183, Brockville 172, Ottawa 120, Arnprior 81, Kapuskasing 65. And now privately owned lands offered to the Ontario housing corporation; for spring building, 80 in Ottawa, in the summer building 277 in Leamington, 212 in Timmins, for a total of 793 in the spring, 1,500 in the summer, 420—I forgot to mention Ottawa—in the winter and fall. That is a total of 2,713 serviced lots we now have in other parts of Ontario.

The member said we did not have any lots. I am saying we do have 2,713 lots owned by the federal-provincial partnership which we can start building on in the seasons that I have outlined. If you add these 4,283 with the 2,713, that is a total of 6,995.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: All right, state your point of order, please.

Mr. Sargent: Who does the Minister think he is, that he can give me a list like this in reply to my question? He is trying to lead me up the garden path.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member please be seated?

Mr. Sargent: I asked a question and he pulls this out of his back pocket, being a smart guy. Who does he think he is that he can flim-flam me like that? I asked him for a list of what he had and he gives me this and he reads me that, who does he think he is?

Mr. Chairman: Will the member take his seat?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Who does the member think he is?

Mr. Sargent: I asked him for a report and he gave me a phony report.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Give me the report back and I will check it out before the day is out and see where it is wrong.

Mr. Sargent: What kind of business is he trying to run over there? We ask for an intelligent answer and the Minister double-talks—

Mr. Chairman: Order! The Minister has answered the question, he will check the list the member has.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Minister, he

hurtled the figures out across the floor in machine-gun like fashion and expects the Opposition to absorb even two or three of them. If he could give them to us a little more leisurely, and let us get an idea of his calculations.

For instance, although I do not wish to make him unhappy, I lost him back in the spring of 1967 for Metro, that was about 10 minutes and 46 figures ago. I think some of us would appreciate taking it a little more slowly because we just cannot absorb them.

Now, can the Minister go back to the Metro figures, because he jumped from 2,000 units to 4,000 units without any intervening explanation at all.

Hon. Mr. Randall: As fast as the member is on his feet, I defy him to compete against that.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am not trying to compete, I am just trying to understand and I find it difficult.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I find it difficult too.

Mr. S. Lewis: Could the Minister go back to Metro some time—

Hon. Mr. Randall: All right, let us go back to Metro.

Mr. Chairman: Would the Minister please repeat some of those figures a little slower so the members may get them.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. Will you ask the member for Grey North to give me a chance to finish?

Mr. Chairman: Absolutely, the Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now, the spring of 1967, west Metro 45 lots—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. As this list comes out, the thing that is making it so confusing is that the Minister is lumping together a variety of categories. He is talking about lots under negotiation, lots he owns, lots he might own later. Could the Minister tell us in the different categories whether he owns them, whether he is negotiating them, when they are being negotiated, exactly what stage they are at?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did that, the member was not listening.

Mr. Singer: I was listening but I just could not follow the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Will you let me finish now and perhaps we can all be enlightened.

Mr. Singer: Well, if he would give it to us in logical sequence and a meaningful explanation—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, would the members let the Minister finish his statement?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not going to give you the list because this list is a confidential list and we are negotiating these lots in Metro, otherwise I would be very happy to give you the list. Let me give you the information I can give; this is what the hon. member for Scarborough wants. Just give me a second and I will give it to you. I am not trying to hide anything or confuse you.

In the spring of 1967 in Metro, west Metro 45, west Metro 362, and north Metro 122, that is a total of 529 expected to be available in the spring of 1967. Now these are being negotiated. Now in the summer of 1967, 494 in west Metro, 453 in west Metro, 500 in west Metro and 200 in east Metro. That is a total of 1,647 in the summer of 1967.

Mr. Singer: Would the Minister permit a question on this point? When he jumps from the spring to the summer, does he mean he has an option that carries him over that period or is he scheduled to negotiate then or just how does he jump in negotiation from May to July?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The lots are being serviced and will be available at that time, that is what I am talking about, serviced lots. And we are negotiating for the whole year as the lots become available. I am trying to set it down in seasons as the hon. member wanted to know last night, so I dug up the information for him. That is what I am trying to give him now.

Now, we are finished with the summer of 1967; 1,647 total. We are now into the fall or winter of 1967-68, I mentioned we had 230 in Thistletown, 1,711 in west Metro, 166 in east Metro, for a total of 2,107 in the fall and winter of 1967-68. Now that is a total of 4,283 serviced lots that we anticipate will be negotiated for and be available in that period.

Mr. Bryden: But in actual fact you have legal title to none of them at this moment?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is correct.

Mr. Bryden: So that this is partly a matter of hope.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not say we had legal title earlier, I said we are negotiating.

Mr. Bryden: No, I did not imply the Minister did, I just wanted to make clear that not even the ones the Minister expects to have available for spring starts are actually under the Minister's ownership at the moment?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not yet. I said we have made formal offers on these and we are negotiating prices.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there is one other question that I would like an answer to if possible. I can understand that if the Minister is involved in negotiations he has to be somewhat careful about what he says. But what is the average price approximately that the people of Ontario are going to have to pay for lots in the Metro area—I will ask only about the Metro area. I know prices are different in other areas. This is undoubtedly the highest cost area but what sort of average price do you envisage?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well is depends if it is singles, semi's or multiples. The prices are going to vary. I think I mentioned here last night that we had a proposal from a builder for 300 condominum town houses in the Metro area for $15,000, including the land under that condominum. That means a $12,000 house and we estimated $3,000 for the land. This is the kind of deal that we are trying to make in the Metro area.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, but in the answer you have now given you are referring to something on which there is already a building, are you?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, no. This is land that will be available. This is a builder's proposal for a condominium, what we call row-housing or town housing, at an average of $15,000 each, with land, in the Metro area.

Mr. Bryden: Roughly how many of these lots that you are negotiating, will be available for single family units, and how many for multiple units?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would doubt in Metro if there are any for single families, because of the value of the land, but I would say in other areas of Ontario it is quite possible there could be some single family in that area, or in multiple developments.

Mr. Bryden: Well in actual fact then, the land rental plan will provide no special family units in Metro.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have just been informed that in Metro they are mostly semi's.

Mr. S. Lewis: What is the figure you gave us for condominium—12 and three? What is the extent of this housing? The cost of house and land, on the average, what will it be?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am sorry, I do not think I got your question. Give it to me again, will you?

Mr. Bryden: What will be the average price?

Mr. S. Lewis: In reply to the member for Woodbine you mentioned that there would be three different prices—single, semi and multiple. Now you have given us the multiple cost and the semi cost?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would doubt that I could give you that at the present time.

Mr. S. Lewis: Not even roughly?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I would hesitate to give you a guess on that.

I think the question that was asked me, what is the price of land in Metro? The price of land as you know, is as high as $16,000 a lot. We are certainly not looking for $16,000 lots, the lots offered to us have to be within the range we talk about for the HOME plan and this is where the negotiations are going on now.

I might say I talked to one developer myself one day and the next day he came back the price was raised $2,000. I said, well you had better go back and get your pencil sharpener, so the man sharpened his pencil.

Now we are not going to make those kind of deals. It is the Ontario housing corporation, so there is negotiation to go on, plus the fact that we are talking here about lots that are now serviced. But also, as I mentioned earlier, there is a great deal of land being offered which we will service ourselves, with or without private enterprise.

Mr. Bryden: But actually though, the very problems of negotiation that the Minister talks about give rise to the very strong possibility that he will not actually be able to close deals on some of these lots on which he is now negotiating. The developers may get an idea of price that the Minister cannot justify under any circumstances.

Unfortunately, with the situation that now exists in Toronto those prices may not be unrealistic in the economic sense. They may very well be able to sell them to someone else

for a higher price than the Minister is willing to pay. The only conclusion I can arrive at, and I am not by any means underestimating the Minister's difficulties, is that his figure of 4,283 for Metro Toronto, available for building in the spring, summer, fall or winter of this year is the most optimistic possible of what he will have available. If any of his negotiations fall through he will have less; is not that fair?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If offers stopped coming in today you could be correct, but offers are coming in every day in the week, almost on the hour since the HOME plan was announced. Our people are talking to builders and developers and people with private property every day in the week. I gave you the latest information we had. Perhaps as of tonight there may be more offers, the builders are coming in to see us with these serviced lots.

Let me remind you that there are a number of developers and builders in this area who have their money locked into land. I am talking of land, not lots particularly, for a good many years. Because of the difficulty, perhaps of financing the rest of the project, they are interested in talking to us about a partnership arrangement—will we go in and assist them in putting in the internal services; which we are quite prepared to do in any part of Ontario. We are doing it in some areas now and have been doing it in the past on a provincial-federal partnership basis.

So the land they are talking to us about at the present time, some of it, has to be serviced, yes; but there is more serviced land coming in today than we thought existed in Metro. I think the surprising thing to us since we announced the HOME programme, is the amount of property that is available. People are locked in and they want to do something with it. Most of it is a matter of servicing. If we can make a deal to help them with servicing they are quite prepared to see that we get a share of that land for the kind of housing we are talking about.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am still puzzled by this. I do not understand the meaning of these statistics. Do you mean if my colleague from Sudbury was to come to you or your department this afternoon and say, I have got seven 50-foot lots and I will sell them to you for $25,000 a lot and they are serviced, that those would be a part of the statistic? Is that what you mean?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No.

Mr. Singer: Well what do you mean then?

Hon. Mr. Randall: What we mean is we buy property the same as any other individual. We get the best deal we can get for the government, for the Ontario housing corporation. We are not paying exorbitant prices for land any more than a private developer would. All I can suggest to you, my friend, is if you look at the properties that we have bought since we formed the Ontario housing corporation the average house that we have built and bought in the province of Ontario in the last two years has averaged us $14,500 with land. We can make better deals than the private developer.

Mr. Singer: That is not what I am talking about. I am talking about the statistic that you admitted a moment ago, that you have not got a single lot in Metropolitan Toronto since the first of this year, and you read us a list that adds up to 42,073.

Mr. Bryden: It is 4,200; let us not make it any worse.

Mr. Singer: I mean 4,200; I think it is meaningless in any event.

How do you get to be a statistic? How does my friend from Sudbury's lot get to be a statistic on that list? Because you added just a moment ago that there may be more in tonight. In other words, if my friend from Sudbury says, I have got a lot here and I think it is worth $25,000 and he puts it on offer to sell to you, I am not suggesting that you are going to buy it at an inflated price, but does that become a part of the statistic?

As I understand things it does. Because you have not bought any lots; you are negotiating for possible use. How do you get this figure of 4,200 odd? Is it just because somebody puts a piece of paper in our hand and says we would like to sell it to you for X dollars?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, these are formal offers offered to us within the range of what we are looking for and we are negotiating a better price, like they do on every formal offer. Your friend from Sudbury comes with a $25,000 offer. Right; if we are interested in $25,000 lots it would be a statistic tomorrow morning. But we are not interested in $25,000 lots. But if you come in at $6,000 or $4,000 or $5,000, he could possibly be a statistic.

Mr. Singer: Then let us get very practical. In the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto,

if the Minister knows anything about prices, he knows that 50-foot lots, just under development now, as far away as Jane and Sheppard are selling for $18,000 a lot. So that if my friend from Sudbury comes in and says, I will sell you a lot at $20,000 he is not very far from the negotiation stage, is he?

Now does that mean you are going to negotiate with him for a while and see if you cannot bring him down to $18,000, or what does it mean? If you are negotiating, if you have an offer, there is a time lapse after which that offer expires. At what stage will you be able to tell us in Metropolitan Toronto, that you have acquired one lot or two lots or ten lots or 2,000 lots? The better part of four months has gone by and you have not acquired one lot. We all know that they are very expensive here in Metropolitan Toronto, but what is your housing programme in Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Randall: All I can say to you my hon. friend is that all the offers we have had are being negotiated and sales are imminent; and they are not in the $18,000 category. This is where a lot of people, such as yourself, are fooled about the price of land in Metro. There are lots available for a lot less than $18,000.

Now I mentioned here in the House the other day, when we were talking about the building of a house; somebody said you cannot build a house for less than $15,000 and I pointed out there was a builder in my office who said I can take you to a lot that was selling a few months ago at $16,000. It now has a house on it, selling for $26,500. So it seems to me you either reduce the price of the lot or you build a $10,500 house.

I do not believe you cannot buy a lot for less than $18,000 in Metro. I appreciate that the price of land is higher here than anywhere else, but the offers we have are formal offers that we can dicker with within the limits we want to operate on.

Mr. Singer: You are still avioding the issue. April 11 is three and a half months into the year 1967 and you have admitted you have not acquired a single lot in Metro and that you are negotiating. How long are you going to continue to negotiate? When do the offers run out?

Your optimism about what one builder told you about one lot and one house proves absolutely nothing. When are you going to produce a house under your HOME plan in Toronto? Can you say that you will produce a house under the HOME plan in Toronto in May or June or July or even December of 1967? I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has no plan at all to produce a single house in Metropolitan Toronto this year and possibly even into next year.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: I would like to follow up a little further on this matter since I think it is quite important. One of the difficulties in the past number of months has been—indeed I would say over the years but I will refer only to the past number of months—has been the fact that the Ontario housing corporation and the government have issued statements which caught many headlines but which were very difficult to interpret. Now with great difficulty we are beginning to get down to some of the basic facts that are involved in the programmes now under way by the corporation. The Minister made a reference, when I was just at the conclusion of my last two or three questions to him, to the effect that the government was also negotiating with people who held unserviced land in Metro Toronto. I wish him all the luck in the world in such negotiations and if he can work out deals to get that land serviced and available for housing, I am for it. We should bear in mind, however, that there will be no housing units on this land this year or indeed next year. We will be very lucky if we get houses on unserviced land the year after next. So that is not going to do anything to solve the present situation.

I am not objecting to the arrangements. I think that the corporation and the government should proceed with any such arrangements because we will still have our desperate crisis two and three years from now. However, let us bear in mind that nothing is being done in that category to deal with any current problems, or even any moderately long run problems—problems of the next year or two.

Now I come to the serviced lands which the government does not actually own but which it hopes to be able to purchase. I would have thought that if they are expecting any spring starts they would have the land by now. I begin to get doubtful about a spring start on land that the government still does not own. According to my definition the spring is now here; it is not a matter for the future. The situation becomes more and more tenuous the further you get on into the year.

I assume that when the Minister talks about negotiations on land on which starts could be made this fall or winter, those negotiations are very far from fruition. Otherwise, why could we not get started earlier? The conclusion one can arrive at, Mr. Chairman, is that there really will not be any houses available on these lots for which the government is negotiating before next year at the earliest. Now is that a fair conclusion? It seems to me that it is a fair inference from the facts. Especially that inference seems to be fair if one assumes that these will not be single family units. They will be larger—some of them will be semi's, some of them will be multiples, but the larger the type of construction the longer it takes.

This plan for whatever merit it may have, and in my opinion it is a very modest plan, just is not going to meet any situation this year at all. We may start getting a few housing units available next year, but of course the crisis will have become much worse between now and then so that we will probably be no further ahead then than we are now.

One last point that seems to arise from what the Minister has been saying is that appendices E, F and G which appear in the Minister's publication, the HOME plan, really have no application to Metro Toronto. We can obviously exclude F and G because the prices listed there do not apply to this area; they may apply to some smaller communities in the province. I want to make it clear that I think the housing needs of smaller communities must also be met.

However, the critical problems are in the more congested areas, and the only appendix that could conceivably apply to the Metro Toronto area and possibly also to Hamilton and some of these other large urban complexes, would be appendix E. Those are the only prices that have any relevance to the realities existing here. Under appendix E the plain fact of the matter is that a person cannot afford this HOME deal unless he is making $8,000 a year or better.

That follows, I think, quite clearly. It is true the book lists a freehold column which suggests that if a person entered the plan on that basis he could handle the carrying charges if his income was $7,000 a year, but that is postulated on the basis of his having available a down payment of $6,000. The tables as set forth here suggest that somehow or other the man with $7,000 income is going to have a down payment of $6,000, whereas the man with an income of $8,000 is only going to have a down payment of $1,250. So I think we can ignore the freehold column. It would apply to only a relatively small number of people who are able to accumulate that down payment.

Therefore, we get back again to the other two columns which envisage incomes of $8,000 or better per year before a person can qualify at all. We have mentioned this before but the Minister thinks that $8,000 a year is the middle segment of the income scale. I would suggest to him that he go back to The Department of Economics and Development and I venture to suggest that they will tell him that he is quite wrong. Eight thousand and better is the upper quarter of the income scale, not the middle third and certainly not any of the lower section. Thus anything that will be available, according to what he says, in the Metro Toronto area is only for a very small number, relatively speaking, of well-to-do people.

I realize that $8,000 a year is not a huge income nowadays but it still is a larger income than the vast majority of families are receiving. You see, this does not meet the need of even the middle third that the Minister was talking about last night. It meets the needs of a relatively small number of people in the upper quarter — perhaps in the lower part of the upper quarter of the income scale.

I know that the Minister also has plans with respect to geared to income rental housing, but I am not going to bring those in now. I want to get some more information later on his plans in that connection but taking this land assembly, land rental, land sale phase, it really is not meeting the needs of those people whose needs are greatest. Furthermore, I am not even sure that it will meet the needs of the $8,000 a year people. It would appear from what the Minister has said that there will not be any single-family dwelling units constructed under the HOME programme under this land assembly, land rental arrangement in the Metro Toronto area.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I said in the Metro area; no, there will not be.

Mr. Bryden: There will not be. Well, I am glad we got that clear because certainly the impression people got from the press reports, and there have been some huge headlines on this, was that a lot of people — and I am afraid a lot of people with incomes of much less than $8,000 a year — thought they might be included — and were going to be able to get houses on the traditional 40-foot lot or

whatever it may be. Well, they are not going to be in this area and the Minister has —

Mr. Singer: There is no traditional 40-foot lot.

Mr. Bryden: The traditional building lot in my constituency actually ranges from 15 to 20 feet, but there is not much building on that type of lot nowadays. At any rate, let us say the traditional individual lot. There are not going to be any at all. There are going to be various forms of multiple dwelling units, most of which will be available for rental.

I suppose if the new condominium legislation goes through, if it truly achieves its objective—and that is a legal problem that I am not competent to judge—there may be some purchase as well. But the whole impression that has been created is obviously wrong. Most of the lots that the Minister is negotiating for are in Metro and they are not going to be available for the type of housing that people thought they were going to be available for. As long as that is understood, then, from here on in we will be in a better position to evaluate the programme and discuss it in public.

Since we now know lots are not going to be available for that type of housing, what type of housing in the main does the Minister think these lots will be available for—for the row houses, small multiple dwelling units, four-plexes, six-plexes and so on—is that the bulk of it? How much will be in, quite large dwelling units of 25, 50 and 100 units in one project? Will there be very many in that category, or is it mainly in this intermediary category that the land is going to be available?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can give the member an assortment. I can only recall that down at the meeting we had on Friday, February 10, when it was announced that condominium legislation was going through, that was one of the loudest cheers of the day from the builders and developers in the room. I think the hon. member from Broadview will attest to that. Since that time I have talked to a number of builders and they have said, "I certainly hope you are going to get that condominium legislation through before the House closes, because we are banking on it."

I cannot answer the member's question as to how much condominium we will have, but I think you are going to see many of the areas in the major cities, particularly this one, go to condominium not only perhaps for the rent part of them, but the sale part.

There was some misunderstanding here yesterday, I think, when we were listening to the conversation, that condominium would be a bad purchase. It is not a bad purchase but as you know, if a man has a condominium apartment, that is his apartment, that is all he is responsible for. If he has one apartment in 100, the other 99 mortgage holders are responsible for the rest of that building.

So the tenant hmiself, when he buys a condominium, is responsible entirely for his own building. He can sell it, he does not have to consult the rest of his tenants in the same building, he can do what he likes, which you cannot do with a co-op.

I would be inclined to believe from my discussions with the builders in the last month or two, since we announced condominium legislation, that there could be a great deal of condominium, not only in multiple dwellings, but in the garden court variety, such as we have in Flemington Park which I think members are familiar with and row housing.

This is what will take place, I think, in most of the major cities in this province, perhaps even Hamilton or Windsor.

Mr. Singer: But when, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, as soon as the bill is—

Mr. Singer: Has the Minister any idea how long it is going to take to process one of those condominium registrations through the registry office?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I do not have any idea.

Mr. Singer: Well, then how can the Minister talk about it unless he does? It is going to take months to clear the mechanical process through the registry office, even after the legislation is passed.

Mr. Bryden: This is the point I have been trying to get at, that the 4,283 lots which consist of most of the serviced lots the Minister has in view in the foreseeable future, will actually mean housing units only at a quite remote period, because the more complicated the type of construction—

Mr. Singer: Probably nothing in 1968.

Mr. Bryden: Well, there may be some in 1968 because I can see in some of the simpler ones—garden courts as the Minister describes them, town houses, some of them may come in in 1968, but there will be nothing in 1967 as a result of this programme.

Indeed, there will not be a great deal as I see it in 1968. When we are talking about Metro, let us bear in mind we are talking about the bulk of the programme, two-thirds of the lots—not that the Minister has acquired but that he has in view—two-thirds are in this area.

It is really quite a different programme from what was implied in this book that got so many big headlines. As to the reference to the 67,000 lots in Ontario and the 4,000 lots in Toronto, they just are not here. This is a belated move to deal with a crisis that is already overwhelming.

There is the other phase that I would like to ask some questions about but I think if other members have questions on these lots, we should clean that up first.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis: Yes, although mine also relates to this, I just wanted to ask the Minister one or two questions. The HOME programme and the lots we have been talking about, if I understand it, are designed for modest income groups. Is that not the phrase that was used throughout the Minister's submission?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We do not put a salary limit on it, we put a limit on the price of the house on the lot.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right. But the Minister did use the phrase "modest income"?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, does the Minister have an approximation? Can the Ontario housing corporation tell the people of Ontario what it means by "modest income"? Can the Minister give us a range? For Metropolitan Toronto, for instance?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know if the member was in the House earlier this afternoon when I said I looked up the income tax form last year and a fellow with a $15,000 net taxable income winds up with a little less than $11,000. Now, would you call him a man of modest income or would you call him a very rich man?

Mr. S. Lewis: I would call him in the very upper portion of the income bracket—a wealthy man.

Hon. Mr. Randall: All right, now we are talking about the modest income families, I am talking about people probably earning up to $10,000 or $12,000 and by the time you take their income tax off, they are back to $1,500 or $2,000 less than that.

In this range are the people who I say are in the middle third category. The member for Woodbine says no, but I break it down into thirds; there is the low-income category who are people that will always have to be assisted. Their incomes are such that they cannot afford the rents being asked and they cannot afford to buy, and we are going ahead with that programme to build more public or Ontario housing, if that is how you want to refer to it, but I would say the modest income family people are in the area anywhere from $2,000 up to $10,000.

When I say the $2,000, they are in the subsidized area. But between $5,000 and $10,000 I would consider as modest income families.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, we probably should not quibble about words. I would agree with the Minister that an income of $8,000 or $10,000 a year is a modest income but it is an income enjoyed by a very small percentage of the people of Ontario. This is the point we are trying to get at. You are not talking of the middle range, but about the upper quarter of the income scale as soon as you get up to $8,000.

The only figures available on family incomes actually are the census figures and unfortunately they are out of date. But even if you make a very generous adjustment in terms of increases in income since then, one certainly could not say that more than 20 or 25 per cent of the people of Ontario make $8,000 a year or better.

We are just fooling ourselves, and the Minister is inadvertently misleading the House when he suggests that a person making $8,000 a year is in the middle range of the income scale; he is not. That is the point that we have to keep hammering on during this phase of the HOME programme. The Minister is not doing anything for the middle income people at all. It is the people at the bottom or at the upper section of the income scale who are going to get such little benefit as will be available.

Maybe we do not consider the latter to be rich but the fact of the matter is they are very few in number. We are not doing anything for the middle category as far as I can see, and we are doing only a very little for the lower category. Mainly, as in the past, the thrust of our programe is for the benefit of the people who I say ought to be on the private market and who could undoubtedly

navigate on the private market successfully if we were doing something more to increase the stock of housing for the lower segments of the income scale.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize through you to the House for blowing my stack here, but I think we all agree that it is not five minutes to midnight. This is a sorry thing to talk about, this housing mess, but I want to say that the Minister is so hipped by this report and what he has in the till now as far as land is concerned. All the figures he read are being negotiated, that is correct. I apologize for not letting you say that. But at the point the Minister launched the HOME programme the Minister did not have any land and the thing I am trying to establish, if I may—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just in Metro. You have a list in your hand there. We had 5,500 acres; I have just read this off. We have something like 2,700 to 2,800 lots in Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, but you had 1,300 lots in Atikokan and 1,700 in Toronto. That is the land you had.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You asked where do we have land, what the price was and where was it. I told you. I told you where it was and I said we had something like 2,700 lots in Ontario. It is Metro we have been talking about here this afternoon, where we do not have the lots.

Mr. Sargent: Why did you not tell the people of Ontario that you had not negotiated for any land at all? You did not tell us that. You led us to believe that you had—as you said,

> conceived this plan early in 1966—

and, briefly, you say, that

> during that period in almost daily consultation with the late Ken Soble and the managing director of the Ontario housing corporation, Mr. Suters, we evolved the main schemes in the HOME plan which we felt would meet the housing needs of this province and its people.
>
> The Prime Minister was kept informed of the progress and on completion of the study several discussions were held with my Cabinet colleagues. The HOME plan was then approved for implementation and presentation in the Speech from the Throne and to the Legislature.

but not given to the press—those are my words.

Now when you say:

> Now to be specific as to some immediate and tangible results anticipated from the HOME plan I would like to advise the hon. members that lots will be placed on the market this year under the HOME plan in time for summer construction.

the point of my friend from Woodbine—

> What is more, lots will be made available not only in the urban areas but also in the small rural communities of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Does the member have any extensive remarks to make now?

It being 6 o'clock, p.m. the House took recess.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 60

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 11, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 11, 1967

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 2029

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 2073

Appendix 2074

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Mr. Chairman: I know the members would want me to tell them about the group of students who are with us tonight from grade 10 in Northern secondary school along with their teacher, Mr. Robert Amaron. Just before we started this meeting I learned that Mrs. Sargent and her daughter are with us tonight and they are helping the member for Grey North to celebrate his birthday.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT
(Continued)

On vote 408:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Before the recess, the Minister stated that the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) did not know what he was talking about. Now I would like to tell the Minister that when we form the government after the next election we have a lot of talent that does know what it is talking about. The member for Downsview has served his apprenticeship in municipal affairs and in the science of government, having been reeve of one of the largest boroughs in Canada, having every knowledge of the affairs of government and the needs of people; he started at the bottom and the Minister started at the top.

Mr. Chairman: I am sure the member for Grey North is leading up to something but it is really not vote 408.

Mr. Sargent: I just wanted to tell the Minister that the knowledge of the needs of people come to being in government, and not starting at the top as he has done so I hope you will give us marks for knowing something about the needs of people. I suggest that through all this debate the Minister has approached this whole subject with an open mouth and I suggest to him that he has not proven to me, at least, that his department is doing the job they were set up for.

Mr. Chairman, in the Toronto *Daily Star* tonight, the late edition, there is a story that should be on the record to show the odd million readers what they have, and this headline in tonight's *Star* is: HOME Plan Farce, Housewife Says, and the text of the story is this:

> A Scarborough woman last night branded the provincial government's home ownership made easy plan a big farce. Mrs. Diana Payne, of Westhill, told a meeting of the consumers housewives union that she and her husband Terry have bombarded Queen's Park with 20 phone calls since the HOME plan was announced but the HOME officials refused to take her application.

Diverting from the text here, with all the fanfare there was in the press that this was the answer to the housing needs of Ontario, the HOME officials refused to take her application. All she got for her trouble, she said, was a pamphlet and advice that HOME is not taking any applications because it does not have any land yet.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Does it not have a picture of the Minister on it?

Mr. Sargent: It would well have. I quote:

> Mr. Stanley Randall, the Minister of Economics and Development told the Legislature March 17 (that is about three weeks ago) that about 7,000 lots would be made available within a year under the HOME plan and that applications would be received immediately.
>
> The housewives met primarily to discuss charges against Toronto landlords who refused to accept children in their apartments. Mr. and Mrs. Archibald Watson, recent arrivals in Canada, claimed that the immigration officials in the United Kingdom told them that they could find a home here almost immediately.

Now these junkets that the Minister takes with television crews abroad and which cost last year roughly—I see one estimate for Trans-Canada air lines of $55,000—out of the public purse. He tells them over there that there is no problem getting a home here in Canada. Now it goes on to say in quoting this lady:

> With two children we walked the streets until 11 o'clock each night for three weeks. Most landlords took one look and said,

"Children, I am sorry"; others said, "One child maybe, but not two."

Mrs. Jack Sheppard, leader of the housewives union, said she will appeal to Prime Minister Lester Pearson in her last attempt to abolish all adult apartment restrictions and get more public housing. The days of wine and roses are over, she said, and—here is the unkindest cut of all—she sees the coming provincial election campaign as a golden opportunity for demonstrations and other forms of protest. So what can the people who are in the majority in this province do about it?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Vote NDP—that is the obvious solution.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, can you name any more important thing in any man's life than his own home, or his castle, and millions of people in this province are condemned to not ever having or owning one. I suggest that there is a great need first of all to get people in this department who can do a businesslike job of it. Sir, you know, and the Minister knows too, that in business today there are a lot of executives who cannot tolerate first class men around them. They separate the men from the boys and hire the boys.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): How would you know that, Eddie?

Mr. Sargent: The thing is, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that there are some able people in this department—looking at two in front of me I know of their ability—but he must have a very soft layer underneath there, because nothing happens when we need some action in housing. I suggest there is a need, Mr. Chairman, to set up a programme based on this Alcan proposal we had today—houses ranging from $10,000 to $15,000, available but not to the modest group you are talking about, the $8,000 to $10,000 group, but the man who takes home $80 or $90 a week or $5,000 a year.

He has a right to his home castle too, not to be condemned to a cell—like a slot in an apartment for he and his children the rest of their lives. They have rights too, and this programme in all its farce is looking after one stratum of our people. I think there is a great need for an exciting, challenging, programme of housing, using the province of Ontario savings branches as the crystallizer in each market, where they can go and negotiate the loan and get housing from a private builder.

These facts, Mr. Chairman, maybe have been repetitive but in my mind the most important thing that a man has is his own home. The government has conned us and kidded us so long. And remember always, Mr. Chairman, that the main function of government is the allocation of resources; and you have resources but you are allocating them to the wrong people and the people are getting wise to you.

You have kidded them long enough. The Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) goes on television and says this is done, that is done—checking them off, when they never come into consummation or reality until possibly two years later. This is lying to the people, and the hon. Minister has in effect been giving a false document to the people of Ontario when he said he had all these housing lots in escrow when they did not service any part of Ontario—only great places in Atikokan, giving them 1,300 lots as part of your wealth here in land—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): What are they going to do? Commute from Atikokan?

Mr. Sargent: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there are many—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I had occasion over the Easter recess to visit my family in Jamaica and we saw in that backward country they are giving each man his own little castle. They have thousands of little homes—cubicles, three roomed homes—where a man has his own home on a property development. And no one can tell me that with all the money we are spending from public funds in research for industry you cannot do a challenging, positive job on behalf of the small man who needs a home in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, what is emerging in this branch of the estimates is truly incredible. I hope the "emperor without his clothes" over there, in the person of the Minister, is not feeling uncomfortable about it. Because before the night is over, or before the week is over, or however long it takes us, I think the HOME programme will be exposed for what it is, namely, a political charade without content, and that is precisely our purpose in pursuing it further.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few points about what emerged from the debate

during the course of this afternoon, which I think are quite relevant and significant. I want to review with the Minister his figures about the HOME plan which he gave to us on this side of the House, and to draw the obvious conclusions from those figures.

As I understood it, and placing it in the context of Metropolitan Toronto for the moment, in the spring of 1967—apparently this period of time—the Ontario housing corporation would be negotiating, and I underline the word "negotiating", for 529 serviced lots. In the summer of 1967, they would be negotiating for 1,647 serviced lots. In the fall or winter of 1967-68, they would be negotiating for 2,107 serviced lots, to make a total by the winter of 1968 of 4,283 serviced lots.

There were several implications which one derived from this—and I think accurately—and they were as follows:

Under the HOME plan—the Minister can interrupt me if I am wrong—there is presently, as of April 11, not a single serviced lot available which the Ontario housing corporation has actually purchased as of this date—not one! That is the first thing.

The second is that even if the negotiations in the spring of 1967—that is those that are being conducted at the present moment—are successful, it is profoundly unlikely that we will have a single dwelling, be it semi- or multiple, completed by the end of this year It is very unlikely indeed, because I would point out to you that of the 529 lots for which the department is presently in the course of negotiation, the negotations are not completed even for those—and to suggest that multiple family dwellings will be completed before the end of 1967 when we have not completed purchase in April of 1967, is to perpetrate the kind of myth from the Legislature which no one would accept, and I know that the Minister is intelligent enough not to suggest it.

So I think that also it follows with equal directness that there will not be a single dwelling, semi- or multiple under the HOME plan, completed by the end of 1967.

Now one might also say, by implication, Mr. Chairman, that there is no plausible guarantee for 1968 for two significant reasons: First, because these are primarily multiple dwelling units we are discussing. In fact, the Minister himself in the course of the afternoon's debate, suggested that single family units were probably beyond the realm of discussion in Metropolitan Toronto because of the price of land.

Indeed, my colleague, the member for Woodbine, points out, not probably, but definitely. So we are speaking of multiple dwelling units. Whereas it is conceivable that you can construct a single dwelling in a period of from six to eight months, I defy the Minister to show the jurisdictions where condominium or multiple family dwelling units have been constructed in something less than a year or two, or three or four. Many people have suggested that it will take three or four years for major projects of that kind. But let the Minister give us the figures of what condominium would take to construct or what multiple family dwelling units would take to construct. That is the first reason why, by the end of 1968, it may be that not a single element of the HOME programme will materialize in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

The second reason, Mr. Chairman—and I suggest to you that it is equally important and equally compelling—is that there is absolutely no guarantee that any of these negotiations will lead to fruition. They are all speculative and the Minister's figures are all speculative. He made a very strong point this afternoon when he indicated that he was in a bartering process with the speculators and the builders, that they were submitting offers and he was rejecting offers.

Very often, I assume, the difference is several thousand dollars. The Ontario housing corporation, thinking of its responsibility to the public, I imagine, is not willing to grant excessive sums to freewheeling entrepreneurs, so that there is no guarantee that a single negotiation will reach fruition.

There is, I suppose, a considerable possibility, but no guarantee. The Minister has not been able to state to us unequivocally that that would be the case. In fact, he has admitted that since the offers come in hourly, as it were, that the figures can change on an hourly basis.

The hon. members for Downsview and Woodbine pointed that out rather saliently, this afternoon. So the picture that is emerging about this HOME programme is really one which inspires a sense of awe, in terms of the incredible press barrage that accompanied the original pronouncements.

The next point, Mr. Chairman, which is very distressing to those of us on this side—and I think that it is true of all of us in Opposition—is that the Minister's definition of modest income precludes 80 per cent of the population from participating in the HOME programme in Metropolitan Toronto. When

you preclude 80 per cent of the population, you cannot talk about modest income, you cannot talk about low income, you cannot talk about middle income; this is a housing programme for the income "elite", and it should be recognized as such.

We have discussed at considerable length the figures, but what we have done in this caucus is to make an effort to analyze the census figures of 1961 and project them to the year 1966-67, and take a look at the taxation statistics from The Department of Economics and Development itself. This is what the figures show; and I want to put them to the Minister confidently, but carefully:

Family income in Metropolitan Toronto for the year 1961—and I stress, Mr. Chairman, family income—showed that only 23 per cent of the population earned an income of more than $8,000 a year. The Minister knows his arithmetic as well as I do, and that $8,000 is before taxes, and if the Minister wants to take the after taxes proposition —which he is usually happy to throw out— then obviously the figures become even more disproportionate. But I am giving him the benefit of the doubt, I am being charitable.

Twenty-three per cent earn above $8,000 a year on a family basis, based on the 1961 census figures. That would preclude 77 per cent of the population of Metropolitan Toronto.

If you project those figures to 1966, taking into account the average weekly wage and salary figure rise over that period, you would find that 30 per cent of the population was above $8,400 at that time. It still means that on a family income basis, fully 70 per cent of the population would be excluded from the HOME plan.

Let us put it on a more realistic basis, Mr. Chairman. Let us put it on the basis of the individual breadwinner in the family and the individual income taken from the taxation statistics of The Department of Economics and Development. Taxable and non-taxable returns for the county of York in the year 1964 showed the following: 82 per cent of the people had incomes below $6,000 a year—82 per cent, taxable and non-taxable returns. If you move it a year ahead, the taxable returns for Metropolitan Toronto show 90 per cent below $8,000. That is, 1964 taxable returns for Metropolitan Toronto show 90 per cent below $8,000. That means, Mr. Chairman, no matter how one analyzes those figures and allowing all the flexibility in the world, that this is a housing programme for the elite, because if you look at appendix "E" of the Minister's original submission, you find that in any recognition of the cost of land in the Metropolitan Toronto area, and of building a home, you would either have to have $8,400 at the bottom level, or $8,800 at the upper level on a leasehold basis, or on an agreement of sale basis.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, what we on this side of the House are trying to point out, is that there have been no purchases made, that there will be no starts in 1967, and the possibilities for 1968 look grim indeed.

We are talking about multiple dwelling units and not single family dwelling units, which was the façade, the charade that the HOME programme was designed to suggest and we have excluded the vast majority of the population from participating in the HOME programme on an income basis.

The HOME programme is a profoundly empty shell. It is a sham and if you want to qualify the letters in sham, Mr. Chairman, then let me suggest that they could stand for Specious, Humbug from Arrogant Men, because that is what has happened to the HOME programme.

And let the Minister not think that he can foist that kind of a proposition on the people of Ontario. Now yesterday, Mr. Chairman, we began to get at the truth about public housing in Ontario and we will come back to that before the evening is over. We did not get the completion rate from the Minister, and I want to tell him, Mr. Chairman, that we will not stop until we get the completion estimates, because this business of giving out starts means nothing at all. Some of my colleagues have some very interesting revelations about the nature of certain of the starts to demonstrate to the Minister during the course of the evening.

But what we have so far deduced in these estimates, Mr. Chairman, is that the government of Ontario as is presently constituted—and only for another six or seven weeks, so I suppose one must be compassionate about it, but as presently constituted—it is doing almost nothing in public housing. The HOME programme is a colossal irrelevance and I say to the Minister that not all his very amiable salesmanship qualities can get away with this much longer. It is catching up with him. The press and the media and the public and the general feeling, are catching up with the loopholes in the HOME programme and everyone recognizes it. There is no answer except to abandon the façade that you have

propagated and begin with something entirely afresh.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he could tell us the acreage involved in the 4,283 serviced lots which he anticipates having in the metropolitan area by the end of this year.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): I cannot give you an acreage on that. I do not know the size of the lots yet. It has not been tallied up. It would be impossible for me to answer.

Mr. Renwick: Well all right then, let us assume that it is an impossible question for the Minister to answer, even in approximate terms, the matter which concerns me and on which I would like to zero in on the Minister for a few minutes, is this question of whether or not this province can afford out of its revenues to devote the kind of money which is required to stabilize housing prices in the province of Ontario, and in so doing to stabilize the price of land in areas such as Metropolitan Toronto.

I want to point out to him that I have very real reservations about the possibility of the government doing just that. If the government simply is going to enter into the land market in the metropolitan area as a buyer of land, it can do nothing but continue the escalation in land values which has taken place in the metropolitan area in such dramatic proportions within the last two or three years.

I would like to give two or three examples from a source which I believe the Minister will accept as being without question. I am speaking now of a presentation which was made by Mr. A. E. Diamond, president of Cadillac Development Corporation Limited, to the joint committee on consumers prices of the federal government.

In that presentation, when he was making his particular position clear to that committee, he had two or three examples which I think pose clearly and with great clarity the problem which the Minister is going to face when he says that he is going to negotiate for land in the city of Toronto, or in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. Mr. Diamond said, and this is directly from his statement:

> In 1959 our company purchased in a relatively good location in Metropolitan Toronto, 120 acres of land. At the time of purchase we paid approximately $6,000 per acre. In the interval between 1959 and 1964 the market value of this land kept pace with the carrying costs and indeed at any time between 1959 and about 1964 this land could have been sold for approximately $1,000 per acre more than our cost after all carrying charges.

Then he goes on to say:

> In the years 1964 to 1966 because of the shortage of serviced land and the fact that it was finally nearing the time when it would become available for building lots the land value increased substantially so that today the market value has risen to some $27,000 per acre.

Another example, which Mr. Diamond used in his presentation was that in 1955 a semi-detached lot in a reasonably close-in location in Scarborough would have cost approximately $2,200 per dwelling unit. Today this cost would be approximately $8,000 per dwelling unit, an increase of some 360 per cent.

In another example which Mr. Diamond used, he stated that:

> In 1955 our company purchased land on St. George Street for an apartment building at an average cost of $1,000 per apartment unit. Today in 1967 our cost of acquiring a piece of apartment land in a similar reasonably good location would be approximately three and one-half to four times this cost.

Now what has happened, Mr. Chairman, as I say, I would like to zero in on this proposition. The government has allowed the situation which exists with respect to the supply of land available for housing purposes in Metropolitan Toronto, and will in due course allow the same result to follow elsewhere, to reach a point where this government finally decided that it must intervene in the market as a buyer at market prices. Now this would have been quite fine had the goverment decided that ten years ago was the time to intervene in the market in order to stabilize and maintain a reasonable level of cost for the value of land in this area. But today, in the panic decision which the government made towards the end of last year to deal with the housing question, they are faced with the proposition that under a cloak of secrecy, which is quite natural in terms of negotiations, they are going to pursue this sort of entrepreneur *laissez-faire* attitude that this government in some way or other should be placed in the position where it is just another buyer in the land market.

In the Metropolitan area this is just not good enough. The government of the

province of Ontario has to face up to the proposition that it has a social responsibility, and that responsibility is the provision of houses and the provision of adequate housing for the one-third of the population of the metropolitan area who are not provided with adequate housing.

In differing degrees throughout the province of Ontario then, this government is going to have to intervene in what has been usually accepted as the traditional commercial way in which this development takes place. The intervention is going to have to be something much more direct, much more effective, much more carefully thought out and on a much broader front than simply for this government to say we are going to be another buyer in the market and we are going to take a lot of other people off the hook who got stuck with land which cannot be serviced, or who have land as a frozen asset and where this Minister is now going to say we are going to use this money of the government of the province of Ontario for that purpose.

The objective is clear: To provide adequate housing. The means which the Minister has used, like the means which this government uses in so many spheres, would have been adequate 10, 15 or 20 years ago but is now totally inadequate.

In the province of Ontario at this time, when we have resources which require, as the member for Grey North has said, a question of clear decision as to where the impact is going to be made and the selection of the objectives that we want to pursue as a government, then it is just not sufficient for the Minister to get into the general commercial swim and think for one single moment that by doing that he can in fact solve the problem.

The figures which I quoted, Mr. Chairman, point clearly to the fact that it will be an uneconomic, wasteful, disastrous procedure if this government thinks that it can solve this kind of problem in the metropolitan area and in areas of serious concentration of population in the city or in any other area in the province of Ontario in this manner.

If this government thinks that this method will solve the problem, it only has to realize that the magnitude of this problem is such that within the next 30 years, even in the lifetime of some of the people in this House, there are going to be double the number of people in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. The Minister is going to have to have not only the reclamation of the housing accommodation as it presently exists, he is going to have to double that accommodation.

Now he cannot do it, it is a wrongful use of our resources to do it, simply through the commercial markets for land. What I am suggesting to the Minister is that there are a number of other techniques which are available for this purpose. I am suggesting that the Minister, by force of the crisis with which he is faced, is going to, this night, in this Legislature, face up to whether or not he has any thoughts of any other techniques except entering into the market as another buyer and as a person who is prepared to provide at government expense the increasing cost of servicing raw land for the purpose of providing houses.

Now one of the methods by which this can be done—and the mechanics of finding out who owns the property are matters which can be left to the government if they have the will and the determination to do it—one of the ways in which this can be done is to say that where there is any substantial concentration of land still available for servicing and development that this government is going to take unto itself the power and the authority by legislation properly debated in this Legislature, the power to take unto itself the right to acquire that property at the cost to those who have bought it for the purpose of holding it either for development or for speculative purposes, at the cost to those persons, at properly rated cost, a properly accountable cost plus whatever is considered to be a fair margin of return on the investment which they have made as an investment and not as a speculation in a profoundly social asset of this community.

The Minister has to face up to the proposition that there must be some kind of legislation on a selective basis which could be applied on a selective basis to different areas of this province if, as and when it is necessary, to take into the common pool and reservoir of land which is necessary to meet the prime objective and target of adequate housing for the people in this community, the kind of authority which will permit him to do just that.

So that when he goes into the market place to bargain for land, he has a reserve instrument and authority because of the predominantly social need which will permit him, where it is necessary for him to do so, to acquire land at an economic cost and not at a speculative profit to those who are involved in selling that land to the province.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question? And I say to the hon. member that it is for information purposes alone, it is not in criticism of what he is saying.

Is it fair to assume that the member is really talking about expropriation of land for this purpose? What he has said lends itself really to most of the elements associated with expropriation. I am simply interested in knowing what the hon. member has in his mind. He has not used the word yet.

Mr. Sopha: I am interested in what is in the Minister's, too. I am preplexed at the motivation behind his question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, the member for Sudbury is often perplexed.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, as usual the government wants to fix into old-fashioned modes and words what we are attempting to get for a modern society. What we are simply saying to the Minister—and I will say it to that Minister as well as the Minister of Economics and Development—is that they have to place their focus on the social objective which is involved and that is to provide housing for the people who are now living, if I may use the word, in rotten accommodation, in the province of Ontario and particularly in areas of Metropolitan Toronto.

Whatever word the Minister wants to apply to the methods which could be used in order to stabilize that element of the cost of housing which is profoundly out of control in the metropolitan area, he can use it. All I am saying is that it is not improper for a government in a democratic society after debating the proposition in this Legislature—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Why does not the member come out and really say what he means then?

Mr. Renwick: Because what I am saying to the Minister is that it is not improper in a democratic society for this Legislature to give the Minister the kind of authority which will enable him to acquire concentrations of land in selected areas of the province of Ontario at a price equal to the accountable cost to the persons who acquire that property for that purpose at a proper price, plus a proper return on their investment, and to rule out the speculative profit which is involved in the escalation of land costs in the city of Toronto, and in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Riverdale has the floor.

Mr. Renwick: All right. Now, there are one or two other methods available for this purpose and one is to impose a proper tax on undeveloped land in order to make sure that it moves rapidly and quickly into the market for which it is available for housing purposes in this area. As a third method I am suggesting that there is a role in which this government has been sadly deficient; to speed up, modernize and provide an efficient municipal system by which persons who wish to develop land for residential purposes are not going to be faced, not with one year but two or three years' delay in going through a complicated series of steps before they can even get on with the proposition of constructing the accommodation which is involved.

Those are three methods, and there are many, many others, and I am not trying at all to be exhaustive, but I am saying to the Minister that he has to face up to this problem in the city of Toronto and in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. The reason he has to face up to it is because, Mr. Chairman, if he does not we will have a repetition on a different scale of what in fact took place in the province of Ontario after The National Housing Act was passed. What in fact took place was that we will provide the kind of accommodation which is required for this middle income group. And we will continue to ignore—and I say ignore advisedly, the housing accommodation of all those people in the metropolitan area and in the city of Toronto who earn something less in our society than $5,500 or $6,000 a year. That recognizes the fact that that area, give or take a few percentage points, however you want to argue it, is the great bulk of the population of this area.

Whether or not the ownership, the actual ownership by some devious means of leasing the land and owning the building or some devious method of a condominium where you own your little compartment of a house and you have the common rights over other ground, or whether you have, as the member for Woodbine has said and as is the case also in my riding, a house on a 20-foot property, whether or not you put value on being able to categorize yourself as an owner as distinct from a tenant, is not for very long going to be of great significance in the city.

What really is at the root of it is the proposition that if you happen to own that

necessary piece of real estate and that necessary home, you can have proper housing accommodation. If you do not own it, you are likely to have poor accommodation if you are in that gradation of the income groups in the city or in the municipality.

What is required is that that distinction will cease to be meaningful when we have an adequate public housing supply of proper accommodation which is available to people. Then it will no longer be significant whether you happen to be an owner or a tenant or somewhere in between, depending on condominium or this land-lease proposition that the Minister has brought forward. Those concepts will cease to be of any great significance.

But it is essential, if this government is going to do anything whatsoever under the guise of this HOME programme to accomplish the social purpose, that they must recognize that the limits of the business community, the limits of the commercial way of attacking this problem will not meet the problem in the gigantic size which it is presently assuming in this area.

The Minister has got to deal with this problem and he has got to deal with it in the exchange tonight in his estimates. When has the government given any thought of any kind to any other alternative methods or different techniques, or mixture of techniques, which could be used in a flexible, intelligent pragmatic way, to deal with the escalation of land values in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto? This in anticipation and hope that when other communities in the province of Ontario—including Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, Owen Sound, Brantford, the city of Hamilton and elsewhere, are faced with this kind of problem the government will have the techniques, the skill, the knowledge and the ability to deal with it in an intelligent, flexible way, because they recognize the paramount social objectives and they do not recognize a social objective which must, in the parlance of their philosophy, be totally subservient to the commercial philosophy which permeates the attitude of this Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister if he will give us some indication as to whether or not he has given thought to any other techniques or methods by which he will stabilize the value of land in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and in the city of Toronto.

Mr. Sopha: The inarticulate major premise behind the Provincial Treasurer's question did not escape attention. I am rather surprised that he is a Tory so far to the right. I knew he was a Tory in his thinking, but he is so far to the right that he would presume, which after all was an underlying presumption behind his question, that as a matter of social policy there would be any complaint about the body politic if the government used means of expropriation. Expropriation is a common device to protect the public good. It is used in many areas to achieve social objects. Why then should the Provincial Treasurer think that if it were advocated in the assembly of land for the building of houses for our people, that there would be any outcry?

Yes; or as my friend from Grey South says, any particular stigma attached to it.

The Provincial Treasurer thought that he was being very clever about it, and when the member for Riverdale brushed aside his question, as he properly ought to do, the Provincial Treasurer then gave the impression that he thought he had achieved some sort of a minor victory in the exchange.

Now of course that is one side. The other remark that captured my interest: My friend from Riverdale made reference to the fact that the government would put itself in the same category as any other type of business in the search for land, and of course that is exactly the philosophy with which the Minister of Economics and Development would approach it. It is my view, and I do not think I do him any harm, I certainly do his reputation no harm, I hope I do not injure his feelings, ruffle his sensitivity or raise hackles on his neck, when I say that is precisely the way he looks at government. He brought the chamber of commerce mentality to government; that being a habit of thought that you can see in the novels of Sinclair Lewis if you would care to read them.

That is his attitude. Government in a pluralistic society is the same as any other organization. Government competes with Abitibi Paper Company. It competes with the chartered banks, it achieves its end in the same way as any other entrepreneur does within our economic system and he would be willing, I suspect, to go into the market place and to bid for land, the same as people would who are going to build a large office complex in downtown Toronto.

I do not think—I have never seen any evidence that he understands the notion that land achieves its value through the social pressure of expansion of population, that pressure that an expanding population brings to bear on it. Earlier, at one time in respect of that, in the absence of the Provincial Treasurer, I wondered aloud whether anybody in the

Treasury department had ever read Henry George, who has now been dead these 60 years. My friend from Bruce, he said it, I did not; he said: Has the Provincial Treasurer ever read anything? I did not ask that question; the member for Bruce did.

Mr. Bryden: He read his Budget speech.

Mr. Sopha: He read his Budget speech, which of course was prepared for him by someone else.

But there is the problem and some of us are ready to face up to it. If my star reached its eclipse for standing on a matter of principle in that regard, then I am willing to say that we have come to a time of enlightenment in our society that we take a good hard look at the socially created value of land and we recognize as a matter of principle that—just to take an illustration—the corner of King and Bay Streets, down there, achieved its value—well, there are four corners, nobody will know which institution I am talking about—it did not achieve its value for reason of what any single man or any group of men acting in concert did. It achieved its value through the pressure of the urban population in this area. That is, in the words of Henry George, that is totally socially created value and it is an unearned increment in value attached to that land.

Hon. Mr. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): You surely do not believe in the single tax.

Mr. Sopha: No, I am not talking about the single tax. I am talking about that part of his thesis, as I say to my good friend the Attorney General, I am talking about that part of his thesis where he defines socially created values. He extended, of course, the philosophy of Spencer, I believe it was, in Britain, who employed the term—economic rent—to refer to those who lived on the value of land which they had had no hand in creating. They lived on what he termed the economic rent.

All right! Then if we have come to this point then I for one am perfectly willing to say that in the interests of the greater good of the greater number, to remove a social vice, to eradicate an evil that affects our society, if government must use the unique power that government has, and this is something that the Minister of Economics and Development might well remember, that in a pluralistic society such as ours the unique characteristics of government is that of all the associations, it is the only one entitled to employ force. It is the only one entitled to enforce its edicts and commands by the use of compulsory measures. That is what distinguishes government from any other association in this society.

All right! Once we agree that the social evil then has to be removed in the interests of the whole of the body politic, then I say to the Provincial Treasurer, in concluding this part of my thesis, what is wrong with expropriation; wherein lies the evil?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I did not say there was anything wrong with it.

Mr. Sopha: Wherein lies the evil? And I would infinitely prefer it to having to sit in this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Other people say there is something wrong with it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (Yorth South): You were suggesting there was something wrong with it.

Mr. Sopha: You were suggesting there was something wrong.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I did not.

Mr. Bryden: We were suggesting expropriation of land that is being held for speculation.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister without Portfolio): Who is making the speech?

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Bryden: But expropriation without any compensation—

Mr. MacDonald: For the speculative gain, let us make that clear too!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Bryden: I do not want to use your word because it is so far removed from what you do.

Mr. Sopha: You see, in the short space of about 20 minutes, we have changed the Provincial Treasurer's mind. That must be the achievement of the session.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You have succeeded in changing nobody's mind.

Mr. Sargent: Change the Provincial Treasurer!

Mr. Sopha: That will come in the fullness of time.

Mr. Sargent: Very shortly, on June 7.

Mr. Sopha: I have always said this: The sun will not fail to rise tomorrow if I were

defeated. Things would go on much the same as they did before I was elected and I will be content to return to my law practice if the people so determine. I always have had a great distaste for politicians who accord themselves a narcissistic view of their importance in public affairs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I wanted to say, once I heard the intervention, that the philosophy underlying the approach to this problem by the Minister of Economics and Development would be that shared by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. McKeough), for example, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett), the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, to mention three.

On the other hand, such people as the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), the Attorney General who leaves his seat, and a couple of others on the Treasury benches, would be more elastic and flexible in their thinking in respect of how far the state should intervene to take effective steps to correct this social vice, Mr. Chairman.

Now I want to say to the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) who is in this House and who is the dean of the Conservative Party, that it must be terribly embarrassing to him in the three decades in which he sat in the House. It ought to be noted, sir, he has never had a Ministerial responsibility, he has never held a portfolio, and therefore he should not be the focal point of any culpability that falls upon the shoulders of the government, but still he must be embarrassed by the fact that as long ago as the third day of July, 1943, a very succinct but still a very substantial and clear recommendation or promise was made by the party which he has supported for three decades in the House on the eve of its accession to power.

I hope he will not think that I betray a confidence, if he will permit me to say this; he told me that back in 1943, Mr. Chairman, when the Conservative government was elected to office and Harry Nixon, the father of the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) was defeated in August of that year, that George Drew called the victorious members together in these buildings and he said to them on that occasion, "If we—"

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: I am going to deal with Drew's plank on housing and I am just saying this in parenthesis—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to the member that he is rather lengthy in getting to it. I do not want to curtail discussion—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Sudbury has the floor.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Drew said to them on that occasion, "If we do things right, we will be in power for 20 years—we can look forward to 20 years of power." They have been in power for 24 years, and yet in that election campaign, the central and basic document that led to the accession to power of this party that has occupied the Treasury benches for 24 years, was this statement, of which I now want to remind the member for Dufferin-Simcoe, because no doubt in that campaign 24 years ago, in his own constituency and elsewhere, he must have referred to this thing.

It appeared as number eight, and if he will hearken to me, I should like to refresh his memory by my reading it. It says this:

> An Ontario housing commission will be created to plan a great housing programme throughout the whole province for the purpose of creating employment in the period of readjustment and at the same time, bring to an end the unsatisfactory housing conditions in many parts of Ontario.

Now could anything be clearer than that- It is open to no equivocation; there is no ambiguity in it whatsoever. Now is it any wonder—though I nettle the feelings of the hon. Minister without Portfolio who, my friend the member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) and I observed, came in tonight with four files instead of one, so the Prime Minister has given him more work to do, his responsibility is growing—is it any wonder that I portray in calling upon the memory of the member for Dufferin-Simcoe, the antecedent events in respect of this; that I speak of the importance of this plank in that critical election which marked the end of the Liberal era which had lasted for nine years, for the beginning of a quarter of a century of Tory rule?

There is another very revealing comment in the document, I would like to remind the member for Dufferin-Simcoe. The man who promulgated these 22 points in a radio broadcast that evening, July 3, 1943, said this along the way:

> I pledge myself as leader of the Progressive Conservative Party in Ontario, to

> carry out each of the proposals contained in this programme when you entrust us with the power to do so.

Now let me interpolate here that the Prime Minister who sits in this House, the leader of the government who acceded to his office in November, 1961, he, of course, by an old trick that he uses—though he is not a man who is given either to guile—

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Not every day.

Mr. Sopha: Not every day, the hon. member says. He is not that type of individual. He would be the first to want to create the impression—and he tries to do it among the unwary—that the Conservative regime, at least that part for which he is responsible, began in November, 1961. The government is only six years old, according to him and yet it is to be marked that 24 years ago, a man who stood very high in stature in the public affairs of this province, a former Premier of the province and who later on achieved prominence in the national field—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Let us get on with the vote!

Mr. MacDonald: Not the vote, but the substance of the vote.

Mr. Sopha: —said—and you will note the words he used:

> I pledge myself as leader of the Progressive Conservative Party in Ontario to carry out each of the proposals.

Well, since as has been portrayed in terms that do not require any repetition at all, the people of Ontario face a very similar housing crisis, then we may at least conclude that neither Drew, nor Frost nor Robarts—and I use the latter name for the continuity of the surnames because the other two have gone—neither Drew, nor Frost nor Robarts has carried that pledge into effect.

Then note the next words that Colonel Drew used in respect of this:

> Each of them is practical—

Each of the 22 points, he means—

> Each of them is practical. Each is based upon a careful examination of the facts.

You note the impression that Colonel Drew was seeking to convey there—

> These are not hasty proposals drafted only for the advantage of an on-coming election. They are the result of serious study and research and they are put forward before the people of Ontario to give them the opportunity of a choice in a responsible way and one that invites their confidence and support.

Which the people gave them for this quarter of a century, and which they have enjoyed.

Now here is the searing and damning point about it, Mr. Chairman. The Prime Minister of Ontario, had he not introduced this HOME programme—let us suppose for a moment, if we may be fanciful that the Lieutenant-Governor's lips had been silent in the Speech from the Throne about any such proposal at all, and it does not really stretch credulity very far to imagine that state of facts—but supposing he had said nothing then the Prime Minister of the province could adopt point number eight in its entirety when he calls his election and drafts his manifesto that he will take to the people.

He could take point number eight in its entirety, incorporate it in his programme. In spending that $2 million that no doubt he is going to spend in advertising in the forthcoming election—something in that neighbourhood—he could use the electronic medium, the radio and the platform that will be provided him and on each occasion he could read that—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Is he getting to the estimates, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes. It is about a housing programme. This nettles him you see. I am getting to him.

Mr. MacDonald: We will get back to the substance when he is finished.

Mr. Chairman: I would again ask the member if he would be a little more pertinent as far as vote 408 is concerned.

Mr. Sopha: I am saying this to you on my own behalf—since no one will speak for me—that everything I have said here is pertinent to this vote. Let me read the point again. This bothers the Prime Minister, this bothers him to hear it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It does not bother me, I have read it before. I do not have to listen.

An hon. member: Why do you not stay and listen?

Mr. Sopha: I observe that the Prime Minister is getting like the member for York South —they are now going outside the House to conduct their business. They are starting a new Legislature. They tell me that yesterday in my absence the member for York South

stormed out of the House and held a session outside and now the Prime Minister has adopted that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! On vote 408 please. The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Twenty-four years ago come July 3 next—let us read it again: "An Ontario housing corporation will be created to plan a great housing programme throughout the whole province for the purpose of—

Mr. Chairman: I should remind the member for Sudbury that he should avoid repetition.

Mr. Sopha: Let me continue to read this.

Mr. Chairman: Well, you say you are reading it again and I think you will agree with me that to follow the rules of the House we must avoid unnecessary repetition.

Mr. Sopha: There are only two more sentences:

> —for the purpose of creating employment in the period of readjustment, but at the same time bring to an end the unsatisfactory housing conditions in many parts of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, that could have been written yesterday. That is as contemporary as this morning's newspaper. And with nothing I put into words could I be more succinct in a searing criticism of the failure of this government to carry out its responsibilities to the people of Ontario. So my friend from Dufferin-Simcoe, who was elected on that platform, must certainly look back over the 24 years and wonder what those in the Treasury benches have done to carry it into effect.

There is one other comment. Oh, I can always sense when we get to them over there. If you stand in the House, Mr. Chairman, and you talk about Lanark being a nice place to retire to you never evoke anything; there are several go to sleep on the other side. But as soon as you say something—my eight years tells me—as soon as you say something that nettles them a little bit you get the reaction.

Mr. Chairman: Very interesting, but let us stay with the vote.

Mr. Sopha: I will make another observation: as soon as somebody says something significant in this free Parliament he is almost always called out of order. There is total correlation. As soon as something significant is said he is out of order.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think the member will be called out of order if he stays on the vote.

Mr. Sopha: I have been trying to point the failure of this government. And I do not know where evidence—I know something about the law of evidence—and I do not know more probative evidence of the failure that I can adduce than this document of 24 years ago in which the promise was made to the people of Ontario. The promise was not kept and surely in the fullness of time, we say hopefully, optimistically, in the fullness of time the people of Ontario are going to catch up to some people such as the member for Dufferin-Simcoe, who was part and parcel of the promise.

I am not given to wishful thinking but I know this: on election night if a report comes in around ten o'clock that the member for Dufferin-Simcoe is behind, we will be able to say the government is in trouble. That will be sure as shooting, but this is the type of thing that is going to put them in trouble.

Finally, I just want to make this plea to the Minister—I just want to make this plea. He made an allusion here this afternoon that was very interesting. He talked about a banana republic and somebody leaned over and asked him what he meant by the banana republics. Apparently, so far as they pertain to Ontario, he means, or he seems to mean—I do not want to put any words in his mouth—that there are some vested interests in the province who have accumulated large amounts of land and they are, it is assumed, a power to themselves.

I say this to him, that if using the power of the state he can get the consent of the Prime Minister—he would be able to get the Prime Minister's consent more readily than he can get the Provincial Treasurer's, because the Prime Minister is more flexible and broad-minded in his thinking than the Provincial Treasurer—if he could get the consent of the head man of the government, the first citizen, and he wanted to use some degree of coercion, which the member for Riverdale was implying, to deflate the value of land, to take away some of this aspect of socially created value in respect of it—unearned value—then he would find very readily that he would have the support of all the members in this party.

I am quite sure they would stand behind and shout "hurrah" for him so far as his measures were directed—they must be directed before they would win our hosannas—toward getting on with the task of building the necessary houses for the people who are in need.

In everything I have said it has been very interesting to hear the comments made by the man who has left, who has gone to his own Legislature outside, the member for York South, and his friend from Woodbine. And if, as a matter of principle, in enunciating the things I have, they quarrel—one wonders just how far to the left they are sometimes. Sometimes I get the idea that in their social philosophy they are somewhere between Louis 14th and Barry Goldwater on the social scale. If they dispute—

Mr. Bryden: Whom are you referring to?

Mr. Sopha: I am not really referring to you—these two down here with whom I am in closer contact; the powers. Now if they disagree, as a matter of principle, in respect of that unearned value of land to which I have directed remarks, I would like to hear from my friend from Woodbine. I do not ask any comment as a historical venture—it seemed to bother the member for York South that I referred historically to this document of 1943, because did he not say along the way that when he is finished we will get back to the real substance? Well, what is wrong? What is wrong with referring—

Mr. Bryden: We are definitely not interested in fighting the battles of 1943. We think there are better fight issues in 1967 and that is what we want to fight. And we will get to them after the hon. member for Sudbury has finished another of his endless perambulations.

Mr. Sopha: You cannot go ten minutes in the House, you cannot go any consecutive ten minutes that he does not mention Mitchell Hepburn, who predates 1943.

Mr. Bryden: And who are you referring to? I have never mentioned him in my life. It is those fellows over there.

Mr. Sopha: I will have attained this advantage, that if he ever does mention Mitchell Hepburn in the future, unless with the deepest respect, I will remind him of this.

Mr. Bryden: I would not demean myself by mentioning Mitchell Hepburn.

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Dufferin-Simcoe.

Mr. Downer: Mr. Chairman, just for the record I know that the hon. member for Sudbury has a penchant for accuracy, but unfortunately he slips a little bit. In 1943, on July 3, I happened to be overseas in England. I was elected in that year *in absentia* by an overwhelming majority and I knew nothing whatsoever about programmes or 22 points or anything else, as far as I was concerned over there. But I would like to say that Dufferin-Simcoe has always recognized good policies and good representation. Thank you very much.

Mr. Sopha: If the member was elected *in absentia,* that will get him straight through purgatory without stopping.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, does he have a monopoly of the floor?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, does he have to buy a monopoly on the floor, this man?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North has been recognized.

Mr. Sargent: On subsection 2 of vote 408 there is a grant to assist non-profit limited dividend housing companies. How many non-profit limited dividend companies do we have in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is the balance of an old programme on the rent certificate scheme that will be paid out this coming year. I think it is down to $80,000. That is the balance of an old scheme to be paid out this year.

Mr. Sargent: This is 50-year money—

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, no, these were grants to reduce, to take care of; grants to institutions that the government made over a period of years.

Mr. Sargent: We have a limited dividend company in Owen Sound, but are there any more financing plans like that available?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not now that we have the Ontario housing corporation operating the way it is operating.

Mr. Sargent: I see:

Mr. S. Lewis: The rent certificate plan is over then?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: That was going to save the housing situation in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Randall: My answer to that is that I phased that out as soon as I formed the Ontario housing corporation because we had no control over the rents.

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh, the Minister did; I see!

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Sargent: I have a heckler here beind me, would you tell him to—

Mr. Chairman: We will have him removed!

Mr. Sargent: Get the Sergeant-at-Arms.

We have $100,000 in this vote for research. Will the Minister please explain what this is for?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, this is research funds set aside for new building techniques, and it was a question I was going to answer when the hon. member for Riverdale brought it up; are we doing anything about new building techniques?

Yes, we have a sum of money set aside to work on matters such as new building and as was brought up this afternoon, Alcan homes. Perhaps some of the money could be used in that area, but this is what the funds are for, for building techniques.

Mr. Sargent: This is a new development in the department, this research?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, we had a sum in there the year before.

Mr. Sargent: How much?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think it was $50,000. I will get that figure, I do not have it here at the moment.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well in these negotiating teams that are travelling about, is it Metro or Ontario which is making negotiation deals for housing lots, service lots? How many teams are there negotiating?

Hon. Mr. Randall: There are three areas of development managers and 12 property managers under them in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: These area development managers are under the Minister's department and they have 12 men?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Under the Ontario housing corporation, yes.

Mr. Sargent: Authorized to negotiate?

Hon. Mr. Randall: To look over properties and do the work we have been talking about here tonight, yes.

Mr. Sargent: And how long have they been operating?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Since we formed the Ontario housing corporation. Of course, some of them were operating when it was just an agency.

Mr. Sargent: This was formed in 1964?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I think the legislation was passed in 1964 and the corporation came into being around November and they started adding to the staff at that time.

Mr. Sargent: Since the Minister's speech of March 17, 1967, this team has not consummated one deal?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well the member said not made a deal. You do not make deals overnight, you have to look at the property. There is much work that they do, they just do not go out and say, "Here is so much money, we want to buy a piece of land". They have to search it out, they get invitations to go and look at properties, talk to municipal councils. As I say, these are the people who are doing the negotiating for land. This is a progressive programme. I would say that this will go on, as far as they are concerned, indefinitely. There will always be buying and selling and looking at properties.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think we all respect the enormity of the programme, but I would like to ask the Minister, in all sincerity: "Who wrote his speech of March 17?" This is very important.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I wrote it myself.

Mr. Sargent: This is interesting then, because we are talking about the Minister's statement to the House.

Mr. Chairman: What we are talking about right now is vote 408.

Mr. Sargent: We are talking about housing and I maintain my right to talk about housing.

Mr. Chairman: Proceed with the vote.

Mr. Sargent: In view of the record of this government, this really puts the Minister over the barrel because he has made statements to the House that he has no hope in the world of ever fulfilling. I could read this; if the Minister would like to go over this, a page of it, he will see the absolute—either how naïve he could be—or how he was trying to flim-flam the House.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have been accused of everything else, the member might as well go ahead and read it. I could not care less; go ahead, read it. The member cannot hurt my feelings.

Mr. Sargent: It is on page 7.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: We have the list by the Minister of the 6,000 acres they own in Ontario, from CMHC, which were acquired the moment the Minister saw he was in trouble. He immediately acquired this land, and he takes credit for it, but none of it has been purchased this year, only one lot.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Will the member read out where I said we acquired 6,000 acres there?

Mr. Sargent: I will go on with page 7. The Minister says:

> Thousands of acres of serviceable land have already been offered to the Ontario housing corporation; in addition to several thousand lots, some of which are already serviced and others which will be serviced and available for building this year. These are in addition to developments already owned by the federal-provincial partnership in many areas of Ontario.
>
> A substantial number of lots will be available this year. Land lease is, of course, only one scheme of the HOME plan; and I would like to assure the hon. members that each and every scheme will be available this year.
>
> Now, Mr. Speaker, to sum up my comments, may I emphasize the following points so there will be no misunderstanding of the government's intention in matters relating to housing through the HOME plan.

Then you claim that you are going to live up to all this. I hate to insult you by saying what I think of it. The very fact is that you have taken on a programme and you cannot make it stand up. You have not got the intestinal fortitude that you admit you cannot do it.

Now the member for Riverdale was talking about the tax on undeveloped land going back and going back in history, back even in the British Parliament. They were talking in 1911 of the tax on the unearned increment in land. Here is the area where you will have to put your thinking together on taxation so you can acquire this land. The people are going to hold this land out—it is prohibitive, you cannot buy it—then you must put a tax on the unearned increment of land.

This is a very basic thing you must face. If people are going to hold this land, every day increasing in value away from the public, then they should be taxed for it, retroactive.

This is something you have never done, not thought of and not put into the hopper at all. So your plan cannot work this year, or even two years from now.

You are going to go to the public on the election and say, we have a housing programme. As the members to our left have proved very conclusively, you have not a programme. We have established that here today.

For instance, Mr. Minister, you said that the industry had no housing problems in Oakville. You made that statement and the member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) tells me tonight that an Oakville industry recently moved to Guelph due to lack of housing in Oakville.

So whatever the Minister tells us does not add up one iota. We have established very conclusively, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister, with all the many hats he wears, the most important he should be doing properly, he is not doing at all.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 408 carried?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hollowness of the land assembly programme has now, I think, been adequately exposed. It is not necessary as far as I am concerned to battle any further. There are no lots in the possession of the Ontario housing corporation for the purpose of this plan which has been announced and re-announced with such fanfare. So having established that, we can move on to other phases of the HOME programme, phases that were not initiated and announced this year. I have particularly in mind the question of the—

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I just interrupt you for a moment? You said there are no lots. I point out—

Mr. Bryden: I should have said there are none in Metro Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Randall: All right. Let us put it that way. I agree with you on Metro, but there are lots in Ontario. I made a statement, there are lots available to start the HOME programme.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am quite happy to accept that correction. There are a small number of lots in some sections of the province where the land problem is not critical. In the areas where it is critical, no lots have yet been acquired. But of the figures which the Minister has given, two-thirds were in Metro Toronto. It is the Metro Toronto figure that helps to inflate his total and the Metro Toronto figure is a hollow sham. Instead of 4,200 plus, it is precisely zero. That is what the Minister now has.

Let us get on to another phase which I consider an infinitely more important phase of housing policy and this is the question of geared-to-income rental housing. This is a policy which the government has been carrying on in an extremely modest way for some years and the OHC when it was set up, followed the extremely modest beginnings which were made earlier.

The Minister, however, led us to believe that it was stepping up its activities in this field to some extent. Last night he gave us figures with respect to starts. I am not going to get into the futile argument that I had with him last night, when I asked him also to give us the figures on completions. Apparently he does not know how many houses he has completed. He only knows how many have been started or might conceivably, under some favourable combination of circumstances, be started. And it seems that he is unwilling to talk about completions at all, although in my opinion in any housing programme completions are at least as important as starts.

However, let us take his figures on starts. At the adjournment time last night, we had made some progress in getting some details on the figures that he provided in his usual cavalier way and I want to take one particular figure which he provided. It relates to family units as geared-to-income rental, which will be started, he says—they cannot start yet, but they are projected starts—between April 1 and December 31 of this year. He said in Metro Toronto there were 3,837 in that category.

I tried to get more precise information from him and at the time of adjournment all I had been able to get was the following: 230 of these were in the Donmount project; 450 in the Blake project and 455 were in another project, I did not jot down the name of the project and I have forgotten which one it was, but there were three he mentioned. Those three together add up to about 1,200 out of 3,837.

He said of Donmount and Blake that those two would be started immediately and as a person who is somewhat familiar with the area, Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to believe that anything is going to be started immediately in the Blake project. The land in that vicinity looks no different than it did 10 years ago. However, perhaps the Minister will be able to clarify that point.

As far as Donmount is concerned, existing buildings have been demolished. A point that should be noted, Mr. Chairman, is that although the Minister expects that in some period of time which he has not yet specified, 230 new units will be built in that area. That is probably not much more than replacement of the housing units which have been destroyed in the area. So that in the long term, the Donmount project will not add significantly in numbers to the housing availability in Toronto.

I have no doubt it will improve the quality to a considerable degree and I do not by any means suggest that is is not a desirable thing. It will not however have any significant effect, even in the long run, on the number of units available in Toronto.

Indeed, for the present, Mr. Chairman, the Donmount project has resulted in a reduction of the stock of housing in Toronto, because a substantial number of housing units in that area have been demolished to make way for the new project. This is regrettable. I am in favour of urban renewal and improving the quality of housing. Unfortunately, in the city of Toronto, the shortage of housing is so desperate that we create a very serious situation when we destroy any houses and this is what has happened in Donmount at the moment. There has actually been a reduction in the housing stock available in Toronto, and this reduction will continue for some time.

However Mr. Chairman, to pursue the Donmount and Blake projects. To begin with, if as the Minister says, they will start almost immediately, then it surely must be

a fact that contracts have been let for both those projects. I would therefore, Mr. Chairman, like to ask the Minister when these contracts were let, what is the total value of the contract, in terms of money, in each case, what is the starting date specified in each contract and what is the projected finishing date that the corporation has in mind with respect to each of these two contracts?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well Mr. Chairman, to reply to the hon. member's question, first of all he mentioned Donmount and Blake. It was Donmount and Pelham that we were referring to this afternoon and that are to be started on.

Mr. Bryden: I am sorry, I did not hear.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It was Donmount and Pelham that we talked about this afternoon, not Donmount and Blake.

Mr. Bryden: You mentioned Blake too.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We said Blake too, but the two we were talking about—

Mr. Bryden: There were three, Pelham, 455; Blake, 450; Donmount, 230. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, that is right. But the ones you asked about I think last night—

Mr. Bryden: Last night I asked you to give some examples and you gave those three and then I asked more specifically about Donmount and Blake.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have Donmount here and Pelham. Let us deal with Donmount first.

As the result of a redevelopment scheme in the city of Toronto, the Ontario housing corporation was requested to build a housing project consisting of 232 family units of the following breakdown: 20 bachelor; 20 one-bedroom; 79 two-bedroom; 70 three-bedroom; 31 four-bedroom; 12 five-bedroom: Total 232.

A tender call was issued on December 9, 1966 for the first phase of 77 units, closing on January 20, 1967. The low bidder in this case was Groom Construction Limited, which firm applied for a building permit on Friday, April 7, 1967 and it is expected that the building permit will be issued this week which will allow for an immediate construction start.

The second phase, consisting of 155 units, will be started this summer and will move progressively as land is cleared.

We cannot build in these areas, you will appreciate, until the land is cleared. Our job is to put houses on land after it is cleared.

Mr. Bryden: Actually, in Donmount, you have only 77 units to be started and the others will come along at some time in the future.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I said this summer, as the land is cleared.

Mr. Bryden: Well, all right, but all we know for sure is that 77 are to be started fairly soon—probably this month.

What is the projected completion date for those 77 units?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I wonder if the member will let me answer this question and then I will come back to his question and give him some completion dates for which he has asked. I think I will be able to give him a list of completion dates on various types of projects which will answer most of his questions.

Let me deal with Covent Gardens. This is a project which came about as a result of an invitation from developers for family housing accommodation in the city of Toronto. It is a combined urban renewal and housing development exercise, having the particular advantage of not dislocating families and creating a net increase in the housing start of 455 family units.

This development will be carried out by Stanton Park Construction Limited, Toronto. Construction will commence on April 20, 1967. Industrial buildings are currently being demolished. The Covent Garden project and the Donmount project will produce 687 units in the city of Toronto and other projects are also contemplated for the city, as I pointed out.

Mr. Bryden: Before you leave Pelham, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that there are 455 units and the contract has been let to a contractor whose name I have missed—but it does not matter, it has been let—and a start is being made on April 20. Now is that contract for all of the 455 units?

A project of this size, I presume, would take two years to complete. Is that a fair assumption? What is the Minister's projected completion date for the whole project as set forth in the contract? I believe that in the answer the Minister gave to a question this afternoon, he said that contracts do include a projected completion date, although naturally they are not firm dates.

Hon. Mr. Randall: As I understand it, from my associates, the project will be fully completed by the end of 1968, if not before.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, the score of the hockey game, I am advised, is 3-0 for Toronto.

Mr. Bryden: The Minister is a harbinger of good news!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, sir!

Mr. Chairman: Has the member for Woodbine concluded his remarks?

Mr. Bryden: No, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister was going to give me further information about the Blake project and then I have a good many others I want to ask about, but if the member for Grey North wants to get in in the meantime, it is fine with me.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There are 460 units in Blake and it will commence in August of this year.

Mr. S. Lewis: Simultaneously?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Pardon?

Mr. S. Lewis: All the units? What is the projected completion date of Blake?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We contemplate finishing this project by the end of 1968.

Mr. Bryden: The Minister is rather optimistic, is he not, that a project of that size can be completed in 14 months?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I marked off a couple of dates; here is one in Hamilton—46 units started on May 24, 1965, completed November 1, 1965. That is five months and three days.

Mr. Bryden: That is not a comparable example; this is a 460-unit—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me go ahead for a moment. Here are 43 started on July 23, 1966 completed on January 24, 1967—that took six months; here are 51 started on January 14, 1966 and completed on November 7, 1966—10 months and seven days.

Mr. Bryden: But these are not 460-unit projects.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am looking for some; here are 136 units, started November 9, 1966 and 79 per cent of them were completed by April 1, 1967.

If a builder gets a job like this—and we talked about the Stanton company—and he goes on to the project, he is more apt to get it finished than if there were two or three contractors on the job. Some of these jobs, regardless of the number of units, are finished in pretty fair time.

Mr. Bryden: What about Blake Street? It would not appear to me that there is land available in the vicinity of Blake Street that would accommodate 460 units unless they are high rise, which I do not think the Minister has in mind. At least I do not think he is contemplating a high rise project.

Hon. Mr. Randall: As I understand it, the planning board, Metro, the city council and OMB have all approved Blake Street and the property will be available.

Mr. Bryden: Where precisely is it? I have a hard job visualizing 460 housing units on any land that is cleared currently and not obviously owned by someone else in that area. Dominion stores own a large piece of land, but I am sure that they are not planning to give up their parking lot for the Minister's housing project. Across the street there are other enterprises with buildings on the ground. There is some vacant land on the side of a hill and that is about all.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Perhaps the answer is that there is one high-rise building and the rest is row housing. Perhaps this answers the member's question about 460 units.

Mr. Bryden: They are going to be fairly compact units, then.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They could be, yes.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, has that contract actually been let?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It will be awarded before August.

Mr. Bryden: Tenders have been called, have they? And have you had bids on it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It was a builder proposal, and I understand that the city said this was one of the finest building projects that had ever been submitted in the city.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get information on some other projects but if the member for Grey North would like to take over at this point, it is fine with me. I can return later.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the Minister, in reading the list of communities in Ontario that had offered land, or subdividers that had offered land, mentioned the town of Leamington as having 227 lots.

I do not know whether any information exists, but is this a proposal by the subdividers or by the community, or by a number of subdividers? If so, what proportion are serviced lots?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am informed that it was private developers who offered this subdivision.

Mr. Paterson: I would like to speak to the Minister as to the importance of a development of that size to a community of approximately 10,000 people in the outlying areas of Ontario. This would automatically mean to this community which has full services of sewage and water, an increase in population of almost 10 per cent. This community is prepared to handle this number of people, but it would also help the whole county of Essex and the city of Windsor with their very urgent problems.

This community can offer these services and if the Minister's officers can see fit to move in and get this development going, it would certainly help the whole Essex county area. In fact, as I mentioned the other day, we have a new industry coming into that community which is going to employ some 200 men and this new housing would certainly be of great benefit.

I think it could be a prime example of what the department could do in the outlying parts of Ontario, outside of the Metro area, which has been discussed so thoroughly today. I hope the Minister will move in with this with great urgency.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I might say there are one or two other areas similar to the hon. member's that we hope will be under way very shortly in some of the smaller towns. All our problems are not here in Metro. This is the major problem, but in many of the other areas we do not have the land problem we do here.

Mr. Sargent: What percentage is the Minister's deal with the municipalities and the federal government on the housing for the aged now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: For senior citizens we borrow 90 per cent from the federal authority.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Randall: On the senior citizens' housing outside of Metro we do not build senior citizen's housing in Metro, it is done by the Metro council—we borrow 90 per cent of the money from the federal authorities, we put up 10 per cent. It is a 50/50 subsidy.

As I understand it, the municipality pays $25—in other words, the maximum tax we pay the municipality is $25 per suite per annum. If it costs them any more than that, then they put that up as their share of the subsidy.

Mr. Sargent: I hate to flog this horse: Is the capital rate down percentagewise?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is 90/10 and the subsidy is 50/50, the federal government 50, and ourselves 50.

Mr. Sargent: And how much does the municipality pay?

Hon. Mr. Randall: They do not pay anything. As I say, the municipality, if the taxes are over $25—we pay the municipality $25 per unit taxes. If the taxes were $30, then the municipality absorbs that $5 per unit.

Mr. Sargent: The capital cost though, what percentage?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is 90/10; but when you say the capital, we borrow the money but we keep in mind we have to guarantee to pay it back.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the question of public housing in the metropolitan area has taken up more space in the newspapers here in Toronto than any other subject and it would lead one to believe that the situation has reached crisis proportion. I have heard nothing said to indicate that this was not the case.

Now, in Hamilton I cannot say that we have a crisis situation, but I can say that we have a very bad situation in regard to housing. And I predict that if something more is not done than what is indicated by the programme up to date, we will have the crisis next year, sir. It will be worse than the situation here in Toronto.

I had hoped that before now, in the debate on the estimates of this department and in particular the housing section, that other members from Hamilton, particularly the government members, sir, those members of the Conservative Party, would have raised the situation that exists in Hamilton; or at least tried to indicate to the Minister that things

are not just as they may seem to be by press headlines.

I have raised the question of housing in the city of Hamilton for many years and I have accused both the government, this department and the municipal authorities of not doing the job that has to be done in regard to public housing. I have never been able to set the blame exactly where it should be.

In raising the serious question of lack of housing in Hamilton, I have been told by The Department of Economics and Development in previous years that the municipalities were to blame, that they must take the initiative and tell The Department of Economics and Development what they need and they will do the job. This year we have found that the city council has taken the initiative and again we have houses by headlines.

Hamilton got its treatment of the HOME programme in the press the same as other sections of the province. Certainly it is not going to apply to Hamilton in any greater degree as far as helping the housing situation, than has been indicated by the Toronto members here tonight. Certainly when my colleagues indicate that the HOME programme will not apply to the groups that really need housing but to those in the higher incomes, it certainly applies to the Hamilton area.

In just brief figures, 50 per cent of the wage earners in Hamilton earn less than $4,800 a year and 50 per cent of that group are below $3,000 a year. So you can easily see that the HOME programme is going to be of little avail.

Now when raising the question of the housing situation in Hamilton in 1964 in this House we had then decided, on a survey that was taken by the housing section of The Department of Economics and Development that we needed something like 900 family units and 600 senior citizens units. In dealing with the estimates last year, we found that in 1965 we had produced 64 family units and 40 senior citizens' units. As far as I can find out, that was the situation.

I understand that the city council met with the officials of the housing branch not long ago. I was a little bit put out because I was not advised of the meeting with the officials of the housing branch; I do not know whether there were any other members of the House in attendance at that meeting, but I would certainly have thought that we deserved an invitation and we should have been advised. I think it is a little bit of shabby treatment to leave the members out in the particular area where the subject is being discussed, and particularly where one's riding is involved in housing programmes. But I was pleased that the meeting was arranged, and the next I knew of what took place at the meeting was another press release—I have not yet been advised as to what the situation is as regards to Hamilton—but we did get another press release: Housing Need Gets Big Boost.

I would like to quote from it briefly, Mr. Chairman, because I want a lot of answers to some of the questions in regard to the situation in Hamilton.

I quote from the Hamilton *Spectator*:

> Board of control claims great progress towards alleviating Hamilton's growing housing crisis. Yesterday, after a meeting with the Ontario housing corporation, the board secured two promises from the Ontario housing corporation. Construction of 1,000 public housing units will begin this year. An OHC employee will be stationed in Hamilton full time to act as liaison between the corporation and the city.

I quote Controller Jack MacDonald:

> We made real progress in getting the roadblocks out of the way.

I go on to quote the report:

> Of the 1,000 units promised for this year, 500 will be contained in a senior citizens' development on Jackson Street West. The remainder will be family units. A total of 140 will be built in Roxborough Park in the east end, 70 are planned for the Canadian Cottons property on James Street North, 16 will be built on the old continue-flow plant, also on James Street North, and the remainder will be constructed on the mountain, probably in Mohawk Gardens. Another 1,500 units will be constructed during the next three years.

Mr. Chairman, I have made some enquiries from the councillors and I was able to obtain a copy of the summary of the meeting sent to them by Mr. Suters, and I have not been able to come to any more than a start, if they are started, of 241 units in the coming year. I would refer to the documents sent to the board of control, signed by Mr. Brady, deputy managing director of development, and in it I would quote the programme. It says:

> It was agreed that the first phase would consist of the following:
>
> (1) Lawfield Gardens—the proposal calls for 15 family housing units closed on Monday, March 6, 1967, and it is expected that

a selection will be made shortly among the eight proponents and the same reference to 16 family housing units that would close on Monday, February 20.

Now this is fine—15 and 16—31 units. I would ask, in regards to these, when were the applications advertised for these units? How long ago were the applications advertised to allow the proponents to bid on the chores of building these units?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We may be able to get it for you if you want to continue.

Mr. Gisborn: And then it goes on to refer to the third item in the first phase—Cotton Mills site, urban renewal area.

It is understood that the first phase consisting of some 2.42 acres will be cleared and available by May 31, 1967. It is further understood that the balance of this area will have roughly the same acreage and will be cleared and available by September, 1967. It was further agreed that this site, in view of the tight housing situation, is to be used exclusively for rental housing and should accommodate between 70 and 80 units.

Soil tests will be carried out and inspection will be made to determine the condition of the land to be turned over to the corporation.

The consideration has already been fixed in the urban renewal agreement and it is important to the corporation to determine whether any expenditures are required to put these lands into a condition which will permit immediate development. It is also agreed that the corporation will invite proposals on this site requesting that the development be carried out in two phases, the first to commence in May, 1967, and the second to commence in September, 1967. There is no indication that there will be anything positive this year out of that site.

Then it goes on with No. 4 in the summary—Mohawk Gardens survey. This refers to the redevelopment of an existing project by tearing down some of the present homes and rebuilding multiple units which will, as has been stated, bring about a net gain of 350 units. There is nothing definite in that section of the summary as to getting something started this year.

No. 5 refers to Roxborough Park and this says:

The city is to provide the corporation with a plan zoning the available land —the present zoning is dealing with the laws for multiple construction. The city is also to indicate to the corporation the consideration involved for this land keeping in mind the end use. Soil tests will also have to be carried out and it was agreed that the foregoing information should be made available by May 1, 1967, or sooner. This area is to provide further 140 town houses.

That is indicated in the press release as a positive thing, but in the summary there is very little positive about that 140 houses being started this year. In fact, I know that the situation was referred to the school board to check the application of children density as to the school facilities in that particular area and the council are not going to move on this until they get the report from the school board. Then it goes on to No. 7 and it gives (a) Gilbert neighbourhood; (b) Gilkinson and Gourlay neighbourhoods; (c) Ralston neighbourhood.

I take it these three sections are ones that will come under the HOME plan—the assembly of land for the HOME plan and certainly there is no indication that the unit number as indicated there will be starting this or even next year.

It gives as No. 8, urban renewal land, north end of York Street.

There is no indication there that there are any starts or if it will have any application to the serious situation this year either.

I am interested also in the general statement at the end. It says:

It was further agreed that the corporation would put a senior development man in Hamilton immediately to initiate the 1967 programme involving approximately 600 family and 500 senior citizen units. In this connection reference is made to housing starts, not completions. The immediate pressure is to be applied to the 1967 programme but it is important that a programme also be developed for the years 1968 and 1969.

The summary sent to the board of control of the meeting that took place between the councillors of the city of Hamilton and the officials of the housing branch indicates nothing positive, and I would like some answers to just exactly what is going to happen in regard to the city of Hamilton.

I again say that I was a little disturbed that we were not invited to the meeting as members in the Hamilton area. We might have had a first hand indication of what might

take place. When we get press releases, the only indication we can have, it says of the 1,000 units promised for this year, 500 will be contained in a senior citizens' development and 140 will be built in Roxborough Park; 70 are planned for Canadian Cottons, 60 will be built on the old continual-flow ground and another 1,500 units will be constructed within the next three years. It does not mean anything constructive and I do not know just how the councillors feel about it. I have not had an opportunity to talk directly to any of them to see if they have any clear idea of what is going to take place in Hamilton.

As to the need, Mr. Chairman, what existed in 1964 has multiplied at the present time. There has been no change—as we said in 1965, we got very few. Last year I have no knowledge of any starts or any completions at all and we still have a demand—we have a city vacany rate in apartments of five per cent and right now the developers are starting to discriminate with their tenants. I have several letters referring to increases in rent and they are all from old age pensioners. Rents have increased in the last year by from $5 to $15 and one letter surprisingly tells me that they are now notified by the landlord that starting in July he is going to expect post-dated cheques for the next two years to cover their rent.

I do not know whether this is legal or not, but I suppose he could coerce them into either giving the post-dated cheques for a two year period, or there would be a certain amount of intimidation and they might have to leave.

We have a backlog at the Hamilton housing authority of close to 600 applications. We have the situation in the welfare department where they have now 50 families living in substandard accommodation and we have several families that are split up because of the lack of accommodation of any kind in the city of Hamilton.

So I would like the Minister to please tell me exactly what is going to happen in Hamilton this year and give me some idea as to what we can expect to put to the council in Hamilton, so that we can put some more pressure on where the pressure has to be put, to get something going.

All I can make out of the present summary, is that we will get 241 units started this year, without any indication as to whether or not they will be completed, but there is nothing precise that they will start. All we can assume is from some of the vague wording in both the agreement and in the press, and they total: Lawfield Garden 15; the urban renewal site, 16; the Cotton Mills site, 70; Roxborough Park, 140. A total of 241.

Of course I would like the Minister also to tell me just what is the situation in regard to 500 senior citizen units on Jackson Street West. I understand it is a building that was partially completed and left through some legal entanglement and the department intends to take it over after it finds out what the legal entanglements are, but nevertheless it is reported as one of the developments, without anything definite in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think I can answer the hon. member's question without reading the report you just read to me. I have it here, too, breaking down each area that the member has discussed a few minutes ago.

First of all let me clear one thing with you. We did not set up a meeting in Hamilton. The Hamilton board of control set it up and invited Mr. Brady to go. They did not notify anybody that they were having a meeting. They were asked to be there and they went and they had the meeting with them. If you did not get an invitation, I think I would check with the board of control, because apparently it was a private meeting. They wanted it with our people and this was the result of the meeting. So we had nothing to do with sending out the invitations. If we had, I can assure you we would have notified you of the meeting.

Now you have already mentioned that we are going to put a man in Hamilton. The man is in the city hall there now. He was granted an office, courtesy of Mayor Copps, and he is one of our senior men, Mr. Alvon. He is already located there working with the city council on housing in your area.

I am not going to repeat, as I said a minute ago, what you have already read to me. But you want to know what we have that is specific and this is agreed with the council and apparently the council is quite satisfied with the programme we have at the moment. This is what they asked for and this is what we are prepared to deliver.

Between March 31 and December 31, 1967, there are 15 at Lawfield; 80 at Cotton Mills; 140 at Roxborough and 389 builders' proposals; a total of 641. You have mentioned the senior citizens on Jackson Street. There are 500; urban renewal areas, 111; another total of 611. These are scheduled for starting this year and they will get underway as I have already outlined. Mayor Copps has been one of the municipal officials in Ontario

who has more than cooperated with the housing authorities and we have done likewise with him. We have our own man in his city hall and I think that indicates he has a keen interest in getting housing built in Hamilton.

There is land in Hamilton proper which is being looked at by some of our people today. As you know, there is land upon the mountain in Hamilton and that is being discussed also with reference to future uses for expanding housing in the city of Hamilton.

We have at the present time in Hamilton, as you possibly know, 1,279 units now under our management. As quickly as we get the requests from Hamilton we are providing housing; just as as soon as we get the resolution. And apparently the board of control are quite happy with the programme we have outlined for them.

I cannot add any more than that. If there is any contribution you can make from your end we would be delighted to work with you.

Mr. Gisborn: I would like to get something definite. You tell me that the numbers you mentioned are slated to be completed by December, 1967.

Hon. Mr. Randall: These are starts. These are starts this year in Hamilton.

Mr. Gisborn: Just starts?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. Starts.

Mr. Gisborn: You cannot anticipate any completions?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Only the 146 senior citizens, that is all that is underway. But this is a new programme given to us by the board of control in Hamilton and they will get started this year as we outlined to you.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have some questions, just to finish off the question of the Blake Street property and the Donmount area. Would the Minister tell me: In the Donmount area, the contract which has been let for the 77 units to Reuben Corporation, what is the cost per unit? I notice that in the abstract on which the urban project was based that it works out to about $15,000 per unit at the projected cost, and that was some time in late 1965. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that was the cost exclusive of land at all; just the cost for the construction of the project on the property.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am informed—I do not have the figure here, I can check it out—it is $16,000 a unit approximately and it is the Groom Construction, not Reuben.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, in the Donmount area, as I understand it, the general design and layout of the project was done by Mr. Moryama, the consulting architect for the corporation. Was any amendment made to the project to provide for the inclusion in it of a retail outlet?

The Minister will probably recall, if he does not, his colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs will probably recall the question of John Smith, who had the so-called corner store in that area from which he was expropriated in the early part of last year. And the question had been raised as to whether or not there was going to be such a retail outlet available in that project on which he might be considered as the lessee, so that he could continue his business in the project.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I recall the discussion on that. I am advised that it is not considered in the first phase, but Mr. Suters will make sure in the second phase that consideration is given to this gentleman with the store.

Mr. Renwick: Is there any thought of including in the project other community facilities? I received some time ago, it is almost a year ago, from the family services association of Metropolitan Toronto, a letter in which they point out the need for facilities to be located in the area which would be a focal point for the integration of the community and would provide community facilities within the area, such as the family service association could provide, sir, and also physical accommodation available for community purposes.

Hon. Mr Randall: It is not our practice, as you well know, to put a community centre in these areas but we do set space aside in some of the high rise buildings for social services. This is a question that has been asked of me, I think, in the last couple of years more than any other single question, with reference to social services. It is not provided for by central mortgage and housing.

However, we have discussed it with them and recognize that perhaps there should be more consideration given to the need for those community services, and I would hope as we get under way with our present programme we can secure the area for providing those facilities. But we do not have it in this particular one here.

Mr. Renwick: I just put on the record the pertinent sentence from the family service association letter in which they state that:

> We believe that public housing if it is to meet the needs of the families involved, must be supplemented by provision of facilities for recreation, community development, informal education and counselling.

Well, the Minister knows my views on it and I do not need to pursue that any further.

I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister tells me that they are going to start there probably next week, put the shovels in on that property. Because in the second phase, the northern part of that development on which the balance of the units to make up the 232 units are going to be constructed, there are people still living adjacent to that area.

Their property is still subject to negotiation from the city. It has been expropriated, no question about that: the expropriation has taken place. The negotiations are still going on with the city. I do not believe the formal notices under The Expropriation Procedures Act have been received. A number of them are elderly people who live just immediately north on the north side of Matilda Street, which is the northern boundary of the first phase, and going on up Monro Street on the west side. There are still persons living there who have lived there for many years.

Now if before they are relocated and if before satisfactory compensation arrangements are made, the shovels are put in there next week, it is going to make life just totally unbearable. Again, I am not going to go over the whole of the Donmount area. The Minister knows my reaction; as far as I am concerned there will never be another urban renewal scheme carried out on that basis.

I am not blaming the Minister, the Minister only comes into it after the land acquisition and the clearance has taken place. But he is in a position now to have his officers of the Ontario housing corporation personally inspect that property and ask themselves whether it is at all fair, with the elderly people who still live on the north side of Matilda Street and on the east side of Monro Street immediately adjacent, whether it is at all fair that in April the shovels should be put in there until the compensation arrangements and whatever other arrangements have to be made to relocate those families can be totally completed. Because if not, then I will only assume that this is the last stage of what was a disastrous blockbusting scheme in any event.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well as I think the member has already stated, urban renewal is not entirely my responsibility, I replace the houses. The pressure from the city for us to get on with the houses is terrific; our people were down there last week and they are at them as to when they are going to get started.

I can appreciate the inconvenience, but that again is, I think, something that the city in their wisdom, they want to go ahead. I think they will have to live with this difficulty in urban renewal. I agree with the hon. member, I think urban renewal in some of these areas leaves a lot to be desired and I so stated when we had that meeting down at the city hall. All urban renewal programmes do not get off to as bad a start as the ones down in east Toronto. I would hope, like the member, the next time they start an urban renewal programme that we do not have the difficulties which have been experienced. But again, I say, if I do not get ahead with the houses, then I am not going to have them finished, so my problem is I am damned if I do and damned if I do not in this case. The city of Toronto is anxious for us to get under way and we have no alternative but to go ahead and get started. If there is an inconvenience down there, I think the city is going to have to live with those people who are inconvenienced.

Mr. Renwick: I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that one of the men who lives on Matilda Street, on the northern boundary of the first phase, is 86 years of age, and served in the Boer war and in the first world war, is a citizen who lives in his own home. His property has been expropriated, the compensation has not been settled as yet and I think it would just be a crime if he is now going to be faced with shovels being put in right across the street from him, adjacent to property where he has lived. This can only make his life totally unbearable.

I would ask the Minister if his officials would raise this point with the city of Toronto officials to find out when that immediate area can be cleared so that these people, most of whom are elderly, and there are now to my understanding about 14 or 15 houses still with people living in them adjacent to that phase. There are others further north, but they would not be inconvenienced to the same extent; I am talking about the ones immediately adjacent to that first phase, whether or not in all humanity it should be commenced until that part of the operation has been completed.

I just want to put on the record what has happened just to underline what the member

for Woodbine said about displacement in that area. My understanding from the data abstract, and why we object to being added in as part of the public housing which the Minister's department is supplying, is that there will be in the Donmount area a displacement of 1,200 people, a substantial number of whom have already been displaced, who occupied 278 dwelling units which could be also classified as 234 residential properties because some of them had multiple accommodation facilities. In place of that there will be 240 units altogether. There are 232 in the scheme which the Minister has spoken about and another eight elsewhere, which will accommodate 932 people. So in fact there will be a net decrease of available accommodation in the Donmount area of 228 persons, in comparison to the accommodation available when this scheme was first projected.

Now on the Blake Street properties, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether or not the price per unit has yet been established for that project and whether or not it is an acceptable price for the project. After the Minister mentioned it last night I had no idea that in some way or other it was in the offing that the development would take place. I took the liberty this morning of going into that area because it is in my riding; and I confirm what the member for Woodbine has said. There is absolutely no difference, visibly in that area, to what it was any time in the last two, three, four, five or six years.

If I may just reconstruct the site for the Minister, there is a school on the brow of the hill on the north side of Strathcona Avenue. Strathcona Avenue has a relatively steep bank where Blake Street is the sole street coming up, there is a vacant area relatively small so far as I can see, a substantial Dominion store right in the centre with parking facilities around it. Immediately to the south of that the whole of the property is occupied by Miller Paving Construction Company.

Now, there is this one area of vacant land and also the hill rising up to Strathcona Avenue. I could not guess what the size is but it seems to me that if they are going to start there in August, I would like to know what the layout is going to be, what type of project it is going to be, is it intended to take the property and relocate Miller Paving or is it just going to be located on this relatively small patch of vacant ground which presently exists in the basin of that valley in which Blake Street is located?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will try to answer all the questions of the hon. member.

In the first place, the parking will all be underground there, it will leave wide open spaces. The property the member is talking about will be taken in with the others that we now have there, so I do not think there is going to be any pieces of property left sitting out in the open.

I think that is what the member is referring to. A price has not been set, negotiations are just about completed, they expect to complete the prices next week. I am informed the plans are there, we have accepted the plans and if the hon. member would like to see the plans in view of the fact it is in his area, we would be delighted to let him have a look at them.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Minister quite got the point I was making. Right square in the centre of the basin in the Blake Street area—which is a hollow area with open space in it—right square in the centre is a Dominion store, immediately to the south is the Miller Paving Construction Company that takes up well over two-thirds of the area. There is a relatively small area of open space including the embankment that goes up to Strathcona Street which is available for the project. If that is the only land that is going to be used I would like to know what the density is going to be, what is the size of the area available to the housing corporation to construct this project or is it the intention, as I had thought when I first heard about this scheme and first looked at that ground that in some way or other you were going to relocate the Miller Construction Company somewhere else so that you would have ample room to construct an adequate public housing project.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am informed that there are 42 units to the acre—city council and OMB have already approved it. Miller Paving is moving out of there—they are moving out, yes, and as I understand it I cannot recall the area myself—the Dominion store is at the east end of the lot is it not—right at the centre!

Mr. Bryden: Blake runs north and south!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well as I understand it, it is at one end of the lot, it is not in the centre, am I wrong or right?

Mr. Renwick: Well as I say, the Dominion store is in the middle of this square and immediately to the south of that is the Miller

Paving, immediately north is vacant property. If Miller Paving is moving out and you are using the property both to the south of the Dominion store and to the north then I can see that it would be a viable project, if that is what is being done.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to get something clarified about the difference between Metro Toronto and the city of Toronto. Now we are told that there is a need for housing units in Metro Toronto of approximately 6,000.

Mr. Bryden: It is a lot more than that.

Mr. Trotter: I know these are maybe minimum figures and I know the demand is so very great, but even with these minimum needs we are not getting close. In Metro the demand was about 6,000 but most of this demand is in the city of Toronto itself. There is an immediate demand for about 4,000 housing units almost on an emergency basis. What is being done in the city of Toronto either by this government or by the housing authority for the city of Toronto? Is there a conflict between the housing corporation and the city of Toronto? What is going to be done to solve the problem, because obviously what is not being done is not nearly solving the situation. It is no doubt a very serious, heart-rending crisis. It has been that way for some time and they do not seem to be doing anything. What is the situation in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Randall: In the first place, let me tell you that I do not think there is any conflict of interest between the city of Toronto and ourselves. The city of Toronto now is part of Metro and the housing registry figures all go to the metropolitan registry office—the city of Toronto does not have a registry—and that is where we get the figures from so as far as the city of Toronto is concerned. Many statements emanted from city hall that I cannot take responsibility for and as far as I am concerned they are running their own housing programme on the houses they now have.

In other words, they have I think about 3,000 units that they own and operate as a city. You will recall your former leader last year brought up the matter of Toronto housing. We cooperated and said we had offered to take over the Toronto housing authority on a basis that would be equitable to them but so far they have felt they wanted to carry on with their own housing programme.

Just to indicate that we are working with the city of Toronto regardless of whether they have their own Toronto housing authority or not, I have here a number of facts and figures. This table shows the number of families housed by the municipality of origin and the municipality in which they were housed. For instance, in Toronto, out of 763 families there were 182 housed in Toronto; 143 in Scarborough; 120 in Etobicoke; 303 in North York; 2 in York; 13 in East York. And Scarborough—

Mr. Trotter: Just one moment, Mr. Chairman. He says the number housed.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, no. These are the number of families that were in the registry and wanted housing—

Mr. Trotter: They wanted housing and actually got it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: There were something like 1,535 families that we were able to house in the city of Toronto in the Metro areas last year.

Mr. Trotter: My concern is not so much with those that have been housed, if they have got into decent housing their problem is solved. But the Minister, when he throws out all these figures that we get blasted at us —just in this instance he tells what is housed. I am interested in the thousands that are not housed. This is the crux of the problem and throwing those figures at me means absolutely nothing. I am concerned about the waiting list. I have figures on what the waiting list is and it is true that when you give the overall amount of Metro Toronto the truth of the matter is that the vast majority of the waiting list in Metro Toronto is in the city of Toronto itself.

I think I told you earlier your government has put up fewer units than they have pages in this HOME book and this is the problem. Now what are you going to do about the city of Toronto proper? Can anything be done with the Toronto housing authority? Is it just a conflict or are you going to try to do something to help these people?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think we have already outlined what we are trying to do. To stand there and say we are not doing anything is a ridiculous statement to start with and I tell you again—

Mr. Trotter: Well what are you putting up in the city of Toronto? Do not tell me it is a ridiculous statement; it is not a ridiculous

statement. I want to know what you are doing in the city of Toronto and I do not get an answer. All you do is throw insults. All you did last night was to throw insults.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Mr. Trotter: A Minister like you should resign because you are not capable.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now if you are through blowing your top maybe I can get you an answer.

Mr. Trotter: I have waited for one for two days.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The city of Toronto is in Metro. I think you will agree with me there.

Mr. Trotter: Sure.

Hon. Mr. Randall: And Metro council asked us for 4,000 units. Then they came back and asked us for another 4,500 and we are on schedule with Metro. Insofar as the city of Toronto is concerned, the problem is lack of land. We have been talking about that here for three days. I cannot create land unless they knock down urban development areas, so as far as Metro is concerned they gave us a quota, we are on schedule with that quota, we are providing what Metro asked for.

As far as the city of Toronto is concerned, they have not asked for housing. They ask Metro and Metro ask us. That is the best I can tell you. I cannot put houses on top of the Bank of Commerce building downtown. If there is not any land there I cannot do anything about it. I am providing houses where Metro wants them in the land that we have available.

Mr. Trotter: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we can tear down old buildings to put up large business buildings downtown, which we do, surely in many of these areas in the core of the city of Toronto where there are many old buildings that simply should not be standing, this is the obvious place where you are going to get the land. What in the world is going to happen to the core of the city of Toronto, the city of Hamilton, the city of Windsor, any of these large centres? These problems are bound to develop in any of these cities and for you to sit there and say we are waiting for them to ask—the only answer is that there are probably two places in this province with the money to do these things; it is with this government and it is with the federal government.

To sit back and hope and wait for the municipalities to do something in the long run is a hopeless situation and you are just simply not facing facts that are staring you in the face.

The land is there. It is true it is going to have to be redeveloped and you are going to have to tear down old buildings, but when I drive home every evening if I do not go along the Gardiner expressway and go through the city streets, I see obviously that is where the land is. There are buildings that should go down and they are bound to go down in the next few years. Some government is going to do it before they fall down because the people are living in conditions that they simply should not be living in and the responsibility rests with this government.

There is no point going around waiting for some municipality to ask you to take action, but I know from the figures that I have here that in the city of Toronto proper, not counting Metro, there are over 15,000 children without a permanent home because of the housing situation. This is not just the emergency situation; there are about 222 of them crammed in emergency housing in downtown Toronto. You simply are not coming to grips with a tragic situation.

I have said that when a crisis develops, this government moves and it is the only time it does move. But here is a case where you have an obvious very tragic crisis and you are just giving us a lot of blarney over there and it is a crying shame that you have been able to get away with this for the length of time that you have.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 408 carried?

Mr. Sargent: How many units, Mr. Chairman, are being built in Ontario this year for elderly persons?

Mr. S. Lewis: 2,984.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You saved me the trouble. We do not build in Metro. I just want to make that clear. Metro build their own senior citizen housing. We build outside of Metro.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue with the Minister the balance of the Metropolitan Toronto housing starts from April 1, 1967 to December 31, 1967. Apart from the Blake, Pelham and Donmount projects, there would be roughly 2,600 other starts proposed and I would be interested in getting a breakdown on completion dates in those areas.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have a report here. If I was to read it to you it would take to three o'clock in the morning. I will be glad to table this report and let you have a copy of it. This is a result of the information that the hon. member for Woodbine asked for. At least I understand his good lady asked for it and we gave them the information we thought they wanted, but when the discussions were on yesterday I went back and had the starting and finishing dates put on here. I would be glad to table this for the hon. member, if you want me to do that.

Mr. Bryden: Does this list the projects in Metro Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, it lists them all.

Mr. Bryden: By project, does it show where the contract has actually been let as distinct from the cases where you hope it will be let soon?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It shows those that have been started and those that have not been started, the estimated starting date, which means the contracts are in the process.

Mr. S. Lewis: Does it show the estimated completion date?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we show the estimated completing dates and I read some of them off here tonight.

Mr. Bryden: You gave us three. You did not give any others.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well I have a list of them here on five or six pages, and I will be glad to give you the complete list if you will drop in the entire starting programme—

Mr. S. Lewis: How about running down one of the pages? Give 15 or 20 completion dates?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did that earlier, I will be glad to do it again, in case you were not in the House. We will take the first page here.

In 1965, we start off with Belleville: 40 units; started September 25; completed July 15, 1966; nine months seven days.

Cochrane, Ontario, 30 units; June 29, 1965; completed January 12, 1966; six months, five days.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am sorry, I think the Minister misunderstands what we are after. We are after the estimated completion dates for those projects which you intend to start between April 1, 1967, and the end of this year. Not those which were started—in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Bryden: We are interested in the information you were giving—

Mr. S. Lewis: And we would be primarily interested in Metro.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well on schedule four, that is starting as of April 1 to December 31, 1967, all these listed on the sheet here will be from eight to 12 months, on an average—there are three pages of them—between starting and completion.

Mr. Bryden: Well in the case of Donmount, Blake Street and Pelham Gardens—with respect to those three—the contracts have actually been let, at least in part, for two of them, I think. And for one of them you expect it to be let within the next few months.

Now are there any other projects for which the contracts have actually been let?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, there are not any on this schedule. I have got the number of houses that are going to be started. We anticipate the starting and have got the starting dates, but again this is the programme we talked about this afternoon that we have to get set up on the lots.

Mr. Bryden: Of the 3,837 units for which you hope a start will be made in 1967, that is between now and the end of the year, contracts have actually been let, I would take it, for 455 units in Pelham Gardens and 77 units in Donmount.

That is the sum total of the contracts actually let to date. Am I correct on that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, on the Blake Street one, we start that—

Mr. Bryden: Well the Blake Street one is soon to be let, but it is not actually let and I understand that the balance of the Donmount project will be let fairly soon. There are no others for which the contracts have actually been let?

Hon. Mr. Randall: There are 363 in Alexandra Park underway also.

Mr. Bryden: One would hardly say that is a new project, that is one that has been hanging around for a long time.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well it is in phases. We cannot put them in there until they pull the old places down.

Mr. Bryden: Well of course it does demonstrate the length of time it takes to get com-

pletions in these projects, because Alexandra Park is far from a new project. I think it was first envisaged several years ago. Now I am not suggesting there were not difficulties there. It merely indicates that of the 3,837 starts that you have listed for Metro Toronto, we can expect a significant volume of houses perhaps two, three and four years from now. None of them will produce anything before the end of 1968, so none of these starts you were talking about will mean anything in terms of the housing crisis in Toronto at this moment.

Mr. S. Lewis: I should have taken the Minister's set.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You said '69 now.

Mr. S. Lewis: I said '69—

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, no.

Mr. Bryden: Well the ones that are most advanced you said will be completed by the end of 1968, so they will be ready for occupancy at the beginning of 1969. Those are the most advanced.

Now I assume that there are some that are not in the schedule IV figures. There are quite a few starts of earlier than that period which are not completed yet, so they will provide a small volume of housing between now and '69. But basically, the public housing phase of your programme is not really going to be producing units before '69. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the situation is critical now and it is going to get a lot more critical and by the time some of your units become available for occupancy it will once again be simply a matter of adhesive tape to patch up major surgery. The situation will have deteriorated so badly that even if all of your 3,837 units come into occupancy in 1969, which is most unlikely, they will be far short of supplying the need.

However, we would be interested in getting the additional figures the Minister has. At this hour of night we do not insist that they be read out to the House. We would like to see them and analyze them at our leisure. I think the main point has been established, that there is very little that is going to be available for a long time, which is unfortunate. I am not saying it is the Minister's fault. It is the fault of years of neglect by this government, its failure to provide housing units.

Mr. Sopha: When I said that your leader protested, I dug up the ghosts of the past. The Prime Minister stormed out of the House.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not storm out of the House, I walked out.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am not going to lay the blame on George Drew. I am going to lay the blame on a succession of Tory administrations, one after the other, every one of which has provided pitifully little, pitifully late. The Ontario housing corporation has the project support which would have been useful 20 years ago, but unfortunately they too are providing pitifully little, pitifully late.

I realize the corporation faces serious difficulties because of the neglect of the past. I would nevertheless say to the Minister that the neglect of the past is now something of the past and the Ontario housing corporation has to raise its sights. It is just not coping with the problem at all, either in the public sector or in the private sector. We got the figures for Metro Toronto. I have no doubt that the situation is much the same in the rest of the province. Starts we are told about, which will not produce units for years, and so here the situation goes from bad to worse.

However, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister will provide us with the additional analysis he now has, we will be very happy to see it. It is unfortunate that we cannot comment on it here under these estimates, but that is the way it is.

Mr. S. Lewis: There will be time later this week.

Mr. Bryden: We still want to see it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not quite agree with you. You have to have a gross before you get a net. I keep on repeating that, but it does not seem to be understood. Let me just tell you what you are going to get in Metropolitan Toronto in the way of starts; I will name the areas.

Now let me have a few minutes. You have done a lot of talking.

Mr. Bryden: Okay.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Here are the totals:

East York, 293 starts to be in October of this year; Etobicoke, 245, June, 1967; Etobicoke, 400, November, 1967; North York, 579, September, 1967; North York, 56, April 1; North York, 76, July, 1967; Scarborough, 414, November, 1967; Toronto, 232, April, 1967; Toronto, 166, April, 1967; Toronto, 460, August, 1967; Toronto, 250, December, 1967; Toronto, 455, April, 1967; township of York, 211, November, 1967.

I indicated on the dates I gave you that it takes eight to 12 months on these projects

from builders' proposals on land now available and they will be started on the starting dates.

I will give the member the list and if he wants to review it, and then come and see me I will be glad to give further information.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, it still maintains the essential point about which there is no real disagreement. What it amounts to by 1969 is something less than 2,000 homes per year developed by the Ontario housing corporation. I am not demeaning the efforts of this Minister since he assumed the portfolio in this area, but we are simply pointing out that that is approximately one-tenth of the effective need, and that it seriously disputes —in fact, it entirely negates—the contention of the government that it takes low income housing seriously. It demonstrates—and I think we have shown it very conclusively—that the HOME programme being an irrelevance, although perhaps an effective public relations irrelevance, this part of the programme is really a tragedy because this is dealing with the lower third of the income earners in this society, and no effort whatever is being made commensurate with the demand.

If the Minister were to say to us that there are 20,000 starts planned between April 1, 1967 and December 31, 1967, we would feel a little more secure about it. But when the Minister says that there are 6,000 planned and none of the projects left except for three that he deigns to name, then obviously in our analysis there enter some very real reservations. The public housing portion of the Ontario housing corporation is, in its way, an even greater failure than the Home Ownership Made Easy. And I say to the Minister that he will find that time catches up with him, that he cannot turn back the demand by simply building in an occasional dyke of public housing as he is presently doing.

It is irresistible and the Minister will have to accelerate the starts six, seven and eightfold in order to begin to make a serious dent. I appreciate the difficulty in getting land in certain areas; I appreciate the problems inherent in what he is trying to do, but surely then the force of the agruments of the member for Riverdale becomes irresistible. Because if the Minister throws himself out into the commercial market as just another entrepreneur in one aspect of the plan and refuses to take seriously the public housing aspect of the plan, then he is going to be a complete failure two or three years from now, and the province will have inherited an accumulating disaster in the housing field.

And there is no other conception that can be put upon it. Again I say to the Minister, not to demean the few projects that are going on, that the most impressive parts of those projects are Thistletown, which began years ago; Alexander Place, which began years ago; Donmount Village, which is providing fewer homes than those it demolished. And these are the projects that the Minister is hailing as major milestones in the housing field and, in fact, they are merely the inevitable result of 10 years of negotiation, red tape and neglect.

The Minister can hardly take credit, with pride, in that kind of social policy. Now I suppose one cannot beat this point much further. There are others in the housing field that we can raise and intend to raise, but I say to the Minister that is our basic contention; we simply are not making any substantial or viable progress and it is catching up with him.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, if I must answer the hon. member for Scarborough West, all I want to leave with you, regardless of what I have heard across this floor in the last couple of days, is that I have a major department in government. Every department is successful and I think that the Prime Minister will attest to that. I have never made any promises that I have not kept. I have lived up to the schedules that I talked about in the Ontario housing corporation when I took on this programme and was given the opportunity to form the Ontario housing corporation.

I did everything I said I was going to do. I lived up to all the schedules; I provided the housing that the municipalities had requested. I could no do more than that and I do not think that any government, on that side of the House or on this side of the House, could cope any better with the problem than we have done.

I can read off 1,000 letters here from senators in Ottawa and from the *Financial Post* saying that this is the greatest programme that ever happened in the Dominion of Canada. We have built and provided more housing in two years than in all of Canada in 15 years. Now, you can belittle the programme all you like, but all I say is that the HOME programme is the catalyst to start everybody —I hope—thinking about housing; not just the low income groups.

Let me remind you when we talk about the low income groups that I think you would agree that we want no more housing ghettos. We do not want housing ghettos and we

must mix the low income groups with the other groups in the various areas. You can pick up this morning's *Globe and Mail* and in Mr. Terrance Wills' article on page 3 you can read of the problems in the public relations job we have had to do to sell public housing to every municipality. Now they are starting to come our way.

The press has done a good job for us and I think that from here on in the job of selling public housing, together with housing for people in the upper brackets, can be mixed together and this is the process of the HOME programme.

I have stated many times in the House that the HOME programme is not the programme to end all programmes; I simply say that it is a start on a new approach to housing and it will open up the minds of a lot of people who have been blocked on housing —and I am not talking about people on that side or on this side. I simply say that a selling job has to be done and I think I can do a selling job. My past record in housing proves that I have kept faith with everything that I said I would do and it has been done as quickly as it could be done and on schedule.

I have no magic wand, but when I tell you that I think we can secure these lots I do so in good faith. I am not kidding you for one moment, because I hope to come back into this House and stand here a year from today and defend my estimates and I am sure that I will still be on this side of the House.

Now if you have any ideas—and I am sure that the hon. member for Riverdale gave me a few here tonight—I would be delighted to talk with you about them. We do not have a closed mind; we know that the programme can be improved upon and we certainly intend to do so, but I just simply say to you again, as I said the other day, that every knock is a boost.

I am going to continue to push the HOME programme in all its phases, and I would just like you to remember that while we concentrate on the city of Toronto—and this is where a major problem exists—there are many centres in Ontario that require housing; 20 houses here, 30 houses there that are just as good as 500 houses to the people of Toronto. Because these other areas have the same kind of problem and we are not working just for the city of Toronto; we are working in every area across this province. I still say that with the HOME programme I hope that we will not only revolutionize the thinking of builders and developers and municipal officials, but perhaps we ourselves will get new ideas.

I can do no more than that except to say to you that the HOME programme has, in my mind, given us a basis for discussion on many things that were probably blocking housing in certain areas. And I fully intend to pursue the schemes in the housing programme with all the municipal officials. I am not going to be successful everywhere, but I will tell you I am never too discouraged and I do not discourage easily.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this man is the greatest actor I have ever seen in my life. He should have won the Academy award last night. He said all he wants to leave with us is that he has given us a true programme to answer the needs of the people of Ontario. Regardless of all we have talked about today, not one piece of property has been acquired by three managers and 12 men and he said he started this programme in 1966 and he has not one piece of property.

And, Mr. Chairman, never let it be said again when this man says he has the answer to the housing programme, never let this Minister or the Prime Minister or this government—

Mr. Chairman: Would the member please refer to the hon. Minister as the "hon. Minister", not "that man".

Mr. Sargent: Never let them go to the people of Ontario and tell them that they have the answer to housing. We have established that the most important thing any man can have is his own home, and the Minister has done more to block it. He brings in a programme for the modest home people. This is not a programme for people, this is a programme for the higher wage group. And the Minister has the nerve to stand up and say, I leave it with you tonight that you have the answer to it; the greatest thing since sliced bread. It is an insult to the people of this Legislature and the people of Ontario. And never go into the election with the Prime Minister or the Minister or the government telling the people that they have the answer to housing, because they have not.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be possible for the tables which the Minister is prepared to table, to be printed as an appendix to *Hansard*? The reason I ask is that I am sure it is of interest to a good many members. When there is only one copy on the table, it is very hard to

consult it. So if the Minister can arrange that, I would appreciate it.

I will not at this hour comment on his peroration of a moment or two ago but I would like to see if it is possible to get to the facts on another matter and that is the—

Mr. Chairman: On the member for Woodbine's request to have the documents form part of *Hansard*, would the House concur that this would be desirable and acceptable to all members? It will be in order then, Mr. Minister. (See Appendix, page 2074).

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some inquiries with regard to the famous Malvern project. When I made reference to it during my introductory remarks on these estimates, which was some little time ago now, the Minister stood up to correct a statement I had made and stated that he did not announce this project, in fact he was out of the country at the time it was announced.

What I want to know, Mr. Chairman, is who announced it and by what authority? When I ask that question, I should specify I am speaking of the latest announcement, I am not speaking of all the announcements that have been made starting from 1952. This is one of the most announced projects in the history of the world. There is nothing there yet but it has been announced many times. The latest announcement, as I recall it, was some time late last year, November or December. Now what gave rise to the enormous spate of headlines that appeared in the papers at that time about this much lamented project?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me just clarify my position again. I was out of the country when the announcement was made. I checked when I came back and apparently nobody in my department made that announcement. It appeared in the press and a number of press people called up and asked questions about it, but nobody seemed to know where the rumour or the remark came from.

I believe it came out of a meeting or an inaugural meeting of a Scarborough council. Who made it, I do not know. We have not been able to find out who made it, it just appeared in the press as an announcement by the Minister of Economics and Development, who was not in the country, that we were going to build 10,000 units out in Malvern. Let me go back to Malvern for a minute. The question is brought up, why did we not build public housing out there on that 1,700 acres? I think the answer is very clear. Until we have developed the HOME programme so you can build higher residential buildings and commercial buildings there, so that you did not put 10,000 low-income family homes in Scarborough—and I do not think we would get away with it, I think you can appreciate that—until we put out the HOME programme, it did not have any interest to any people in Scarborough and they wanted to know how we were going to develop it.

I have had two or three appointments with Mr. Campbell, the mayor. Unfortunately, last Wednesday I had to cancel out on account of estimates. I had to cancel this Wednesday, but as soon as I am through we are going to sit down with Mayor Campbell and see what can be done in his interest as well as our own, to develop Malvern.

The question comes up, why did you not develop it before? Well, we did not have a programme like the HOME programme whereby we could take that property, develop it ourselves commercially, put the internal services in and sell off enough of that property for commercial purposes to arrange for schools, shopping centres, high-rise and keep a certain percentage of that acreage for the kind of homes we are talking about in the HOME programme, plus low-income housing.

This is the thing we want to discuss with Mayor Campbell and we have already discussed it with him. I met him at a cocktail party at CFRB, we talked about it for 20 minutes or so, and as soon as I am free I intend to sit down with him and see whether we can work together to get Malvern finished.

Mr. S. Lewis: Cocktail housing, is that what it is called?

Mr. Sopha: No, highball housing.

Mr. Bryden: But the essence now is this, that the latest resurrection of the Malvern project was in fact merely an erroneous press story. Some newspaperman got a wrong impression somewhere and reported this once again when it really was not a significant factor in the corporation's thinking at all. Does that not follow from what the Minister has said?

The Minister suddenly found people asking him questions about this, so he started to look at it again. He has had the land since about 1952, I think. So this suddenly came to his attention and now he is scrambling around to see if there is anything he can do about it in

the face of one of the most serious housing crises this city has ever seen.

Unfortunately, it is not the most serious it will ever see because it is going to get worse year by year. Actually there was nothing there, nothing even in mind, and now the Minister is looking around a bit. I think he has a feasibility study in progress, I do not think it is completed yet. He has no understanding with the municipality and if the words of the mayor are in any sense representative of the thinking of the municipality, he may have some difficulty getting an understanding with him.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would doubt that.

Mr. Bryden: It is just a press story up until now. There is really nothing there.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, the land is there and the land will be—

Mr. Bryden: It has been there a long time.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The land is there and the land will, under the HOME programme, come to life, I can assure hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: What difference does the HOME programme make? The land has been there for 15 years. The land has always been there, but it has been there in the department's hands for 15 years.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is all right, there was no major reason for developing all low-cost housing in that area in the past, and I am sure that Mayor Campbell would be one of the first to refuse to have 10,000 low-cost homes in there. We are trying to look at what the municipality wants to do as well as what we need to do ourselves.

We can talk about this by the hour but I am just going to suggest to the member that I have always talked to Mayor Campbell; some of the things that he is supposed to have said have appeared in the press. I think perhaps Mayor Campbell, like you and I, periodically is misquoted. I am not going to blame the press, I am simply going to say that I do not conduct the Ontario housing corporation negotiations through the press. I do not pay too much attention to what appears in the press. I talk to the man involved.

Again, I can go right back to our Thistletown project, which was on the fire for two years before I took it on and within three months MacBeth the former reeve, and I, had the matter settled and we put the shovel in the ground. I think the same thing can apply in many of these other areas where there seems to be some difference of opinion.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, this is really fantastic. I have to commend the Minister because what he is saying is that he has managed to perpetrate a magnificent hoax and he has gotten away with it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I never said anything about it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Certainly the Minister did and he did it with premeditated intent. The Malvern project apparently—and I find it very difficult to believe it, it really stretches credulity—the Malvern project happened to slip into the press by some slip of the tongue at some slippery meeting after the responsible parties at that meeting left and the Toronto press headlines said "10,000 units in Malvern" and certain officials of the Ontario housing corporation were named, if memory serves me.

I think I saw Mr. Suters' name in certain of those stories confirming that there were certain plans involved for Malvern. At no time, I want to remind the Minister, either when he was out of the country, or in his absence, on the part of his staff, at no time was the public disabused of their certainty that the Malvern project would result in 10,000 homes.

Having got 10,000 homes out of the blue capriciously overnight without advocating it, sir, you were not going to let the cat out of the bag. You were going to take full advantage of this advent of—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have the figures here today if—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: Then what happened? There was a subsequent series of news stories. I do not have the clipping with me now but I can remember it fairly vividly, documenting certain features of the Malvern scheme in a fairly authoritative way. Not a sound emanated from your department. Then the council in Scarborough and the mayor of Scarborough rebuked the department with obvious accuracy for not consulting them before announcing the project. The Minister defended not having consulted them by pretending that civil servants had been in close contact over a period of time.

In other words, you were keeping the mythology alive. You thoroughly enjoyed the hoax and you were prepared to perpetuate it week after week, month after month, until

you had taken every ounce of publicity that you could milk from it. Indeed, you stood up in this House and you talked about what had gone on at the various meetings between the civil servants and you even came up with that—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well you asked the questions. You wanted the answers. Do you not believe what we told you? I answered the questions raised in the House. Are you telling me now that I am a liar, that what I put on those—

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh no, no! I am not going to call you a liar.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well all right! I am telling you that my people have been talking to Scarborough.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am saying you did a very effective job of dissembling—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I told you exactly the facts.

Mr. S. Lewis: Because at no moment in time throughout the whole episode did you ever suggest to this House until tonight that the Malvern project is a hoax.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not say it was a hoax. You said it was a hoax. I did not.

Mr. S. Lewis: First you interspersed a comment in the midst of my colleague's lead-off, suddenly foisting the Malvern project on your civil service; and now tonight you have suggested that it was not even your civil service, it was some newspaper leak from some uncertain meeting.

Now really, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Can I interject here? My civil service employees were not at the meeting where this rumour emanated, so I am not blaming my civil service and I simply suggest to you that to the questions you asked me I gave you the facts and the truth.

Now our people had been talking to Scarborough and I put it down in writing. You have the facts, we have not perpetrated any hoax on anybody.

Mr. S. Lewis: The point is that you have very happily accepted the kudos for 10,000 units in a Malvern project in Scarborough, and we all now know the following:

(1) It was never contemplated; (2) No serious discussions were held on details; (3) Until this day you have never consulted with an elected member of the council, except over a martini at some cocktail party; (4) There is no suggestion in the world that there will be one solitary house in Malvern under the HOME scheme or any other scheme. Indeed we know the HOME scheme is not going to produce any houses until 1969.

You did not even include the Malvern project in the figures which you put before the House tonight.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Correction. I do not drink martinis.

Mr. S. Lewis: Let us face it, Mr. Minister, through you Mr. Chairman, you have done a very neat job and you know full well that it will not be retrieved. The press tomorrow is not going to say "Minister Dismisses Malvern Project".

Hon. Mr. Randall: You do. I do not.

Mr. S. Lewis: The fact is that you have, through the public housing undertaking, through the supposed HOME programme and through the Malvern project, managed to take some of the heat off the department, managed to take some of the heat off the Ontario housing corporation.

It just will not wash, Mr. Chairman. It may take a considerable amount of time to evoke the entire truth from this government, but we are getting there slowly in these estimates No public housing, no middle income housing, a HOME programme that will not effectively produce houses until 1969, no constructive additions to housing staff, and now the Malvern project once again consigned to limbo.

That is what you said tonight—it has been consigned to limbo. That is the effective meaning of your remarks. In other words, Mr. Chairman, every time one exposes the Ontario housing corporation to a little criticism, begins to scrape beyond the surface, it is apparent we are back to the Emperor without clothes again.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me say if that was a little criticism I would hate to get a lot.

Mr. S. Lewis: I would not want to denude the Minister figuratively for his department but that, of course, is what happened to these estimates. I think there are other areas that we should continue to explore and pursue before we finish them but I am glad to see that the Malvern project has once again been laid to rest. No longer will the suggestion arise that Malvern means a thing. It is a dead issue and the citizens of Ontario should at least know that at this stage.

Hon. Mr. Randall: In your mind you said it, I did not.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, just to underline the extent of the hoax that was perpetrated on the people of Ontario I want to read a few paragraphs from a story that appeared in the Toronto *Telegram* on January 13, 1967.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just who is the official Opposition around here?

Mr. Bryden: January 13, 1967, certainly the Minister did nothing to correct the totally false information appearing here. Let us look at some of it.

> Canada's largest housing town project—for 10,000 families, estimated to be more than 30,000 people in an area twice the size of Don Mills is being developed by the Ontario housing corporation for northern Scarborough.

Incidentally the headline should also be read—a large headline as you can see: Go Ahead for 30,000 Town in Scarborough, and, The Malvern Town Projects Will Have About 2,000 Public Housing Units.

I might just say in passing, Mr. Chairman, that whenever one asks the Minister a question he always answers some other question of his own making. He talked at great length about 10,000 public housing units in Malvern —somebody having made reference to that. I know of no one who ever suggested that and so let us leave that aside.

What was suggested in the story that appeared to emanate from the department, and the department did not say it did not emanate from them, was that there would be a project with housing accommodation for 10,000 families and included in that would be 2,000 public housing units. It looked good, I will say, except that we now see how hollow it is.

Now let it be said that Mr. Suters, OHC managing director, within the body of this story did apparently try to put the brakes on a little bit.

He did not say—if he was quoted correctly or fully, he may not have been—but he did not say that this is all a great pipe dream of which there is no realistic possibility in the foreseeable future. I think that is what should have been said, but he did sort of try to slow this rumour down a little bit. He said and I am now quoting from the story again:

> But development of a 1,600-acre site that has been sitting idle as a land bank since 1953 may still be halted by lack of services. Mr. H. W. Suters, OHC managing director, said today that the entire development may hinge on when Metro extends trunk sewers into the site bounded by Fince Avenue, Littles Road, and the Macdonald-Cartier freeway at Golf Club Road. He said OHC board of directors would approve the hiring of a firm of consulting engineers next Tuesday to begin a six to eight week feasibility study to pin down costs, and other questions.

This feasibility study, I may say, has been going on for a lot longer than six to eight weeks. I have also heard by the grapevine, I do not know whether it is true or not, that OHC's board of directors was in exactly the same position as the rest of us peasants. The first they heard of this project was when they read it in the newspapers.

I will read some more of this:

> When it is complete, he said—

That is Mr. Suters:

> —a development committee including Scarborough and Metro planning commissioners and representatives of OHC and Canadian

Canadian it says:

> Canadian mortgage and housing corporation—

That is the way it states it here:

> —will meet to consider the report. He said there had been no consideration yet of what sort of cost sharing deal might be worked out between the provincial and federal governments. But with luck, he said, a start on the first stage might be made by the year's end.

Well, we can see that sort of luck is not going to happen:

> The project could be completed in four or five years. The project will include industrial and commercial complexes as well as schools, parks, churches, high rise apartments, row housing. Four or five homes will be privately owned. This will reinforce OHC policy to avoid massive ghettos of public housing, Mr. Suters said. In all an expected 35,000—

Within the body of the story the total works up from 30,000 to 35,000:

> —in all an expected 35,000 people will live in the development. About 6,800 families in Metro are now waiting for public housing. To keep pace with demand 25,000 units a year are required.

I may say that we have been suggesting—we have been more modest—we have, sir,

suggested 20,000 public units for the whole province, but this story says 25,000.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You are not quoting Mr. Suters there now are you?

Mr. Bryden: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Randall: You are not quoting Mr. Suters—

Mr. Bryden: I am not sure. I am quoting the *Telegram* story: "about 16,000 units were built or bought last year".

Now where in heaven's name that figure came from, I do not know, but obviously from the information presented to us here it was about 3,000 miles off base.

Then we go back to dear old Regent Park, which the city of Toronto itself built in its first phase against obstruction from almost everybody under the sun, including government. We get back to Regent Park to make this thing look good; but surely it is not implied that Regent Park was built last year.

And so it goes. The story ends up with some suggestions from elected people in Scarborough that this was news to them and they doubted if the whole project was feasible. But I think that type of headline, Mr. Chairman, is eloquent testimony to the thing we have been complaining about, the thing that has now been so fully exposed, that behind all the fine and noble announcements that the government has made, or has permitted newspapers to make, there is practically nothing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How do we prevent the newspapers—

Mr. Bryden: The newspapers made the statement. You knew it was totally false, grossly and cruelly misleading to people in this area who are desperately seeking houses and you did nothing to correct it. You did not correct it at all. In fact, what your corporation did was make statements that tended to encourage the belief that this was true, though you knew very well it was not true; there was nothing there. It is true of everything you do. All your plans—taking them altogether—contribute practically nothing to the current problem.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Maybe that is why we are successful.

Mr. Bryden: Well you are certainly not very successful when you permit a desperate crisis to become more desperate. Everything you produce will not keep pace with just the accumulating demand that we see in the future.

This is the tragedy. We were in a bad crisis and doing nothing to cure the crisis, but you are not even going to keep up with the present situation. It is going to get worse and you can say all you like that you are doing better than Macaulay or Nickle, who I suppose was one of the greatest failures as a Minister in the history of the British empire. You may be doing somewhat better than he did, but what you are doing is inadequate, totally inadequate, completely unrealistic. It just is not related to the need at all.

The Minister says he does not have a closed mind. Well maybe he does not, but unfortunately he has a closed mind on the most vital point of all. His mind is totally closed as far as recognition of the nature of this emergency is concerned. He simply refuses to recognize the sort of emergency we face in relation to housing. This is the great tragedy.

One can commend the housing corporation for whatever little it has done, and we realize that it is trying to build on a foundation of zero, but let us bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that all those previous programmes were ballyhooed just as much as this.

Macaulay was at least as good a ballyhoo expert as the present Minister, and he was going to solve all these problems, but now we understand that when he went, the situation was much worse than it had been. Well I am saying to the Minister when he retires from the scene, which will be fairly soon, the situation will have got worse still.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not at all.

Mr. Bryden: We have the figures and we can see that it will. You do not even come close to meeting the need.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have achieved all the figures that the municipalities have set for me.

Mr Bryden: Well if the municipalities are not on the bit, that is unfortunate, but people are going without housing accommodation. They are living in pitiful rat-infested slums. If the municipalities are not on the bit, that is no answer. Let it be borne in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the municipalities are faced with very grave problems again because of the neglect of this government. They cannot meet their current obligations. They are all in a desperate situation. And just

to show how serious the Minister is about public housing—which ought to be his main responsibility—in the geared-to-income rental housing he is still charging seven and a half per cent of the operating costs to the municipalities.

Then he tells us the municipalities are not asking for units. Of course not. He put a penalty on them to make sure that they will not ask, except in such municipalities as Metro Toronto, where the situation is so desperate that they have to ask. You have imposed a disincentive on the municipalities, so do not come in with that story, that they are not asking.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will just correct one point. When I took on housing the municipalities were paying seven and a half per cent of the principal as well as—

Mr. Bryden: And you had nothing to do with—

Hon. Mr. Randall: —their share of the losses. The municipalities were relieved of the principal amount and they just pay their share of any losses if there are any losses and you will find the municipalities are very happy to pay seven and a half per cent.

Mr. Bryden: In subsidized housing there are bound to be losses and the position of the municipalities has, it is true, been improved financially under the arrangement, the Minister coyly says since he took office. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that it was not because of anything he did, as he appears to imply.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It was when I introduced the Ontario housing corporation, since we got a change—

Mr. Bryden: Well now let us face the fact. The changed position of the municipalities arose from the fact that the federal government was shamed into pumping far more money into the picture. In fact your financial responsibilities were reduced too, as a result of the changed policy of the federal government and yet you still maintain this seven and a half per cent disincentive for municipalities and then you have the gall to come into this House and say that you cannot do more than the pitiful little you are doing because the municipalities are not asking you to do any more.

I say to you, take off that disincentive. Provide for local administration, but do not impose on our hard-pressed municipalities any financial obligation at all with regard to public housing. If you did that, maybe we could start getting a more realistic attitude from the municipalities, but as the matter stands now, one can only say that your programme is a total flop. It does not meet the need, and the unfortunate thing is that it includes a very large element of hoax, of deception of the people. This is most tragic, because they are people who are desperate, who really think and hope that their position is going to be improved as a result of what you are doing. Unfortunately their hopes are going to be sadly disappointed.

Mr. Sopha: There is one question I would like to ask about a facet of this that interests me. Would the Minister indicate whether, in the public housing that will be built, the emphasis will be on single family units or on multiple dwellings?

Hon. Mr. Randall: In the major centres, they will be primarily multiple dwellings, because of the cost of the land and the density problem. But in some of the towns where we are building, we can provide semi's or single family dwellings.

Mr. Sopha: Is the intention to locate in the major centres? We have talked a good deal about Toronto here; is the intention that it must be located contiguous to the heart of the metropolitan area?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not think so. I think with the transportation systems available today, and the highways, that many people would prefer to go away from downtown.

In fact, a year or two ago there was a survey made in Moss Park of 475 families. We were told by the city of Toronto officials that they want to stay down on the corner of King and Yonge but the survey indicated that about 70 per cent of those people said that if their jobs were on the outskirts of Toronto, that is where they would like to go —and this is where industry is locating.

Mr. Sopha: I am familiar with the Regent Park area because when I first came to this city 20 years ago, I lived over in the extension of Carlton Street beyond Parliament Street, and I saw the intitial stages of the development of that housing project. But I have in mind the series of excellent articles that were written for the Toronto *Daily Star* about two or three months ago on apartment dwelling. Some of the incidents that attend apartment dwelling are pretty startling and there are two of them that come to mind.

The writer, a female, told about living on the fifth or sixth floor and the children playing in a play area and an injury occurring to

one of them within sight of the mother—or a child being set upon by bigger children—and her inability to come to the rescue for a period of 15 or 20 minutes, because she had to go down the elevator shaft and out; as a result, great harm could befall. Another aspect that that writer dwelt upon was the necessity of inhibiting children from making noise because the neighbours complain and, indeed, in many instances there were allegations that the children made noise when in fact they had not. Some neighbours wanted, by complaining, to restrict noise-making in the future.

Some of those things were pretty disturbing and I for one, would not like to see society, as far as its urban character is concerned, become wholly troglodytic—cliff-dwelling—and one has only to think back 20 years when one first saw this city, one sees the immense high rise developments that have taken place. Surely consideration might be given to the location of public housing at some distance from the heavy population density so that government might encourage the single family dwelling unit rather than bunching people together in what some have called "a soulless, spiritless atmosphere" of the apartment building.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 408 carry?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before we leave vote 408, there are some other matters that I would like to touch upon.

During the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General, I referred to the policy which the government is going to follow with respect to elderly people who have been expropriated. When the Attorney General was speaking about the report on the basis of compensation, I learned that the only assistance that this government was going to provide was under the programme instituted by this Minister, and I note in the front of his HOME programme that we have this reference that the plan will assist elderly home owners of limited and fixed income who would otherwise suffer financial hardship as a result of public expropriation of their home.

I want to speak specifically again, for the umpteenth time, about Donmount Village and what happened to the people in that area. I want to ask the Minister whether or not there is any conceivable way that benefit, limited as it may be and not yet put into operation, can be extended to those persons who fall even within the limited category that he speaks about, of being elderly persons who have, in fact, relocated themselves after having been expropriated—to use the word that is so dear to the heart of the Provincial Treasurer of the province of Ontario—whether or not this plan can in some way be adapted to their need.

I am going to use quite advisedly the name and the story of one man, and the name of another man in that area. Mr. Craigen still lives on Munro street, just up from the corner of Munro and Matilda.

If the shovels are put in, he will suffer grave inconvenience. He is 77 years of age and has lived there for something over 40 years. He owes no money to anybody. He has been offered, so far as my latest advice has informed me, $8,800 for his home. To locate in the city of Toronto in another home at his age will require a minimum of $15,000.

Now that man is still on the location. There are others, 14 or 15 people, families, still in location right north of phase one of this project who are faced with this problem. Some of them are elderly people.

I think the benefits of it should have been made available to a large number of other people and I think that there should have been some different system than this deferred payment method that the Minister has outlined.

But let me get back to the specific instance of that man. What can be done under this HOME programme? And since that property is going to be conveyed to the Ontario housing corporation, can the Ontario housing corporation intervene now to work out a satisfactory arrangement for Mr. Craigen? I repeat, he is 77 years of age; he and his wife have lived there for over 40 years; their home is debt-free and well-kept, and he will get $8,800 for it.

What, specifically, can be done to assist that man?

I refer now to another man who has been relocated and I want to know whether or not it is possible in the total mess that Donmount has been, to make at least some effort to provide retroactively some benfit and relief for this man, because the government says that this is the only possible way in which it can be done.

This man's name is Charlie Wilson and his story is quite simple. When the city offered Charlie Wilson and his daughter, Roma Bradbury, $7,600 in the expropriation on their Napier Place home last July, they did not complain—they were lucky to get that, they figured—until they went house hunting. Then

they learned that the only home you can get in Toronto for $7,600 is not available. They got themselves a lawyer, went back to the city and fought and haggled and succeeded in upping the ante to $8,600. Then they went house hunting again only to find that houses going for $8,600 are not fit to live in, and that they are not too much better at twice that price.

Suddenly the bitter truth struck home. Charlie and Roma, who had lived comfortably and relatively debt-free for the last 14 years in their Munro Street house, would have to go deep in debt if they wanted to live half decently again. They found a two-bedroom place on Lyall Avenue which Roma says is "real nice," and they paid $4,400 down, leaving a $7,500 mortgage at 7 per cent interest. Charlie is 75 years old, earns $52 a week as a watchman and now he has to pay $75 a month in mortgage payments, plus interest on his new home. He is the only source of income. Roma has been ill and has not worked for five years.

In the very limited context in which this government has faced up to the problem on which we have been harping for a long time in Donmount Village, can the Minister in any way assure me that his corporation in implementation of the HOME programme, are prepared to go back and look at the situations that meet his qualifications, whether they are still living in the area having been expropriated with no place to go, and the problems that they face in connection with that and those who, in fact, have been relocated and have made their way elsewhere.

Surely it is not too much to ask, that the Minister and his department and this corporation will find out this information. It is available in detail at the city hall. If you cannot get it, I will get it for you; who the people are, where they have gone, and what their present situation is. I want at least to feel that after all these months we can point to one or two or three or four people who have got some benefit and some assistance from this programme.

This is not my approval of this programme. The way this should have operated properly was to have an adequate basis of compensation for such people in these urban renewal schemes where they could have gone out and bought their own homes. But if, within the narrow limits of this government's outlook on this problem, this is all that can be done, what can be done for people similar to those two examples that I gave?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would suggest in the first place that the member let me have full details on these two people as he has outlined it here tonight. I will be glad to have my housing officials take these two cases under their wing and see what they can do about it.

First of all, let me tell you, in the HOME programme—and I am not ducking an issue here—this is the responsibility of the city of Toronto and we are prepared to help the municipalities. The city of Toronto has not done anything in this case and apparently has not acted on the invitation of the HOME plan. I will be very happy to have our people go to the city of Toronto, dig up these two cases and see what we can do.

The question I want to ask the member is, what happened to the man who got the $8,600 with his daughter? He put $4,000 down, and kept the other $4,600 I presume, in cash, is that it, and then took on a $7,000 mortgage?

Mr. Renwick: I do not know what he did with it, whether he had to pay off certain other debts or not; I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The point I was making here, if they are in the HOME plan, we have been able to find, let us say, a $12,000 home for this man, and the land cost had been $4,000. This is where the land could have been leased on a basis where he could have got into a home without having a $7,000 mortgage. I would be glad to have our people look into it and see if we can find a solution for both of them. If we can find a solution here perhaps this answers the problem the member talks about of other people in Donmount.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of other matters that I would like to deal with on this housing vote.

Again I want to refer to this statement of Mr. A. E. Diamond, the president of Cadillac Construction. I do not know whether the Minister has seen it, but I would certainly send him a copy of it or arrange to get him one. I think—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Was this in the *Globe and Mail* this morning?

Mr. Renwick: No, this is some time ago. This was the statement which he made before the joint committee in Ottawa on consumer prices and he was dealing with housing. He is qualified to speak on these matters. And he had in the course of his remarks this statement to make:

> We believe and have felt for some 18 months that there is developing a very severe housing shortage in that the problem is not so much one of absolute supply as the steadily widening gap between the cost of the commodity and the ability of the consumer public to pay for this housing accommodation.

We have emphasized that a great deal during the course of the debate in the last few days. But he then goes on to say:

> However, should a substantial amount of mortgage money be made available today we will simply not be able to provide housing for those people whose needs are greatest due to all of the factors that affect housing costs.

And again, we have dwelt at some length on our view of that particular part of the housing problem. And he goes on to refer to the four basic elements that enter into the cost of housing and the last one is the question of the cost of money.

I am going to ask the Minister if he cannot in some way bring to the attention of the federal government or to the Minister of Finance in Ottawa, that there should be no one and a half per cent differential between mortgages which are guaranteed by the government of Canada through CMHC and government bonds. As has been stated in this particular presentation of Mr. Diamond, he makes the point and he makes it very, very clearly, that a government guaranteed mortgage as distinct from government bonds should for practical purposes be interchangeable if in some way or other there was a market for those mortgages, so that they could be turned over.

This is really the only difference. But to make a differential—and as I understand the system which the Minister of Finance has now instituted, somehow or other the rate on the mortgage under the CMHC is going to float one and a half percentage points above the government bond market. He makes the point very, very clearly that a loan of $10,000 amortized at 7.25 per cent over 30 years carries exactly the same debt service as a loan of $11,100 over the same period amortized at 6.25 per cent.

In other words, the one per cent increase in interest costs has had the same effect as an increase in building costs of 11 per cent. And he goes on then to say:

> Bearing in mind that buildings available for rent or sale today have been for the most part mortgaged prior to the time that these higher interest rates came into force, we can say that the present cost of housing accommodation does not yet reflect the higher cost of money which has occurred within the past eight to ten months. This added cost must be borne by the renting or buying public in the months ahead.

I do not pretend to understand all the implications of the interest rates which are involved, but surely there is some way in which this government, as part of the method of stabilizing housing costs throughout the province of Ontario and in the municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto, can bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance that you just cannot afford to have that differential in a rising cost of the housing market or situation that we find ourselves in today.

I would ask the Minister whether he agrees with the remarks which I make and whether or not in some way or other this point can be brought forcibly to the attention of the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I am going to Ottawa, I think, within the next ten days. This is one of the matters we want to discuss with Mr. Nicholson, the Minister of Housing, and I am sure there will be discussions with the Minister of Finance. I might also point out that since the banks have now been freed to go into the mortgage business, I think there is going to be some competition with reference to mortgage moneys.

I noticed an advertisement of the Bank of Commerce yesterday asking for all the mortgages that anybody had available. I think the very fact the banks are now accepting mortgages is going to have something to do with the mortgage rates. I do not know what and I do not know when and I do not know for how much at the present time. But certainly with that competition in there, and it was stated, I think, some time ago that the banks will have roughly a half a billion dollars a year for mortgage money, it should make some impact.

Following up the remarks of the hon. member—yes, we will be discussing interest rates and borrowing rates with Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Sharp in the next thirty days.

Mr. Sopha: Will the Minister take up another thing with him? Will he tell them there is a Liberal down here who normally supports his party, who has always held the view that it is completely unjust that the people of Canada should guarantee to the banks and the trust companies that they will not lose money on a mortgage?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Two per cent, the member is talking about?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed. I have always looked upon that item with the greatest dismay because it means, of course, that when the two per cent fee is deducted, the effective interest rate to the borrower goes up; he never gets the money. When you take off the legal fee which is 1.25 per cent plus the two per cent insurance fee, then the effective rate on a 7.25 per cent mortgage, I suspect, being no actuary, is then approaching something like 8 per cent.

I really do not see—and I will put it quietly this way—why the trust companies, the chartered banks, the strong financial institutions—and after all, if you have been in business since 1817, to single one of them out, the inner reserves of that company must now be tremendous—I do not see why they do not take their chances in the economy like the rest of us.

No government says to the lawyer, which is the only profession I know other than the nautical one—I have only been in two in my life—they do not say to the legal profession, we will guarantee you against loss. If you cannot work, if you have a heart attack, or develop some terminal disease, we will see that you are looked after and your family.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Well, that may be so because of our industry and our initiative. But why, under what grounds of rational philosophy, do the people of Canada select the chartered banks and the trust companies and say, "you institutions, if you will come into this field, we will absolutely guarantee that you do not lose any money". I am most reluctant to accord them that privilege in our society and I am fortified in having just finished the memoirs of Charles Stephen Power, who has been in politics in this country for more than half a century. He said that the chartered banks beyond question have retarded the economic development of the country.

I learned that at the foot of Harold Adam Innis, over here at the university. He said the same thing. Others of that school said that in lecturing to us. That was the view and certainly the man who taught central banking and used Humphrey's book, I just forget his name now, had that view in their very progressive school.

Any reading of the history of the country shows that that is so and I really do not see why we are victimized by the chartered banks to the extent that they raise the effective cost of building a house because they insist on their being guaranteed by the public that they will not lose any money. Everyone else in the economy, in this free enterprise economy takes the risk that his business may be a failure.

So I would be much obliged if when you are talking this chummy chat—and with Mr. Sharp as I know him it will not be like the reeve of Scarborough; you will not meet him at a cocktail party when you are getting another olive for the martini. It will have to be in his office.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, another matter which is of concern to me, if I can locate the table with the rates on it, is the question of the schedule of rents geared to income which the corporation has presently in operation.

I think I can probably make the point without having it in front of me. But the question I would like to ask—I do not even know whether this is a figure that can be calculated or expressed the way in which I am going to phrase the question—assuming that the Ontario housing corporation in the units which it owns is renting whatever the agreed percentage of those units to persons who are getting the benefit of what we could call the rental subsidy, what is sort of the quantum of that subsidy which is presently being provided to assist people who do not have sufficient income to meet their rents?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not quite understand your question. They are on geared-to-rent income and if they cannot pay the economic rent, then this is where the subsidy comes in. Now the subsidy can range from $5 a month to $40 or $60 a month.

Mr. Bryden: What is the sort of scale they pay?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Pardon?

Mr. Bryden: What, roughly is the scale they pay? What percentage of income with a family of—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The scale runs from an income of $192 family income a month for 16.7 per cent which is $32 and it goes as high as $561 a month, which is 30 per cent, roughly $168 a month. That is the dollar range that we are in.

In the area where they cannot meet it, of course, this is where the subsidy applies.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just as an example, take the Regent Park south property

that is owned and managed by the housing corporation. Do you have any projection as to what subsidy is allocated for that building, or do you simply allow it to fluctuate depending entirely on who the tenants are that come into the building?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have no subsidy allocated for that area. If they do not meet the rent, of course this is where the subsidy applies. The average rent is around $70, I am informed.

Mr. Renwick: On Regent Park South, just before I come back to the same question of this rental scale, is there any different policy being followed by the housing corporation with respect to Regent Park South? I get the impression that people who have lived in Regent Park South for many, many years, have noticed a change in that particular building, or those premises, since the Ontario housing corporation has taken over that building.

In the immediate surrounding area there is now a very real sense of social distance between those who live in Regent Park South and elsewhere. The impression which is created by whatever the policy is of the housing corporation in that particular development, is that the housing corporation is using this as a gathering place for, shall I say, multiple problem families or difficult families, and that in many ways it is the direct opposite to the dispersal philosophy which is so much a part and parcel of the Minister's view of public housing.

Am I correct? Within limits is this what is happening? Is this sort of a gathering place for difficult problems and therefore there is a deterioration in the atmosphere in Regent Park South compared with what it was before the housing corporation took it over?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I cannot speak from personal experience, which the hon. member will understand, but I am informed by my associates here there is no change and the resident manager who has been there in the past is still there. We have had no complaints that there has been any change. If there is any, we would like to know about it.

Mr. Bryden: If I may just intervene at this point, Mr. Chairman, it harks back to one of the favourite points of the Minister. He does not believe in public housing ghettos, but I am suggesting to him, or putting it forward as at least a thesis for consideration, that what is happening in a place like Regent Park is not that there is any change in policy, but that changing circumstances are changing the character of the unit. What are the changing circumstances? An increasingly acute shortage of this type of housing.

This means that more and more, this type of housing—the small amount of public housing that is now available—becomes a concentration centre for multiple problem families. There is such a shortage that the few units you have have to be used for multiple problem families. This is not only true in Regent Park, it is true elsewhere. So it is the exact antithesis of your declared policy. You are doing such a poor job in meeting the need, in fact we are falling behind it all the time, that we are getting public housing ghettos.

The answer to the problem is to start building public housing and not to worry too much about getting a certain percentage of this, that and the other type of housing. Let us just get the units built. As we get more built, then we can have more and more dispersal and we will not have this type of problem.

I think that right now we have serious and increasing problems of public housing ghettos, for the very reason I mentioned. In relation to the need there is so little of it that the only people that can now qualify are families with quite acute problems in many areas.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 408 carried?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have now located the schedule, which I believe is an up-to-date schedule and I ask the Minister whether in the light of the rising cost of all the amenities or requirements of decent living, whether or not he cannot do something to get this scale of rent geared to income changed so that it will be somewhere close to being adequate.

The figures which I have, using the examples; if you have a family income of $222 a month, the rental is $60 or 27 per cent. If that is so and you subtract the $60 from the $222 and you have $162 left for a family to subsist on for a month—

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are talking about the new scale now; it goes into effect May 1, and there has been a reduction in those scales.

In answer to the question from the member for Grey North put today, I informed him that the new rental scale would go into effect on May 1. I will be glad to give a copy to the member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: The scale I have is dated February of this year and I thought it was an accurate one, but the level here was—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I might add that the scale is spelled out in the HOME book.

Mr. Renwick: Where is it spelled out?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Appendix B, right at the end of the book.

Mr. Renwick: On a monthly income of $304 for the family, the monthly rental is $70, 23 per cent, which would leave the family $234 for the month, so that is a substantial improvement. Thank you.

The other matter that I would like to refer to, I would like to come at in a different way rather than castigating the Minister for not providing all the housing that is required in the metropolitan area. I notice in this report which was made to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto under date of January 27, 1966—the report on the housing situation in the metropolitan area at that time, and I assume that there has not been any later report furnished by the corporation to Metropolitan Toronto—in this report is a very strong recommendation with respect to the research that would have to be done to find out what the housing need is in the city of Toronto. And in that report the reference is quite clear that it is apparent that the time has come for a:

> —sophisticated appraisal for current need and demand, involving detailed market research into the general area of housing for modest income families and single persons.
>
> No housing agency, commission or group existing in Metropolitan Toronto today can provide this information or has ever made a serious attempt to estimate the quantity of housing required, to say nothing of the kind of location, the density and the staging thereof.

And you go on with a reference to a possible solution saying:

> It is suggested that the Metropolitan Toronto planning board is the most appropriate agency to conduct detailed market research to estimate the probable demand, having regard to the current high price of real estate reflected in high land price, high construction costs, availability of funds, priority of private and social programmes and other related factors .

Now, has anything further been done to implement that suggestion of the housing corporation, or has the housing corporation now got the facilities to do that kind of a study in the way in which I understand they can do it for smaller communities?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is my understanding that the metropolitan council hired a consultant a few months ago to carry out this study. We are paying 12.5 per cent of the cost, Metro is paying 12.5 per cent and the federal government is paying the remaining 75 per cent. So they are working on the study you are referring to.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister or the housing corporation have any reasonably accurate figures as to the extent of the need and the character of the need in the city of Toronto? I am thinking that the only late information we ever had available to us was in the Goldenberg report when, at that time in Metropolitan Toronto, that report suggested a need for 15,000 units of public housing and admitted that 61,000 Metro families could qualify for public housing on the basis of income alone.

In fact, between the Ontario housing corporation and Toronto's own housing authority, there were only 3,707 units available when the Goldenberg report appeared, and Metro leads the province in this field.

On the basis of 3,000 or 4,000 units at the time of the Goldenberg report and its suggested need of 15,000, has the Minister any more approximately accurate figures as to what the need might possibly be in the metropolitan area at this time?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The answer to that question is that we have the figures supplied by the metropolitan housing registry and that is the reason why we have gone along with this study. We check out these studies to see how accurate they are. I think that perhaps when the study is completed we will have a better picture of not only ourselves but as to what the needs are. I think that right now it is a figure out of a hat, because the figures change almost weekly.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the last matter that I want to raise is this question on which it is so difficult to come to grips with the government—urban renewal. Without going into any past history and to make it as brief as possible, urban renewal in Toronto has now ground to a halt. The Donmount one was disastrous and the Trefann Court one is in limbo someplace.

The partnership which is involved involves the other levels of government and also the city of Toronto and Metro. It involves this Minister's department. Everyone knows that there has to be a new philosophy, a new attitude and a new approach to the urban renewal problems. The Minister himself said

earlier tonight that he recognizes that this has to be done.

What, if anything, is being done in order to try and bring together the kind of team or group of people who could provide that kind of new approach, so that in some way or other urban renewal in Toronto can benefit from the disastrous experience in Donmount and benefit from the kind of approach which is now generally being used elsewhere to substitute for a short-term demolition procedure, a relatively longer term rehabilitation procedure, with demolition only in those areas where it is necessary, and a different approach from a community planning point of view?

Does this Minister have any responsibility in that area, or is it still just left that no one really is coming to grips with a different approach to the problem, because of the urgency of now getting another pilot project going that will be done adequately and properly, using the resources available to get on with urban renewal or whatever new name may be applied to it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me just suggest this: I think there is an educational job to be done here in Toronto with reference to urban renewal and you have been more deeply involved in it than I have. I recognize the problems of urban renewal, but it is not within my jurisdiction, as you appreciate, to handle the question of urban renewal. That is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner).

I might say that the Minister and I have discussed the problems that you have been involved in and he has cooperated with me and I have cooperated with him.

I have nothing to offer you tonight. I certainly think there has to be a different approach, perhaps in Toronto here at least. We have not had these same difficulties in other areas, as you well know, that were spelled out in the press here yesterday. But we have had the problems in Toronto here and I am not too sure that we are going to solve them overnight. I think that there should be a different approach to urban renewal than there has been.

I do not think you can throw people out of homes until you have places to put them. I will make that statement. My difficulty has been having the places to put them because of the situation we have in Metro, at least in the city of Toronto. However, I would say that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs will have something to say on urban renewal and certainly I am working very closely with him and giving him all the assistance we can.

As you know, at Alexandra Park the city was involved in this, and when we came on the job and took it over from them we did not change the architects. We used the same architects; it has cost us a little more money, but we want to get the job processed and I think you can look at the record as far as my department is concerned and find that as soon as we can get on the property we do the job. Now insofar as the planning and the other problems regarding urban renewal, as I say, that is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I have nothing further I can add to that.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 408 carried?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, just before this vote goes through. The abuse and the rebukes which characterize a heated House in debate extended far and wide. I want the Minister to know through you, Mr. Chairman, that they were all directed towards him and his government and his party; they were not directed towards the members of the Ontario housing corporation who are doing their job in the face of some considerable difficulty. And I am saying that with a particular purpose, Mr. Chairman. I am saying it because before these estimates go through I want to pay a particular vote of thanks to one Mr. Whaley, without whom a great many members of this House could not possibly cope with the individual problems that come to them from constituents requiring emergency housing or other housing location.

The kindest thing that can be said about Mr. Whaley, I think, is that he is to the Ontario housing corporation, in our estimation, what the Deputy Minister of Family and Social Services is to that department. He is an indispensable component of your housing machine and I think a word need be said in that regard before we actually pass the vote. I simply wanted the Minister to know that the malevolence on this side of the House was accurately directed.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have read some of your complimentary letters and I appreciate your comments.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 408 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report it has come to one resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to one resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to go to some second readings that are on the order paper and if there is time we will return to these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 12.15 o'clock, a.m.

APPENDIX

ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION
SCHEDULE OF STARTS AND COMPLETIONS
1965

SCHEDULE I

MUNICIPALITY	FAMILY HOUSING				SENIOR CITIZENS HOUSING			
	No. of Units	*Date Started*	*Date Completed*	*Months to Complete*	*No. of Units*	*Date Started*	*Date Completed*	*Months to Complete*
Belleville	40	Sept. 25/65	July 15/66	9.7	—	—	—	—
Cochrane	30	June 29/65	Jan. 12/66	6.5	—	—	—	—
Fort Frances	10	Oct. 8/65	Aug. 18/66	10.3	—	—	—	—
Hamilton	46	May 24/65	Nov. 1/65	5.3	40	Mar. 17/65	Oct. 15/65	6.9
Kingston	30	Sept. 20/65	June 29/66	9.3	—	—	—	—
Listowel	10	Aug. 3/65	Dec. 29/65	4.8	—	—	—	—
London	—	—	—	—	71	July 25/65	May 17/66	9.7
Mattawa	20	July 1/65	May 25/66	10.8	—	—	—	—
Metropolitan Toronto:								
Etobicoke FP 10/63	309	Aug. 20/65	225 (Mar. 31/67) (Units taken over progressively as completed)	—	—	—	—	—
OH21 Scarborough	91	Mar. 15/65	Jan. 26/66	10.3	—	—	—	—
OH32 City of Toronto	47	Dec. 15/65	Dec. 2/66	9.6	—	—	—	—
Oshawa	18	Aug. 11/65	Mar. 15/66	7.1	—	—	—	—
Ottawa	104	Nov. 8/65	Nov. 30/66	12.7	—	—	—	—
St. Thomas	24	Nov. 10/65	Aug. 8/66	8.9	—	—	—	—
Sudbury	83	June 10/65	Aug. 4/66	13.8	—	—	—	—
Windsor:								
OH4	49	Sept. 1/65	June 6/66	10.2	—	—	—	—
OH1	132	Sept. 28/65	Oct. 17/66	12.7	—	—	—	—
Woodstock	40	June 21/65	Mar. 31/66	9.3	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	1083				111			

ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION
SCHEDULE OF STARTS AND COMPLETIONS
1966

SCHEDULE II

MUNICIPALITY	FAMILY HOUSING				SENIOR CITIZENS HOUSING			
	No. of Units	*Date Started*	*Date Completed*	*Months to Complete*	*No. of Units*	*Date Started*	*Date Completed*	*Months to Complete*
Belleville	—	—	—	—	37	July 27/66	72% Complete	—
Brantford	—	—	—	—	80	Dec. 1/66	10% Complete	
Calvert	16	June 21/66	Nov. 2/66	4.4	—	—	—	—
Chelmsford	8	June 22/66	Nov. 18/66	4.9	—	—	—	—
Galt	28	Nov. 30/66	30% Complete	—	56	Nov. 15/66	90% Complete	—
Guelph	43	July 23/66	Jan. 24/67	6.0	31	Dec. 31/66	40% Complete	
Hamilton	—	—	—	—	146	May 1/66	70% Complete	
Kingston	30	Oct. 14/66	58% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
Kitchener:								
OH-1 (Contract 1)	61	Aug. 26/66	79% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
OH-1 (Contract 2)	40	July 6/66	92% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
Lindsay	7	June 15/66	Oct. 24/66	4.3	—	—	—	—
Listowel	—	—	—	—	12	Nov. 22/66	69% Complete	—
London	51	Jan. 14/66	Nov. 4/66	9.7	—	—	—	—
Metropolitan Toronto								
OH-1 North York	236	April 22/66	78 (March 31, 1967) (Units taken over progressively as completed)	—	—	—	—	—
OH-15 Scarborough	60	July 12/66	(Units taken over progressively as completed)		—	—	—	—
OH-29 North York	53	April 20/66	Nov. 28/66	7.2	—	—	—	—
OH-45 Etobicoke	158	Aug. 8/66	62% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
OH-44 North York	209	Aug. 18/66	55% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
OH-32 City of Toronto	216	Sept. 20/66	30% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
OH-54 Etobicoke	221	Sept. 27/66	30% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
OH-43 Scarborough	60	Nov. 17/66	35% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
Midland	16	May 30/66	Feb. 14/67	8.5	—	—	—	—

ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION
SCHEDULE OF STARTS AND COMPLETIONS
1966

SCHEDULE II—*continued*

MUNICIPALITY	FAMILY HOUSING				SENIOR CITIZENS HOUSING			
	No. of Units	*Date Started*	*Date Completed*	*Months to Complete*	*No. of Units*	*Date Started*	*Date Completed*	*Months to Complete*
Oshawa:								
OH-1 (Contract 1)	12	Oct. 11/66	45% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
OH-1 (Contract 2)	23	June 6/66	Oct. 6/66	4.0	—	—	—	—
Ottawa:								
OH-1	32	June 15/66	Nov. 28/66	5.4	—	—	—	—
OH-3	136	Nov. 9/66	79% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
Penetang	14	May 30/66	Nov. 30/66	6.0	—	—	—	—
Peterborough:								
OH-1 (Contract 1)	11	April 23/66	Oct. 17/66	5.8	—	—	—	—
OH-1 (Contract 2)	11	Sept. 9/66	6% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
Port Arthur	25	Nov. 2/66	Feb. 15/67	3.5	—	—	—	—
Prescott	12	Oct. 21/66	33% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
Sault Ste Marie:								
OH-1 (Contract 1)	40	June 1/66	Mar. 30/67	10.0	—	—	—	—
OH-1 (Contract 2)	38	June 20/66	Mar. 6/67	8.5	—	—	—	—
St. Catharines	—	—	—	—	75	Dec. 22/66	14% Complete	—
Sudbury:								
OH-4	70	July 19/66	78% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
OH-5	30	Oct. 1/66	62% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
Teck Township	30	Oct. 6/66	67% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
Windsor:								
OH-3	—	—	—	—	216	Sept. 1/66	32% Complete	—
OH-10	—	—	—	—	12	Nov. 25/66	23% Complete	—
OH-9	16	Nov. 25/66	23% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
OH-2	56	April 1/66	Nov. 29/66	7.9	—	—	—	—
OH-6	40	Nov. 28/66	50% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
OH-5	141	Sept. 9/66	20% Complete	—	—	—	—	—
Woodstock	—	—	—	—	28	April 5/66	98% Complete	—
	2,250				693			

ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION
DWELLING UNITS—STARTS
JANUARY 1st, 1967 TO MARCH 31st, 1967

SCHEDULE III

MUNICIPALITY	FAMILY HOUSING		SENIOR CITIZENS		STUDENT HOUSING	
	No. of Units	*Date Started*	*No. of Units*	*Date Started*	*No. of Units*	*Date Started*
Arnprior	20	Jan. 23/67	—	—	—	—
Guelph	—	—	—	—	1662	Feb. 1/67
Hamilton:						
OH6	47	Mar. 5/67	—	—	—	—
OH6	14	Mar. 15/67	—	—	—	—
OH6	15	Mar. 21/67	—	—	—	—
Niagara Falls	—	—	32	Mar. 8/67	—	—
Metropolitan Toronto	97	Jan. 15/67 (North York)	—	—	—	—
Owen Sound	32	Jan. 9/67	36	Mar. 8/67	—	—
Richmond Hill	—	—	56	Mar. 29/67	—	—
Stratford	40	Mar. 29/67	—	—	—	—
Toronto Township	30	Feb. 10/67	—	—	—	—
Windsor	28	Mar. 8/67	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	323		124		1662	

NOTE: Approximate completion date 8-12 months from date started.

ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION
SCHEDULE OF ANTICIPATED STARTS
APRIL 1st TO DECEMBER 31st, 1967

SCHEDULE IV

MUNICIPALITY	FAMILY UNITS		SENIOR CITIZENS		STUDENT HOUSING		
	Starts	*Anticipated Starting Date*	*Starts*	*Anticipated Starting Date*	*Beds*	*Self-contained Units*	*Anticipated Starting Date*
Almonte	—	—	16	Aug., 1967	—	—	—
Armstrong	—	—	6	Aug., 1967	—	—	—
Atikokan	26	May, 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Barrie	30	May, 1967	30	July, 1967	—	—	—
Brantford	50	June, 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Brockville	28	May, 1967	48	May, 1967	—	—	—
Burlington	54	June, 1967	28	June, 1967	—	—	—
Calvert	14	July, 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Carleton Place	8	July, 1967	7	July, 1967	—	—	—
Espanola	6	Aug., 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Flesherton	—	—	10	June, 1967	—	—	—
Fort Erie	10	July, 1967	10	June, 1967	—	—	—
Fort Frances	—	—	10	July, 1967	—	—	—
Fort William	—	—	—	—	270	Lakehead Univ.	Aug., 1967
Guelph	50	Aug., 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Gore Bay	—	—	10	May, 1967	—	—	—
Hamilton:						250	
OH	15	—	OH 500			McMaster Univ.	Sept., 1967
OH	80		OH 111				
OH	17						
OH	140						
OH	389						
Harriston	—	—	12	June, 1967	—	—	—
Kapuskasing	—	—	24	Aug., 1967	—	—	—

Kenora		14	Sept., 1967	22	Sept., 1967	—	—	—
Kingston		72	June, 1967	30	Sept., 1967	—	—	—
Kitchener		92	July, 1967	35	Sept., 1967	—	—	—
Leamington		16	Sept., 1967	4	Sept., 1967	—	—	—
Lindsay		27	June, 1967	—	—	—	—	—
London		120	Sept., 1967	230	Oct., 1967	1200	400 University of Western Ontario	July, 1967
Markdale		—	—	12	Oct., 1967	—	—	—
Meaford		16	Oct., 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Metropolitan Toronto:								
East York	OH	293	Oct., 1967					
Etobicoke	OH 26	245	June, 1967					
	OH	400	Nov., 1967					
North York	OH 25	579	Sept., 1967					
	OH 58	56	April, 1967					
	OH 61	76	July, 1967					
Scarborough	OH	414	Nov., 1967					
Toronto	OH 24	232	April, 1967					
	OH 32	166	April, 1967					
	OH 33	460	Aug., 1967					
	OH 35	250	Dec., 1967					
	OH 46	455	April, 1967					
Township of York	OH 27	211	Nov., 1967					
Midland		—	—	22	May, 1967	—	—	—
Mitchell		8	Sept., 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Niagara Falls		96	Oct., 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Neelon and Garson		6	Aug., 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Newmarket		—	—	56	April, 1967	—	—	—
North Bay		30	June, 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Oakville		58	June, 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Orangeville		6	July, 1967	10	July, 1967	—	—	—
Orillia		14	June, 1967	14	June, 1967	—	—	—

ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION
SCHEDULE OF ANTICIPATED STARTS
APRIL 1st TO DECEMBER 31st, 1967

SCHEDULE IV—*Continued*

MUNICIPALITY	FAMILY UNITS		SENIOR CITIZENS		STUDENT HOUSING		
	Starts	*Anticipated Starting Date*	*Starts*	*Anticipated Starting Date*	*Beds*	*Self-contained Units*	*Anticipated Starting Date*
Oshawa	—	—	30	Sept., 1967	—	—	—
Ottawa	300	Aug., 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Peterborough	100	Aug., 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Port Arthur	—	—	12	Aug., 1967	—	—	—
Port Dover	6	July, 1967	4	July, 1967	—	—	—
Prescott	—	—	7	July, 1967	—	—	—
St. Catharines	200	June, 1967	—	—	—	—	—
St. Thomas	21	Sept., 1967	28	Sept., 1967	—	—	—
Sault Ste. Marie	—	—	39	July, 1967	—	—	—
Sarnia	24	July, 1967	32	July, 1967	—	—	—
Stratford	25	Aug., 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Sturgeon Falls	20	June, 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Sudbury	200	Aug., 1967	70	April, 1967	—	—	—
Teck Township	—	—	20	Aug., 1967	—	—	—
Tilbury	5	July, 1967	4	July, 1967	—	—	—
Timmins	30	Oct., 1967	15	July, 1967	—	—	—
Toronto Township	64	July, 1967	20	July, 1967	—	—	—
Walkerton	6	Sept., 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Waterloo	21	June, 1967	—	—	—	—	—
Welland	50	July, 1967	30	Aug., 1967	—	—	—
Whitby	42	Oct., 1967	8	Oct., 1967	—	—	—
Wingham	—	—	6	Oct., 1967	—	—	—
TOTALS	6,443		1,582		1,470	2,150	

NOTE: Approximate completion date 8-12 months from date started.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 61

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, April 12, 1967

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 12, 1967

Human Tissue Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 2083

Pesticides Act, 1967, bill intituled, Mr. Dymond, first reading 2083

Raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, bill to authorize, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 2083

Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 2083

Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 2083

Statement re labour-management committee and union-management council, Mr. Bales 2084

Statement re appointment of Mr. S. A. Caldbick as senior advisory Crown attorney and Crown attorney for Ontario, Mr. Wishart 2085

Question to Mr. Wishart re Dr. Abram Hoffer, Mr. Nixon 2085

Question to Mr. Haskett re tire standards, Mr. Young 2086

Question to Mr. Wishart re John A. MacDonald and Birchall Carson, Mr. Sargent 2086

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the workmen's compensation board hospital, Mr. Renwick 2087

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Dr. Morton Shulman, Mr. Renwick 2087

Questions to Mr. Bales re the workmen's compensation board hospital, Mr. Renwick 2087

Questions to Mr. Wishart re coroners, Mr. Singer 2088

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Dr. Sereny, Mr. S. Lewis 2088

Question to Mr. Dymond re children at the Etobicoke centre, Mr. S. Lewis 2089

Questions to Mr. Dymond re children at Ontario Hospitals, Mr. S. Lewis 2089

Question to Mr. Bales re the workmen's compensation board hospital, Mr. MacDonald 2089

Question to Mr. Robarts re Charles M. Harding, Mr. S. Lewis 2090

Air Pollution Control Act, 1967, bill intituled, Mr. Dymond, on second reading 2091

On notice of motion No. 16, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. White, Mr. Sopha 2107

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 2118

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1967

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the east gallery, St. Bernard's separate school, Toronto, St. Francis Xavier separate school, Toronto, and Hollycrest public school, Etobicoke; in the west gallery, St. Cuthbert's United Church, Toronto—a group of ladies, I should say, from St. Cuthbert's United Church, Toronto—and Olivet day school, Islington.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE HUMAN TISSUE ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled An Act to amend The Human Tissue Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to facilitate kidney, cornea and other transplants in the circumstances prescribed.

THE PESTICIDES ACT, 1967

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, The Pesticides Act, 1967.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. V. M. Singer: (Downsview): Pesticides?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Nothing personal!

Mr. Speaker, I draw attention to the fact it is pesticides, not pests. The purpose of this bill, general revision, is to bring the Act up to date.

In addition the following new principles are included: Provision made for the licensing of operators, that is, persons who carry on business as exterminators; a pesticides advisory board is provided and an appeal to the court is provided from an order of the Minister cancelling or suspending the licence of an operator or exterminator. An appeal is provided from the order of an inspector terminating an extermination.

RAISING OF MONEY ON CREDIT, CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Secretary) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I would think that the explanation of this bill is contained in the title to the bill.

THE ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES CAPITAL AID CORPORATION ACT, 1964

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1964.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Ontario universities capital aid corporation to purchase from colleges of applied arts and technology bonds or debentures issued by them for capital construction projects that have been approved by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis).

THE ONTARIO EDUCATION CAPITAL AID CORPORATION ACT, 1966

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, under this Act, the Ontario education capital

aid corporation is empowered to purchase municipal debentures issued for public library purposes and for grants to associations constituted for the promotion of the welfare and education of retarded children within the municipality.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to make a statement.

More than a year ago, my predecessor, now the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), invited a group of knowledgeable and distinguished trade union and business leaders to meet under the chairmanship of Dr. H. D. Woods, dean of the faculty of arts and science at McGill University and one of Canada's foremost industrial relations authorities, to discuss ways and means of exploring and finding solutions for mutual problems in the field of labour-management relations.

My predecessor's initiative was based on the belief that labour and management share many common objectives; that it is preferable for them to try to solve their own problems rather than have government impose solutions on them; and that they should be given opportunities and should be encouraged to come together for the purpose of exploring and perhaps solving these problems outside the crisis atmosphere of collective bargaining. I should add that I share these views.

Initially, the committee consisted of the following: The labour members were Mr. David B. Archer, president of the Ontario federation of labour; Mr. William Ladyman, vice-president of the international brotherhood of electrical workers; Mr. Larry Sefton of the united steelworkers of America; and Mr. Russell Harvey of the office employees' international union. The management members were Mr. H. J. Clawson of the Steel Company of Canada; Mr. J. H. Smith, of the Canadian General Electric Company; Mr. J. A. Belford of Massey Ferguson Limited; Mr. R. P. Armstrong, then of the Foundation Company of Canada, now of Rio Algom Mines; Mr. Michael Warren of my department acted as secretary of the committee.

During the year Mr. Armstrong withdrew from the committee when he changed his business connections. The labour side was reduced by one, with the death of Mr. Harvey. Replacements were not appointed. Professor John Crispo, director of the University of Toronto's new industrial relations centre, joined the committee for its final two sessions.

The committee met on eight occasions and discussed not only some of the current major issues in industrial relations, but also the question of whether a formal, public body consisting of representatives of labour and management would serve a useful purpose.

I am making available to the members a copy of a memorandum from Dean Woods outlining the committee's recommendations, both as to the functions of a labour-management body, and its constitution.

It should be noted that the committee did not recommend that the union-management council be established. It merely recommended the form it should take if the government decided it ought to be established on a permament basis. The initiative was left with the government.

Mr. Speaker, we have decided to proceed with the establishment of this new body to be called the Ontario union-management council, with a constitution and terms of reference as suggested by the special committee. Labour and management will be asked to submit for our consideration the names of a number of persons who are available and willing to serve. Other organizational steps will be taken and plans will be made for an initial agenda for the council.

It gives me great pleasure to announce the appointment of Dr. John Crispo as chairman of the council. Dr. Crispo is well qualified to undertake this responsibility. During the past few months he chaired a group representing the management of Domtar and its union which worked out a precedent setting agreement in the area of employee adjustment to technological change. He has carried out important duties and studies for both the federal and provincial governments and some four years ago, served as research director for the Legislature's select committee on manpower training.

In my view, this council will give labour and management an opportunity of working together to develop new means of accommodating their varied interests, but even more challenging is the opportunity it will afford for the parties to examine their responsibilities to the public interest in the light of our generally accepted social and economic goals.

However, in my view the council will not be a short run panacea for labour and management difficulties. Its real impact, if it succeeds in establishing a solidly based place for itself in our industrial relations picture, may not be felt for some time.

In spite of this, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced there is a great deal to gain by pro-

ceeding with this body at this time. I give labour and management, and more important the members of this House who represent the public, my undertaking that I and my department will support this experiment to the fullest extent and will leave nothing undone that will help its success.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement before the orders of the day.

It will, I am sure, be of interest to this House that I have appointed Mr. S. A. Caldbick, QC, of Timmins, as the senior advisory Crown attorney and a Crown attorney for Ontario. This may be of particular interest, Mr. Speaker, since we have been engaged in the estimates of my department and this particular appointment relates significantly to the development of the administration of criminal justice in the province.

For some years, Ontario has recognized that the independence of the prosecutor has an integral part in the administration of criminal justice. For this reason, we have appointed full-time Crown attorneys and assistant Crown attorneys so that as of the present date, we have 86 of these Crown counsel on a full-time salary basis serving throughout the province.

Mr. Caldbick, in his new position, will be responsible for assisting the Crown attorneys in the training and development of the younger men who are entering this career of public service. The Ontario Crown attorneys association has been most cooperative throughout the years in helping us to introduce procedures which assist all of the Crown attorneys in the carrying out of their duties, and Mr. Caldbick, in cooperation with the association, will be able to further our mutual objectives in maintaining an integrated, informed, and well developed Crown counsel system in all of the counties and districts in the province.

Mr. Caldbick, who is a Crown attorney of great experience, was first appointed in 1927 and is presently one of the most experienced Crown attorneys serving in our province. He will continue to maintain his office at Timmins where he will serve as Crown attorney. Since it is most important that this position be a functioning part of the Crown attorney system, his continuance in that office will be most suitable in carrying out the programme to which we are looking forward.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General would permit a question on that statement?

Will Mr. Caldbick be asked or expected to make an annual report to the Legislature on his activities?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well I accept what I think might be a suggestion from the hon. member, and I will suggest this to Mr. Caldbick.

Mr. Singer: Good!

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General.

Does the Attorney General feel the public interest is being served in the inquest into the death of John Stern when it is reported that: (a) the coroner conducting the inquest has apparently missed an opportunity to have Dr. Abram Hoffer, a psychiatric director of the Saskatchewan Department of Public Health and an authority on LSD, testify at the hearing; and (b) the coroner has further indicated that the inquest will not inquire into the illegal sources of LSD and marijuana, which may have been associated with the death?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to the hon. member for the opportunity to comment on this matter. I would begin by saying that no opportunity has been missed and I would say that on the instructions of the Crown attorney for Toronto, detective sergeant Ken Foster of the Metropolitan police called Dr. Hoffer by telephone in Saskatchewan on Monday, April 10, at noon. Detective Foster at that time advised Dr. Hoffer that his evidence at the Stern inquest would be appreciated and that he would be advised shortly as to when that might be necessary. I should interject that it was expected that the inquest would be adjourned after certain proceedings had been taken and certain factual evidence obtained.

Dr. Hoffer expressed thanks for the advice that it would not be necessary to attend on Tuesday and indicated that he would stand by and await notice as to when he could attend and be of assistance.

The Crown attorney and the presiding coroner were not advised by Dr. Hoffer of his presence in Toronto yesterday and I have no knowledge that he was here. He may have been, but I do not know that he was at the inquest. It was not intended that he should be there last night. His presence was not expected and it is intended to call him later.

If the Crown attorney and the presiding coroner had been so advised then his evidence

could, and I think most certainly would, have been taken yesterday evening.

In accordance with the conversation which was had with Dr. Hoffer on Monday, he will be notified of a mutually convenient date upon which he may provide his evidence. Certainly the intention is to have him present and give his evidence and he is prepared to do so.

As to the second part of the question: The investigation of the illegal sources of drugs is really a police matter. This is of course most properly undertaken by the RCMP and by the Metropolitan Toronto police and other police forces. This, I understand, is being thoroughly investigated also by the police.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Transport.

Would the Minister inform the House if the work of the task force set up by the American association of motor vehicle administrators to study tire standards has completed its work? If so has standards for tires been recommended by the association?

Do the tire regulations announced on February 10, 1967 setting out the V-1 standards differ from the standards agreed upon by the Canadian tire manufacturers for 1966?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the task force to which the hon. member is referring is doubtless the vehicle safety equipment commission, originally founded by the American association of motor vehicle administrators. It operates now as a separate body.

This group put out the original V-1 standards in May of 1965, revised them in October of 1965, and finally had them confirmed by the Oregon meeting of the American association of motor vehicle administrators in September of 1966.

About the same time the VSEC issued its original V-2 standards related to recut and retread tires. They are still working on these standards and we expect some further reports from them on this work. In Canada, the tire manufacturers in 1966 issued first standards that were known as RMA-1, and while these were similar in many matters to the V-1 standards they were less comprehensive. Later the Canadian tire manufacturers agreed to accept the revised and confirmed V-1 standards, and these are the ones now in effect.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General which has been submitted to him with regard to John A. MacDonald who has been in Don jail for five months without bail or or without trial. What is the story on this case now?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is not the way the question reads, Mr. Speaker, it is what action has the Attorney General taken. However, I am glad to answer it.

I would say for the benefit of the hon. member, the Crown attorney was contacted, the matter has been fixed for trial on May 2 of this year, 1967.

I would like to add some of the background of this case. MacDonald was originally charged with defrauding a widow of $9,920. The widow laid the information, MacDonald was arrested and when arrested he could not—

Mr. Sargent: Does it matter?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, it is part of the answer. The hon. member asked for information and I would like him to have it.

Mr. Sargent: Does it prejudice his fair trial?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, no, no, no, it is nothing to do with his trial.

His bail was fixed at $10,000, which he was unable to raise. The bail was reduced—no, this has nothing to do with his guilt or innocence, nothing to do with his trial.

His bail was reduced to $5,000, but it still could not be raised. I would say that the matter involved shares in a company known as Atlantic Distillers, Limited, and this necessitated inquiries in the province of Nova Scotia.

When those inquiries were completed his preliminary inquiry was held on December 20, 1966, and the accused was committed for trial. MacDonald has had counsel throughout all the proceedings and I am sure his counsel is familiar with the whole matter.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept another question on this?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: In the case of Birchall Carson, an American citizen, who was held for five months without bail, nothing happened until the United States consul read it in the press: Why Are Americans in Our Jails—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sargent: Well, it is important to justice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: So is the government out of order in this case. Let me ask the question.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member be seated while I finish what I have to say. The member asked a question regarding what action the Attorney General was taking regarding Mr. MacDonald, and following the reply the member may ask the Minister a supplementary question which should be on the same subject.

Mr. Sargent: Well this is leading up to that.

Mr. Speaker: The member will have to ask the Minister if he will answer a supplementary question first, and then do so on the same subject matter.

Mr. Sargent: Meaning be seated!

Will the Minister accept another question then?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: How many more of the 600 or 700 inmates held in Don jail are currently without bail or without trial?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have not made a count.

Mr. Sargent: Can the Minister give me an answer tomorrow on this?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I might get you some information on this.

Mr. Sargent: He might, or will he?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I certainly could not give it at the moment.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General.

By what authority does the Attorney General presume to suggest that the continuation on April 19 of the inquest into the death of Francesco Gualtieri at the workmen's compensation board hospital at Downsview should await the pleasure of the commissioner to be appointed for the public inquiry announced by the Prime Minister on Monday?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out immediately that I never at any time suggested that the inquest—and to use the language of the hon. member—should await the pleasure of the commissioner. That I never suggested. I did say that before I made a decision I should like to discuss the matter with the commissioner, and I intend to do so both as a courtesy to him and in order that neither of these important inquiries may be prejudiced one by the other.

Mr. Nixon: Who is the commissioner?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the House will learn that very shortly.

Mr. Renwick: Would the Minister permit a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Renwick: Does a politically inspired public inquiry take precedence over a judicial inquest into the death of a citizen of the province of Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the supplementary question is out of order.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General.

Why was Dr. Shulman denied the opportunity of a hearing and an inquiry before he was discharged from his office as chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Dr. Shulman in his letter to myself of April 3 made his position eminently clear that he was not prepared to accept authority. I think he has confirmed that by his conduct since and there was no purpose or need of a hearing in those circumstances.

Mr. Renwick: Would the Minister permit a supplementary question? Before Dr. Shulman was summarily dismissed from his office why was he not entitled to the same protection in his judicial office as a magistrate would have been in similar circumstances; namely to the appointment of a judge with powers under The Public Inquiries Act and with an opportunity to be given notice of the hearing and an opportunity to appear, be represented by counsel and to cross examine witnesses and to give evidence?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the answer that I would give, Mr. Speaker, is that Dr. Shulman himself put it out of his power to expect anything except dismissal.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour. What was the name of the firm of general contractors who built the workmen's compensation board hospital at Downsview?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the hon. member for Riverdale the general contractors were Anglin-Norcross.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I had a question which I gave yesterday to the Minister of Labour; perhaps he would have the answer today.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the question yesterday from the hon. member for Riverdale was: Is the workmen's compensation board hospital at Downsview owned or operated, or both, by the workmen's compensation board, and if not, what exactly is the status?

The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is that it is owned and operated by the workmen's compensation board.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes.

Mr. Renwick: Could the Minister tell us what statutes govern the operation of that hospital?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The Workmen's Compensation Act, I believe is the answer to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. Can the Attorney General advise the House what legal right Dr. H. B. Cotnam had to prevent Dr. Morton Shulman, or his designee, from holding an inquest into the death of Francesco Gualtieri?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the answer is that the authority is contained in subsection 3 of section 10 of The Coroners Act of Ontario, and I would point out that the coroner, Dr. Cass, was advised at the time the instructions were given that the reason for the action was so that the supervising coroner for Ontario could undertake the inquest. There was never a suggestion or any inference that this inquest would not be held immediately.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, could I ask the Attorney General if on any other occasion the supervising coroner has so set aside the warrant of a local coroner?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Offhand, I cannot be certain, Mr. Speaker, but I know that there have been quite a number of other occasions when the person holding the inquest has been changed. I know that there have been a number of inquests where the supervising coroner of Ontario has himself acted, and these arrangements are not at all unusual. In this particular case, the reason for the supervising coroner's action was that he thought it was a matter of province-wide importance, an institution which concerned the whole province.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. In view of the Minister's statement yesterday—and I believe that is incorrect, it was two days ago—is he aware that Dr. George Sereny won his postgraduate specialty certificate in internal medicine in 1956 and has done both clinical and research work since that time to this day? Why then would such a specialist in general medical practice not qualify to fill a coroner's vacancy in Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, there is no suggestion that Dr. Sereny did not qualify and nobody has ever said that he did not. He is quite well qualified; I accept that. He is an eminent doctor and an eminent specialist and he just did not qualify as well, in our opinion, to suit the position of coroner as others we had in mind.

I am aware of his qualifications, Mr. Speaker, and as I said in answer to a question on this subject, Dr. Sereny is well qualified in his profession. He would make an admirable witness in the areas within which he is qualified, and I think he would certainly serve very well in this regard. I would repeat that we consider specialized physicians as possible expert witnesses, rather than as possible coroners.

For this reason, very few specialists are acting in the capacity of coroner in Ontario. There was no question of Dr. Sereny not being qualified. Like many other situations where there is more than one person to fill a position, he did not, in our opinion, fill the position of coroner as well as others.

Mr. Singer: Why did it take more than a year?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We appointed other coroners to fill the positions.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, if the Minister will permit: Is it not true that no coroner has yet been appointed for that area in over a year, and does not the Minister understand that a

specialist in internal medicine means a specialist in general practice?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He is a specialist, actually, but we do not appoint the coroners to a special area in Toronto; they are coroners who serve all over the city. There is no difficulty in coroners reaching the area.

Mr. S. Lewis: May I put a question to the hon. Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker?

How many children are presently in treatment at the Etobicoke centre—formerly Warrendale—that are attached to the Thistletown hospital?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, there are 18.

Mr. S. Lewis: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Is not the Minister somewhat embarrassed by the fact that 46 places have gone empty for seven months when Thistletown has a waiting list of 1,200?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not embarrassed, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that staff capable of looking after the children is not yet available. We are training them as quickly as it is humanly possible for us to train them.

Mr. S. Lewis: With all the resources of government! May I ask one other question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker?

What is the present situation of the following three children:

1. The 12-year old boy in the Hamilton Ontario hospital who has apparently been confined since January 13, 1967;

2. The 13-year old girl in Toronto Ontario hospital who has apparently been confined since December 15, 1966, and

3. The 14-year old girl who has been in St. Thomas Ontario hospital during January and February, 1967, as a ward of the Windsor children's aid society, and apparently has been moved. If so, where has she been placed?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in answer to a somewhat similar question—I think it was on February 14, 1967—this is really confidential information relative to the relationship between the doctor and the patient, or the guardians of a patient.

I therefore do not think that it is fitting or appropriate that that sort of thing should be brought to the floor of the House. Just because a patient happens to be a patient in a hospital owned and operated by the state is no reason to feel that the confidentiality that exists between the patient and the doctor should not be preserved and observed in the case of those patients, just as though the patient were in another type of hospital. This is a matter between the doctor attending the patient, the patient and/or the guardians and this I feel, sir, is not proper to be discussed on the floor of the House unless, sir—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —unless, sir, I have the specific permission of the parent or guardian.

Mr. S. Lewis: I assure the Minister, sir, that I am not trying to intrude on the doctor-patient relationship. Do I then assume, Mr. Speaker—by way of a supplementary question—that the children are still there? That is all I am asking.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: What is that? I did not hear.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member repeat his supplementary question?

Mr. S. Lewis: I am simply asking if the children are still there.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am implying nothing, sir; I am not answering the question.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour. Has the Minister ascertained exactly who is responsible for fire inspection in the workmen's compensation hospital at Downsview, and if the municipality is responsible, under what statute is this responsibility fixed, and why is it not enforced?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, this is basically the responsibility of the workmen's compensation board itself. I am advised by the board that they have discharged their responsibilities in the following ways:

1. I am advised by the board that there is on the staff of the hospital and the rehabilitation centre, a qualified firefighter designated as the fire prevention officer, who has conducted a continual round of inspections and has been in constant liaison with other fire authorities. He was trained at the Ontario fire college.

2. The North York fire department has attended at the premises on 16 occasions between the time the centre was built and the recent fire.

3. The loss prevention department of the firm of brokers who are responsible to the board concerning its insurance coverage has inspected the premises on several occasions.

Mr. S. Lewis: I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister. I believe you altered it to remove the red carpet, but I want to ask the Prime Minister what prompted him to appoint Mr. Charles M. Harding, president of Harding Carpet Limited, Brantford, to the board of governors of the University of Toronto today for a four-year term?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harding was appointed by an order in council dated April 4, 1967 and he was appointed because he is competent to do the job.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I rise on a matter of privilege arising out of a report appearing in all three Toronto newspapers of today's date, to the effect that the Sergeant-at-Arms, a servant of this House, had advised the press outside the House that he had called me an "insolent pup" on the floor of the House.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The same words were used by Sir John A. Macdonald. Sir John A. called Oliver Mowat the same thing.

Mr. Bryden: I realize, Mr. Speaker, that there are some members of this House who revel in abusive language of this kind, but I do not consider it a laughing matter, and in order that you may have the matter properly before you, I will review very briefly the circumstances in which it arose.

Yesterday, before the orders of the day, the hon. Attorney General arose on a matter of privilege and made a certain statement with regard to the hon. member for Riverdale. At the conclusion of his statement, I indicated that I wished to raise a point of order—

Mr. Sopha: You horned in.

Mr. Bryden: —and you said, Mr. Speaker, as the record shows, that you would hear my point. Although you continued to stand while I spoke, it is quite clear from the record that I was speaking with your permission. I complained that the hon. Attorney General had applied the words "cowardly" and "despicable" to the hon. member for Riverdale, and then proceeded to make an additional comment which prompted you to say that I was getting out of order, and to ask me to resume my seat.

Thereupon, as the record shows, I immediately completed my remarks in one sentence by suggesting that the Minister—that is, the Attorney General—should withdraw those adjectives. I was then on the point of resuming my seat—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: This is all on the record, Mr. Chairman. I was then on the point of resuming my seat when I noticed—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I will have no more interjections until the member finishes his point.

Mr. Bryden: —when I noticed to my consternation that the Sergeant-at-Arms, without any direction or authority from either the chair or the House or any valid reason of any kind, had taken it upon himself to post himself before my desk and to order me to sit down. I told him that he should return forthwith to his place and suggested that he should be instructed in his duties. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, Lewis at page 99 outlines the position of the Sergeant-at-Arms in part as follows:

> The Sergeant-at-Arms is also appointed by the Crown "to attend upon the Speaker", and for life. After his appointment, however, he is the servant of assembly—He is responsible, subject to instructions from the Speaker, for the proper conduct of members and visitors.

Some substantial time after the incident I have just described and after the House had resolved itself into committee of supply, I had occasion to absent myself briefly in order to get a file. As I returned I happened to pass by the desk of the Sergeant-at-Arms. As I did so, he hurled the epithet "insolent pup" at me.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: You betray your lack of understanding of the rights of a member; the usual arbitrary approach!

Mr. Sopha: The member is lucky he did not run him through with the sword.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Since few, if any, people other than myself could possibly have heard

what he said, I chose to ignore the episode and had no intention of pursuing it further.

Since, however, the Sergeant-at-Arms subsequently advised the press outside the House that he had applied this abusive epithet to me, I now have no option but to call it to your attention. The rights and privileges of this assembly will be reduced to a mockery if a servant thereof can speak abusively to a member with impunity. The government obviously does not appreciate the gravity of this matter but I think this should be told.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request you take this grave matter under consideration with a view to taking such steps as may appear appropriate to you to ensure that in future no member of this House will be subjected to insulting behaviour by one of its servants.

I am not asking for public apology, although I think I am clearly entitled to one. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if anyone used that term in here I think I would be entitled to an apology, but when a servant of the House does it, I submit to you it is a grave matter. Notwithstanding the gravity, I do not ask for a public apology, I merely ask that you should speak privately to the Sergeant-at-Arms in order to inform him as to what the nature of his duties are and how they should be carried out.

Mr. Sopha: He should challenge the member to a duel.

Mr. Speaker: Order! As the Sergeant-at-Arms is attached to the department of the Speaker, I may say that I have already taken this matter up with the Sergeant-at-Arms. He is quite aware of his duties in the House. It has been his practice over a number of years, that whenever the Speaker rises and asks a member to take his seat or resume his seat or to sit down, whatever terminology is used, the Sergeant-at-Arms approaches the member's desk and may ask him to please sit down.

Mr. Bryden: It has not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Circumstances such as that have happened many times, the member for Grey South may well recall a particular occasion.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): I remember it well.

Mr. Speaker: And I think other members as well. However, I have spoken to the Sergeant-at-Arms regarding the remarks of the member. I did not know just the circumstances under which it had taken place until I read it in the press myself. We had a short discussion this morning and I am sure it will not happen again.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have your clarification on a point that arose yesterday during the point of order raised by the hon. member for Riverdale. He asked you, "I would like to know whether or not in the rules of this Legislature there is going to be an opportunity other than in the Budget debate to debate the matters which the Attorney General has purported to put before the House as a matter of law" and your comment was, "I would say that there will be an opportunity to arrange for some debate". Could you clarify that?

Mr. Speaker: What the chair had in mind in respect to that statement was the leader of the Opposition's statement that he might bring a motion before the House. This party has another motion to bring before the House and the leader mentioned they were going to raise this matter in that motion, that is why I said at that time I thought there would be another opportunity for perhaps this debate.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you for your clarification.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, 1967

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): moves second reading of Bill 67, The Air Pollution Control Act, 1967.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I heard the voice of the member for Yorkview first, although I am not sure which member stood first.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I have have some remarks about this bill which has been introduced by the hon. Minister of Health and perhaps some questions.

It seems to me, first of all, that I would like to elicit from the hon. Minister some comment as to what standards are envisaged here and how standards might be set. I wonder if it is permissible for the Minister to give us some idea about the setting of standards for this bill and then I would like to make a comment on it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that second reading is traditionally the debate of the bill on principle, not a matter of answering questions concerning specific clauses.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I am quite content with that answer since we will have a chance later on to deal with this in perhaps a little more detail.

But the problem is to deal with this bill properly without understanding what standards are going to be set and how those standards are going to be set. While standards here are mentioned in the regulations, the power to set regulations for automobile exhaust, no standards seem to be outlined or no way of setting standards for the emission of industry, housing, oil burners, all this sort of thing. This was my problem.

Mr. Speaker: This is the second reading, the member realizes that this is on the principle.

Mr. Young: To talk about a principle without knowing how far the bill is going to go and what it really means, is very difficult.

However, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this bill is generally window-dressing, it certainly has every evidence of having a very casual approach on the part of government to this whole problem of air pollution. The time is slow, there is a 28-day lapse here, although there is provision for the Minister to act quickly if the Minister will take that power, and I doubt if that is going to be taken into account because again I am puzzled as to what standards he is going to set up in order to act quickly—this is one of the problems I face in commenting.

There seems to be very little public protection built into this bill. The air pollution advisory board, for example, is to be set up but we do not know who is going to be on it. We do not know how big it may be. Perhaps that advisory board is going to be made up of people such as the chairman of General Motors, of Inco, of a foundry company, of a quarrying company. There is no laying out here, as there was in the medicare bill and in other bills, of just who is going to sit on this board and who are the people who are going to administer the Act when it is passed.

I think this is one of the weaknesses of the total bill, that we do not have this spelled out and we do not know who the people are going to be.

As far as the phasing of a bill is concerned, the Minister talked something about this, and I do not want to spend too long on it. But it looks to me as if he intends, and this he said, that the areas that now have staff and are prepared to go ahead are the areas that are going to take about 18 months to get going.

I think there is a serious flaw here because there are areas like Metropolitan Toronto and the other ones that are mentioned. Metro, particularly, has a competent staff. They know what they want to do and they have run into very great difficulties under present legislation in carrying out their jobs. They have not been able to judge properly because of the lack of standards as to what air pollution really is and they find it very difficult to get convictions.

It seems to me that this Act should recognize the fact that Metropolitan Toronto has a competent staff, that they are ready to go, they are willing to go and that provision should be made here for immediate action for an area like Metropolitan Toronto, so that they can move independently of the implementation in the rest of the province.

I realize that the Minister says that this is one of the first steps in this area, but they are going to be under the jurisdiction of the province when at this point they are ready to move under their own jurisdiction. And so I think provision here ought to be made that they are allowed to move forward, that the Act or the bylaw which they gave to the Minister last fall, and upon which the Minister is now sitting, should be allowed to go forward and that the air pollution people in Metropolitan Toronto should be able to act and act with dispatch.

In this city we have, we are told, about a million sources of air pollution and the situation is extremely serious. I would hope that with the kind of problem we are facing that the Minister would see to it that this matter is dealt with with real dispatch.

I think one of the great problems in the air pollution situation is that many of the companies concerned have not been willing, and perhaps there has been no incentive for them to undertake genuine research in the whole field of cutting down pollution so that the job of the Minister will be minimized. The average oil burner in this city and across this continent is pretty inefficient. We have very inefficient garbage disposal units in our apartments.

There should be a great deal of research carried on and I hope the Minister in his total grants, that he mentioned to universi-

ties, will see to it that research is carried on. Perhaps pressure can be brought to bear on the companies concerned that this research should be stepped up.

As far as his comments about the motor car emissions are concerned, Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to bring before the House one, or perhaps several of the findings which I have here on my desk. I have for example, a letter from one of the authorities in California: a letter from Nicholas Pietras from the California Legislature and another from Senator Tom Carroll.

Mr. Carroll points this out and this is after the Minister has said that he has no intention of implementing the part of the bill concerning the exhausts from motors cars at the present time, because California has had unfortunate experience. And I quote from a letter from Senator Carroll:

> We now have 5,000 licence inspection stations in order to assure the proper operation of control devices, operated privately, as well as random roadside checks by the state highway patrol and control through the registration procedure upon vehicle transfer of ownership. A mandatory inspection programme of pollution control systems may be proposed this year in the Legislature.

Then he sent me a general outline of what they are finding in the whole matter of control devices on motor cars, and he says this:

> Complete control of vehicle emissions as well as all other air pollutants is not technically or economically possible. We admit that. The vehicle emission standards established for the state department of public health are aimed at restoring air quality to about the pre-war II level. Even tighter air standards will go into effect by 1970. The crankcase of the automobile is rich in hydrocarbons and accounts for 25 to 30 per cent of the total from an automobile. Exhaust gases are responsible for another 60 per cent and nearly all the carbon monoxide. Only a small amount of hydrocarbon escapes through fuel tank evaporation or carburetor hot seat loss. The cost of a crankcase device—

This is a blow-by device, Mr. Speaker, which recycles the gasoline which evaporates from carburetors and the other engine systems and burns it.

> The cost of this device now being installed at the factory is approximately $5 and between $12 and $25 to put on used cars. Exhaust systems—

That is the after burner system.

> —on new vehicles costs between $18 and $45. There are at present no exhaust controls approved for used vehicles in the state of California. With both these controls a car will be 96 per cent smog free.

Then the question is asked, are these controls doing any good? Definitely, is the answer. It is estimated that devices presently on cars are removing 450,000 gallons of hydro-carbons and 2,100 tons of carbon monoxide from California's atmosphere every day. California is approximately the size of Canada, populationwise.

Dr. A. J. Hargen-Smith, a world renowned authority on smog has testified that crankcase controls are responsible for reducing the number of eye irritating days in Los Angeles. The board has stipulated these controls must perform effectively for at least 50,000 miles with only one tune-up at 25,000 miles. Very little maintenance above what is normally required by the vehicle manufacturers will be needed for these control systems. However inspection probably will be on an annual basis.

Then as to the question whether motorists will have to replace these exhaust devices regularly, the answer is no. In the case of the exhaust system, the motorist may only be required to undergo a modified tune-up for an engine check. The crankcase device requires a periodic cleaning or replacement of a valve. A new improved valve now makes this chore necessary only once a year.

Now this means finally in this regard, that even with the new exhaust controls one of the worst cars may pollute the air as much as twice as the best cars. Previous surveys of the used car population has shown an even worse range of ten to one. The Minister has indicated that he going to delay action because these are not too satisfactory. But the fact is that even the worst cars, says the statement here, pollute the air only twice as much as the best cars, whereas the relationship used to be about ten to one.

This condition argues strongly for a quick and simple method of checking every car for emissions, compulsory annual inspection would then find these high polluters and attention could be given to lowering their pollution capabilities.

Many of the field problems related to exhaust control systems have been start-up problems, the California people have decided. To rectify these problems, the manufacturers made several product changes and specification changes during the 1966 model year.

The majority of service managers appear to be of the opinion that the exhaust emission control systems have presented less problems than other new systems introduced in the past.

Most service personnel feel that practically all customer complaints relating to the exhaust emission control systems can be solved by either explaining the system and/or repairing engine malfunctions and properly adjusting the engine.

In other words, the California experience, Mr. Speaker, would seem to indicate that there should be no delay as far as we are concerned in mandating the after-burners and the blow-by devices. Most cars today have the blow-by devices now on them and I would think most Canadian cars are now equipped, that is, new cars. But the after-burners are another matter and it seems to me that the time is here for us to take action.

That is backed up by the fact that in the United States, the 1968 models must have the after-burners on them. In other words, the federal authorities of the United States have come to the conclusion that the experience so far in California is a good experience and that the time is here to mandate these devices on all cars sold in the United States.

I know action to recoup the past will be a slow business but the time is here, I think, in Ontario when we ought to mandate the after-burners on the cars sold in this province. Beginning with the 1968 models, they will be on the United States cars and unless we take action here, they will be left off our cars in order to save the few dollars which the motor car industry would have to spend to put them on here.

The industry has consistently fought this battle to prevent safety devices of various kinds on cars and it seems now that this Minister is fighting their battle for them right here in the province of Ontario. There is no question but that this would cost something. It would cost the industry something to build in these devices, it would cost them something to re-design the engine but the engineers believe that the engines can be re-designed so that these extra devices could be built right into the structure and the fabric of the motor itself.

The thing that we must not forget, Mr. Speaker, is that today this industry is willing to spend a billion dollars a year for model changes, to build in obsolescence. It should be willing to spend that much money or a good deal less perhaps, that is all it would take, to build in safety, to build in the devices which would cut down on air pollution across this continent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just say to you that we must in this province not only pass this legislation in respect to the motor car, but that we must take steps immediately to put it into operation. I heard one comment that I pass on to the House, the comment of a person who wondered whether, if we did not take action as the United States is taking action to get the after-burners on the 1968 models, would our cars then be stopped at the border? Would we not be allowed to visit in the United States because we do not comply with the regulations which they have over there? This is a question which the Minister of Health perhaps could answer for us. But it is not out of the realm of possibility.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the observations that I want to put before the House today. I want to point out the difficulties Metropolitan Toronto is facing in not being able to go forward with the bill or the by-law which is framed and given to the Minister. I point out the necessity of cutting down on air pollution and the grave problem which we face in the whole field of air pollution because of the motor vehicle and the need for action in this field to immediately mandate the blow-by devices and the after-burners to make our cars as pollution free as is possible to make them.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the bill before us transfers the responsibility for the inspection of the anti-air pollution measures from the municipalities to the province and under the jurisdiction of the Minister who is presenting the bill. It has always seemed to me that the most appropriate jurisdiction for the application of air pollution legislation would be at the municipal level because it is here that the citizens would have the watering eyes and the other physiological difficulties directly associated with air pollution and would then be able to contact their municipal councillors and those with the immediate responsibility for the control of this pollution.

But it has been the general experience that the municipalities have not responded as strongly as we would hope for the control of air pollution. I think the reasons for this are an important commentary on the purposes of the present bill, because if a municipality were to set high and rigid standards for the control of air pollution, they would then face the difficult situation where certain industries, particularly those which were polluting the

air or might pollute the air, would look to other municipalities that would have less rigid restrictions and thus permit them to carry on with this polluting activity if they were to move away from the first municipality.

The same is true of a good many other requirements for measures associated with water pollution. But these matters then must give us some concern when we look at the problem and see that the first approach would indicate that the authorities at the local level should maintain their position of enforcing the particular control that would give rise to the anti-pollution measures, the abatement measures that we would look forward to.

So our experience in this regard has not been good enough. There is a need for the various municipalities to provide circumstances that will not in any way inhibit industrial expansion in their own area, this inhibition, of course, leading to lost assessment which is so particularly important in the particular terms of municipal financing under which our municipalities are now struggling.

So it has been the decision of the government, and a decision that I would support to bring the control of the inspection particularly of air pollution under the jurisdiction of the central government.

In other words, we are regarding Ontario as a single community in this regard and we are taking into account the fact that because of the economic pressures, the naturally strong economic pressures that have been put on our municipalities of late years, that they have been rendered powerless in order to direct that anti-pollution measures must be brought into their own area and to direct with some rigidity these improvements.

Actually it is the financial situation at the municipal level that has rendered them impotent in many areas to carry out the inspection that we would hope for. Now we find, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health is going to apply these regulations in a general way across the province after a series of about four phases. He is going to allow the municipalities that have taken up the responsibility in the months gone by to continue with their own staff and he will make available regulations that will permit them to continue in this excellent work.

But the phasing of this particular responsibility is something that appears to be strangely slow. It seems to me there are many municipalities which have not accepted the possibility of imposing regulations for air pollution under the old legislation. In very short order indeed the industries in these areas must be brought under the direct control of the provincial government through their inspection processes.

The last speaker has indicated quite clearly that the standards needed to be applied on a province-wide basis cannot be enacted as we read the bill as it is presently before us. The section dealing with the enactment of regulations is by no means specific or clear in the rights that it should give the government to set up proper standards that could give the province-wide control that we require.

I know the Minister wants to comment on this and we will listen to his specific references and answers to this problem with some care. I have never agreed with the Minister himself, or his federal counterpart, when both of them have indicated that they feel that the control of automobile exhaust fumes is not yet technically possible. It seems obvious that the anti-pollution devices on automobiles would require the same servicing as other accessories to remain useful and effective. It seems strange that the province of Ontario, which has these extremely large concentrations of automobiles, would not be in the forefront of the enactments that we require in the communities, particularly the communities with large populations in this province.

Leading also from that, and this matter has been dealt with rather fully this afternoon already, is the requirement that associated with the control that the province is taking on itself under this legislation there be much more extensive research done in the province, particularly associated with the air pollution from these vehicles.

There should be research stations and air testing stations close to the large expressways leading into the big urban centres, particularly Toronto. There has been no research done in our own jurisdiction that would indicate just how dangerous the air pollution from these sources actually is.

There was some indication a few weeks ago that pollution in the Toronto area even surpassed that of the dangerous pollution that has been recognized around the city of New York and there are statistics available from that centre that indicate that the number of deaths during those times of serious pollution was far in excess of that which would take place as a base statistic.

It is difficult to pin down specific deaths to the causes that are directly associated with pollution. It has to be done in an overall

statistical way and none of these studies, as I am informed, have been carried out in this jurisdiction that are of significance. So the problem is very great and growing.

It is, of course, of great importance to the public, who are becoming more and more aware of it. I think that the indication that the Minister has brought in this bill, that he in his special responsibilities in the Department of Health is prepared to take action, is commendable. Although I have grave reservations about the removal of the responsibility from the municipalities, it is obviously our experience in the term that the old legislation has applied that the municipalities have not taken strong enough action—with one or two exceptions.

My view, Mr. Speaker, is that the reason for their inability to act in a proper way was because of the danger that they feel, at the municipal level, that they would drive industry away from their borders and lose the assessment that is so necessary if they are going to function under the particular financial strains that are characteristic of municipal financing in this province.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I concur with my leader in his remarks insofar as this bill is concerned but may I, in congratulating the Minister in bringing it to fruition, suggest that is only a vehicle which will need many more pieces of accessory legislation to put it in gear with the times and with the rest of America. Geography is a very important part in air pollution today and I think that the move is just a start because it is too little, too late at this point.

Other jurisdictions have been making great strides over the past ten years and here we are just getting on the move, as it were, with legislation to make the lives of our people safe.

This morning I got from the meteorological branch of the Island airport a report. I brought this before the House last year and at that point there were people who were not concerned with the threat of air pollution and they more or less laughed the matter down. Again I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Minister, a piece of black filter. I will describe the technology of it. The Minister is probably aware of it, but the reason for this is that it is data published by the national health and welfare to deal with radioactive pollution rather than industrial pollution.

Since atomic testing stopped, the radioactive level has been at a safe level. This black filter here is a 24-hour sample from 11:00 a.m. yesterday to 11:00 a.m. today. A white filter was put in the machine yesterday at 11 o'clock and this is the result of 24 hours of filtering the air in the city of Toronto.

Now the white filter—this is an unused filter for comparison. This is the 24-hour picture in the city of Toronto. In essence, every person, man, woman, or child in the city of Toronto or its environs has lungs as black as this piece of paper, and this is a matter of fact.

The weather during this sample period, we have here the report from the technician in charge, was clear, so that this sample is not as bad as when we have a smoke or a haze and the pollution is so thick you can see it.

The air sample I have shown you is taken in a screen designed so that the pollution caught is what is suspended in the air, rather than particles that are falling out. He has given me some technological data about strontium 90 in the air and how it is involved in the milk and the vegetables we eat and what goes into the human body. But he says that, "I have heard in the United States when an industry is compelled to install controls, that in three years, the by-products from the smoke stack had paid for the equipment and were making money."

When I am through with this, I will put this in the mail and this goes on to Ottawa—a sample for April 11, 1967.

To show you the magnitude of this subject, of which the Minister is well aware, we will show you in many jurisdictions in the United States how many hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent in every area at this point to slow down this great threat to people. Here is a reprint from the Toronto *Telegram* of November 25, and the heading says:

WINDS SAVE US FROM DEADLY SMOG

Only meteorological luck in the form of lake winds saved Metro from struggling under a blanket of air worse than the one which pushed New York air pollution index past the danger point yesterday.

The stagnant air mass which trapped a blanket of smog on New York continued, but fears of a major death hazard have diminished. Officials have said that air pollution remains about one and a half times normal but dropped from the critical level reached last night. A top level alert has been feared.

In Toronto similar conditions would be a rarity occurring about every 20 years, a weather office researcher said yesterday.

> A minor air inversion occurred over Metro two nights out of three, researcher Dr. Ted Munns said. Metro is saved by the breakup of these inversions in daytime, usually one half hour after sunrise.
>
> Smog air inversions occur when a mass of warm air moves in over cooler air and acts as a lid.

He goes on to be technical, but we will all recall this, that the only time it has happened in 20 years was during the grey cup weekend in 1962. We all recall that—we could not finish the football game because of the famous "fog bowl" and Metro at that time, Mr. Speaker, teetered precariously on the brink of a major disaster.

The fog resulted in an unprecedented two day football game and reached the strangling level of intensity of the one which killed 4,000 Englishmen in 1954. This thing that you are trying to put up legislation for in one area in London killed 4,000 people in one day. This is a matter of record.

At dawn each day a breeze wafted in from Lake Ontario—I am talking about the fog at the grey cup—the fog was wafted away from a breeze from Lake Ontario scattering the concentrated pollutants. He says that it probably will not happen again for 20 years:

> Now Toronto's fog, given the notoriety of 1962 grey cup, is compared to both Los Angeles and New York when it strikes. In Los Angeles the level of sulphur dioxide in the atmosphere reaches 0.3 parts per million parts of air, and this level has often been reached in Toronto.

Now the article goes on to state that:

> In fact, for 30 minutes on the 1962 grey cup weekend, there were 2.1 parts of sulphur dioxide per million parts of air in the city's atmosphere and had the smog lasted another day or so, the situation would have been serious, Dr. Munn said, and even during the relatively short period of smog, a marked increase was noted in the admissions to the hospital for sick children in Toronto.

So we know of the seriousness of this threat in the Metro area. We have seen a visual of what every one of us has in our lungs, having been down here four or five or six months a year, and we see what the lungs of the children of Toronto are like, and so the Minister has taken steps to start the ball rolling to try and control this monster.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): He is interfering with the steps that have already been taken.

Mr. Sargent: I suggest that he is setting up the framework to work on solving the problem, but to show what is being done in the United States so far as costs are concerned, shows how far we are behind the times in this.

They are going to spend $300 billion on this problem in the next 10 years, or $30 billion a year, in the United States, and we ask ourselves, "What is going on in Ontario?"

My colleague mentioned the automotive field. General Motors says that they will spend $150 million in the next 10 years on this problem. The Ford Motor Company says that it will spend $90 million in the next three or four years, compared with the $42 million they have spent, Mr. Chairman, in the last 15 years. They have been spending $3 million a year on this and here in Ontario, we are now becoming conscious that there is a need for this.

The Ford Motor Company figures that it will cost them $6.5 million to equip its foundries in the Rouge River plant for 11 dust collectors.

Insofar as the muffler costs on cars is concerned, the authorities tell us that it is going to cost us, as, starting next year, all new cars must be equipped with exhaust controls or engine modifications that will cost from $20 to $55 per car.

The Minister of Energy and Resources Management could tell us whether or not there are one million cars sold in Canada each year—I do not know whether that is true or not—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): A little high, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: If we are talking about one million cars, we are talking about $55 million per year in exhaust controls in this thing.

The United States public health service states, that about 60 per cent of the dirt and fumes, at least, in the air, comes from transportation, and chiefly autos. I am told it was suggested that the government should allow a 20 per cent credit against corporate income taxes for investments made in anti-pollution equipment.

Kaiser Steel in California claims to have the cleanest steel mill in the world and their control devices cost them $17 million, and the

annual operating cost of the equipment comes to $400,000—in one mill. Kaiser is spending $150,000 a year on its air control and research into this problem. And the deadline of December, 1968 has been set for the observance of all strict controls over waterborne wastes—that is not the problem here.

In Kellogg, Idaho, the Bunker Hill Company is spending $3 million to extract sulphur from gases in their plant. The Crown Zellerbach Corporation plans to close a paper mill—and this would be a sorry plight for some of your friends in the north in the paper mill business if they had to do that—Crown Zellerbach plan to close a paper mill, because a company official indicates that other mills are slated for closing where pollution is just too costly to lick.

The S. D. Warren Company plan to spend $1 million to control air pollution next year. A Rumford, Maine, plant, spent more than $4 million building a plant insured against pollution.

So we go on, Mr. Speaker, to show that there is a bill here that meets a very urgent need, but I suggest that possibly we have been very late in coming to meet this problem, because this shows today that the people of Toronto are getting a bad deal so far as control of air pollution material here.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, this bill represents another in a series of fumbles by the government and the Minister on the question of air pollution. I think we can find the reason for these persistent fumbles by looking back at what the Minister in charge, the hon. Minister of Health, had to say on the subject not many years ago—in December of 1961, to be precise. I would like to quote one sentence from the *Hansard* of 1961-62 at page 263. I am quoting words of the Minister:

> I am dreadfully afraid of imposing sanctions on industry to control, as someone has put it rather crudely, belching smokestacks at the expense of full lunch pails.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Who said that?

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister of Health. As a matter of fact, he got quite a story in the press at the time. That statement, in my opinion, sums up the attitude which the government has taken to air pollution control down through the years, and this is the reason why we have—at least this is a contributing reason—come to the very serious situation that now exists.

This attempt to create a false antithesis between clean air and full lunch pails is typical of the government. It is a typical device that has been used in many contexts. It used to be used with regard to industrial safety—that it was better for men to have jobs than to be safe on the jobs.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that it is possible for men both to have jobs and to be reasonably safe on the job—certainly to have such protection as science has provided.

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps the member is straying from principles embodied in this bill. He is repeating much of his former testimony and I think if he would come back and discuss the principles that are embodied in the bill, rather than the subject matter which he has been discussing—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would call your attention to the fact that I quoted one sentence from a past utterance of the Minister and, in my opinion, this is quite relevant to the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I have not heard you mention any principles involved in the bill.

Mr. Bryden: Well, the bill is a bill for the purpose of controlling air pollution. In my opinion, the record of the government in that area has been most inadequate. Unfortunately, as I hope to show, if I may be permitted to prepare the way, this bill is not going to improve the situation. In fact, in some respects it is going to make it worse, but I think it is necessary for me to outline, as briefly as I can, the situation that the bill is supposed to be attacking.

At any rate, I suggested that the attitude of the government, which carries forward even to this day, is demonstrated in the false antithesis that the Minister drew between clean air and full lunch pails a few years ago.

The choice, actually, Mr. Speaker, is not between clean air and full lunch pails but between clean air and full coffins. I think the evidence and I think it is properly called evidence, that the member for Grey North placed before the House a moment or two ago, regarding the seriousness of the problem, indicates that I do not exaggerate when I put the choice before us in those terms.

A few years ago, when this matter was before us by way of amendments to the then Air Pollution Control Act, which is now

to be repealed, the position the government took was that this was strictly a municipal responsibility. I well recall the little homilies we used to hear so frequently and at great length at that time, that the government believed in local autonomy and it was respecting the principle of local autonomy by enacting, at that time, sir, that the matter would continue to be under local control.

We in the Opposition, certainly in this group, and I believe in the Liberal group, although I am not quite sure—I have not checked it—took the position that since pollution was not a respecter of municipal boundaries, the matter could be handled adequately only at the provincial level. To talk of municipal autonomy or local autonomy was simply to divert attention from the main issue.

We argued then, and were of course snowed under on the issue, that this was a provincial matter and the provincial government ought to take responsibility.

The provincial government refused to take responsibility. It insisted that the matter must be dealt with by the municipalities. As a result of those decisions taken by the government some years ago, some municipalities of this province did in fact take the responsibility seriously. The Minister's statement on first reading of the bill indicated that four municipalities at this time have air pollution control systems in existence.

The municipality of Metropolitan Toronto has an active, well qualified staff in charge of this matter. Now what is the Minister proposing to do? He proposes to move in and disrupt what these four municipalities are now doing. His statement indicates that these are the only four municipalities in the province which have done anything in this matter under the responsibilities imposed upon them by earlier legislation.

So why does he act here? Why does he not start to move in in those areas where the municipalities have done nothing? Some major centres, I may say: Ottawa, Windsor, London, Sudbury, the Lakehead—and when I mention some of those, I will not make any comments about any individual one of them, but we can all recognize that at least some of them suffer quite seriously from the problems of air pollution.

No, the Minister does not move in there. We would be happy if, in bringing forth this bill, his plan was to act in the areas where nothing had been done, but he is not going to do that. He is going to move in where something is being done.

He is proposing a major administrative change in an area such as Metropolitan Toronto and Hamilton, where work is being done. Major administrative changes are almost bound to be disruptive, Mr. Speaker. And why does the Minister decide that he will disrupt instead of trying to extend the work already being done in some municipalities?

I would suggest to him that what he ought to do is to build up a staff that matches the competence and qualifications of the staff already in existence in Metro Toronto and Hamilton and use that staff to bring up standards in other municipalities where work really needs to be done. Then as his programme develops and he begins to achieve the same level of competence as Metro Toronto, it would be possible to absorb the Metropolitan Toronto system into the provincial system without disruption.

Unfortunately the way he plans to go about it, he is going to maximize disruption. He is not going to advance the cause of air pollution control, he is going to set it back once again. That is all this government has ever done, set back the cause of air pollution control on the basis of phoney arguments such as the one I quoted from a speech of the Minister of a few years ago.

The only criticism I would make with regard to Metro Toronto and Hamilton—I think what I say is applicable to Hamilton, I am not sure, I know that it is applicable to Metro Toronto because I am familiar with the situation here. Perhaps I should confine my remarks to that with which I am familiar. But the only criticism I have with regard to air pollution control in Metro Toronto does not apply to the municipal council or to the air pollution control division in Metro Toronto. They are doing the best they can but they suffer two disabilities: First, lack of financial support from the provincial government, second lack of adequate authority under provincial law.

This is the only difficulty in Metro Toronto for the present. If the Minister would remedy those defects, if he would approve the bylaw that Metro Toronto has had before him for about six months and which he has been sitting on, if he would do those things, we could continue to proceed to build on the progress already made in this area. But no, he is going to come in and disrupt a going organization and leave other areas with nothing at all, for a period, he suggested in his statement, of about 18 months.

Mr. Speaker, the programme he has suggested he is going to implement under this bill makes no sense at all. One cannot perhaps object to the principle enunciated in the bill of provincial control over this problem, but one can certainly object, and I object most strenuously to the plans the Minister has announced for the implementation of the principle contained in the bill.

The principle is sound. We have always argued in this group that the provincial government should assume responsibility and that no one else can discharge the responsibility adequately but we certanly do not see any point, at this primitive stage of the development of provincial facilities, that going concerns like the air pollution control system in Metro Toronto should be disrupted.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, to indicate what I would call the lack of seriousness with which the Minister has always approached this problem and with which he apparently continues to approach it, he has calmly advised this House that he plans to do precisely nothing about what is now recognized to be one of the most important sources, in fact perhaps the most important single source of air pollution in modern cities, and that is the automobile exhaust.

He tells us that someday in the sweet bye and bye he will undoubtedly get around to doing something about it. But for the present, he will do nothing. Great clouds hang over Toronto every morning, clouds of pollution, emanating from the exhausts of thousands of automobiles, and he is going to do nothing about it, he says, until some time in the future.

Actually, if I may put my own interpretation on his remarks, and I think it is an interpretation that can properly be drawn from them, he is not going to do anything until the automobile manufacturing industry gives him permission to do something. His attitude is precisely the same as that of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett). This government cannot do anything until it gets permission f morDetroit. That is his attitude and of course he retails all the phoney arguments from Detroit.

You know the automobile industry has dragged its feet on every safety measure that was ever suggested. They did nothing until public opinion forced them to act and they could no longer resist it.

It is the same with air pollution. An afterburner has been developed which is effective up to a point. Everyone admits that it is not 100 per cent effective. It is effective up to a point, and I say in view of the seriouness of the problem, when we have devices which are effective up to a point, we should use them.

But no, Detroit does not want to be bothered with them. It is much more concerned about getting some jazzy new type of styling. It could not care less about the health of the people, or indeed about the safety of the people. All it is concerned with is to see how it can get another piece of chrome, or something that can be considered as *avant garde* in styling. That is the basic concern of the automobile industry and this is the concern with which this government always goes along.

Fortunately there are other governments on this continent which are more responsive to the needs of the people and more mindful of their responsibilities to the people. They have taken action in this field just as they have taken action with regard to automobile safety; possibly not as much action as some of us would like, but at least they have taken action. This government always drags its feet and now on the question of after-burners it continues to drag its feet.

What is the Minister's excuse? He says, in addition to the fact that the devices are not fully effective, that after a year they cease to be effective at all, in fact if they are not properly operating, they might even increase pollution. I think that is essentially what he said in his statement.

Now Mr. Speaker, I think this government has to face up to the fact that in this province, as in many other jurisdictions, we have to establish a system of annual inspection of automobiles. If such a system were established, then there would be no problem whatever, in having the after-burner devices which are installed on automobiles inspected at the same time as the annual inspection. If they were found to be defective, then the same sort of order should be issued to a motorist as would be issued if he was found to have defective brakes, or defective lights, or any other defective mechanical defect in his automible which could affect public safety. The matter could be handled quite readily. If we had a system of annual inspection, the after-burners could be inspected and proper instructions could be given for them to be repaired and maintained, if a motorist was not willing to provided for maintenance and repair on his own initiative.

These things can be done. The only trouble is that Detroit does not want them done and this government is unwilling to offend Detroit. This is what it boils down to.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, to sum up, I approach this bill with mixed feelings. I think I fairly stated at the beginning that it represents another fumble, in a series of fumbles, by this government. In the abstract it is sound enough, but in the concrete context within which it is presented to this House, the past record of the government, and the Minister's explanation of what he has in mind by way of implementing the bill, the principle is really defeated. We will not make a step forward under this bill in the foreseeable future in controlling air pollution. On the contrary we will be taking a step back and in my opinion, that is most regrettable.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, in the first place I would like to congratulate the Minister on proposing this bill on air pollution and you know of my interest in—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): It took 10 years to do anything.

Mr. Cowling: I was just going to tell you about that. I was just going to mention that for you. Thanks very much.

You know of my continuing interest in the matter of air pollution. I am not going to discuss the proposed after-burners on automobile exhausts because I have a private member's bill on the order paper to do with this matter.

The only thing I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, is that the matter is a serious one and I think that anything we can do to relieve the contamination from the exhaust fumes, particularly in Metropolitan Toronto, would be very important.

I can foresee, in the not too distant future, where it might be necessary to eliminate private motor vehicles in the downtown section of Metropolitan Toronto, in order to relieve this situation.

No question about it—the congestion and the cars are certainly adding to this unclean air in this area.

Mr. Singer: Is that part of the government programme?

Mr. Cowling: Well, we will work on that just as soon as we can.

Polluted air, of course, knows no boundaries and that is one of the reasons why it is maybe better to have control at the provincial level, although at the same time, I think that where a municipality is doing a good job, that maybe in some way, there should be permissive legislation to let the municipality continue to do that job, under supervision, of course, of the province.

As I understand it, in this bill, The Department of Health is taking over full control of the problem in the province. That might be something that could be considered. In Metropolitan Toronto, it is a fact that the citizens pay out annually about $60 or $75 each for what is happening to their homes—that is the dirt, the necessity to repaint and to maintain their homes—which would not be nearly as great if we did not have air pollution.

But you just cannot blow it away overnight. It is something that takes time to control. The hon. member for Parkdale said that our air pollution report was submitted in 1957. That is a fact. But many of the recommendations contained in that report have been put into effect by the government and more will be done.

I think that all the citizens of our great province are entitled to breathe clean air. It is just as simple as that and anything that can be done to bring about that situation is good. In Metropolitan Toronto, despite a very active programme—by our Metropolitan Toronto air pollution control department—a very active programme, one of the most progressive on the continent—they are just keeping even with the problem.

Many of us can well remember the old steam engines along the lakefront; smoke engines were polluting the air and really making a mess of things. They, of course, went out with the arrival of the diesel.

Although the first concern of a person is to remove the polluted air that you can see, that is the smoke and the soot and the dust—and I think in a great many cases, that has been done—I also think that the more important problems, and certainly the ones that we have to deal with now, are those pollutants that you cannot see, but nevertheless you are breathing every hour of every day in the more congested areas.

It is all very well for the people living in outlying areas and on the beautiful farms of Ontario to say, "Well really, we are not too much interested in air pollution; our air is fine here on the 'back 40' and we are doing all right," but in our studies and in our committee, Mr. Speaker, we found very definitely that bad air does affect livestock and it does affect the crops in areas close to large metropolitan cities. So that everybody has an interest in doing something about air pollution.

In many areas the local authorities have set aside a week which is to be known, and has been known, as "clean air week" and I think that anything we can do through the press, the radio, television and any other way, to have the interest and the support of the general public to a programme of clean air, and I like the use of the word "clean" air, rather than air pollution, it sounds cleaner, I think anything that the public can do—

Mr. Trotter: Is that part of the Tory programme?

Mr. Cowling: Clean air, yes. We certainly have had a lot of the other kind in here lately. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the idea of the province taking a more active interest in this programme is very important.

We found in our studies that there is only one effective way to bring about a good programme of clean air, and that is to get tough.

For example, we visited places such as Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh used to be known as the smoky city but not any more, it is one of the finest cities in the land and the reason is that they set up an air pollution control programme in Pittsburgh and they got tough. They simply told people that they cannot contaminate the air, that the citizens want to breathe clean air.

Mr. Sargent: Where have the people been in the last five years in Ontario?

Mr. Cowling: I am talking about Pittsburgh. They cleaned the air, they spent the money that was necessary to make their operation clean. And it can be done. People are not going to move out of an area because we have a tough air pollution control programme; they are not going to do that, they are going to cooperate and spend the money.

We recommended that in place of having the programme under the Minister of Health in The Department of Health, we set up a separate autonomous commission, as autonomus as you can get, but a commission, such as the Hydro commission, and other commissions, to look after the problem.

Our committee felt that in this way we could be a little sterner, a little more effective possibly than it would be in The Department of Health. I am quite prepared to say that through this Minister, who has an abiding interest in the problem through his department and with his advisory committee that will be set up, we can bring about a very effective programme.

My only plea, Mr. Speaker, is that we get on with this job as quickly as possible to provide the citizens of Ontario with the kind of clean air they deserve and the sooner, the better.

Mr. Trotter: The member for High Park has said that he believes the Minister has an abiding interest in this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite convinced after observing what this government has been doing, having to do with clean air, that the Minister has hoped and prayed that the problem would blow away. The problem has not blown away, it is worse than it has ever been before. All we have to do is to read that report that the member for High Park helped to prepare, and of which committee he was the chairman, to know that from polluted air, not from clean air, we are far more apt to suffer from lung cancer and various diseases.

If, by this bill, the Minister really means business, I would be extremely happy that this is being done. I agree with the principle that in this province the provincial government should be responsible instead of the muncipalities. It stands to reason that the province as a whole, with one or two exceptions in the larger centres like Toronto and Hamilton, is far more able to hire the personnel who have to be well trained—and is far more able to have an overall policy, not only for the province itself within the province, but in dealing with neighbouring Canadian provinces and dealing with the states of the United States.

Admittedly, this is an overall problem, but when you have jets the size they are today—and they are getting larger—when you have machines of this type flying around, one jet can cause more pollution in one hour than a thousand cars can in one day. So the more air traffic we have, the more serious the problem will become.

If you read the report on pollution by the committee that the hon. member for High Park chaired, you will learn that there is no type of air pollution that cannot be solved, that this is a problem which can be solved if we wish to do something. That report was excellent, Mr. Speaker, the pity of it is that it came out 10 years ago and in essence, despite a certain façade that something was being done, it has been gathering dust for years.

On various occasions we have spoken up on this side of the House and referred to that report and have emphasized that this was

really a problem for the province, not for the municipalities. With all due credit—and let us bear in mind that Toronto has done a considerable amount if you drive along the Gardiner expressway in the morning you realize Toronto has an awfully long way to go.

And as you enter Hamilton, all you have to do is take a deep breath and smell Hamilton harbour to know that you have a very great deal to do with this problem.

The fact that it would take this government 10 years to finally come out with a bill like this reminds me of the time we were discussing flags and I suggested a flag for The Department of Health—snail rampant on a field of red tape. I still think that this sort of symbolizes the rate at which this department moves.

Assume then that the province passes this bill and uses some common sense in incorporating the good work that the city of Toronto and the city of Hamilton have done, because here is your hard core of well-trained men in the province of Ontario. Assume this is done, and I emphasize the importance of having well-trained men, because if you get into these smaller municipalities, so often it is the retired politician who is appointed as an inspector.

What you need is someone who really knows what the problem of having clean air is all about. When it is on the local level they do not have properly trained help. Of course, there are larger centres that can afford to pay the decent wages that such people should have.

Then again, you must have the law that will enforce the Act. It is one thing to say you must not do this and haul them into court and give them a fine, because the fines that are being doled out for polluting the air and for polluting water are so small that it is almost like a licence to go ahead and do it. The fines are going to have to be substantial, otherwise there is no use in passing the law.

Not too long ago, we saw fines in the city of Toronto—I think it was for polluting the Don River, but in principle this is the same thing, be it air or water—that were so small on a very major company that it was ridiculous, insofar as enforcement of this type of law is concerned.

I will be very interested to see, Mr. Speaker, what kind of regulations this bill is going to have attached to it, because if the regulations are typical of what has been passed by this government in recent years, they are not going to mean very much.

So I say this in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we approve the bill in principle but we have very serious reservations that this really is going to meet the problem because the government does not have the will or the desire to do it. If the Minister had the will or desire to do it or that abiding interest that the member for High Park talked of, it could have been done long ago.

But any government that takes 10 years after having an expensive report filed, shows that it simply is not interested in this problem. The only reason it is even going through the façade of showing they are doing something with this bill is that the average municipality has not taken an interest and at the same time, the problem of air pollution has become so serious that it is becoming a major health and industrial crisis here in the province of Ontario, in this country, and literally throughout the world.

So I do hope that the Minister will show far more effort and more abiding interest in this problem than he has done, and this government has done, in the last ten years.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Minister for this bill, The Air Pollution Control Act. We all realize that it is not completely new. We have had air pollution control legislation, but this is being updated and reinforced in many areas and it is going to have a tremendous impact on the control of air pollution in our province.

I spoke earlier this year to a resolution which stood in my name on air pollution control and I have been interested to see how many areas or points that were in my resolution appear to be taken into this bill or there are items in the bill which can very well embrace the suggestions that I had in here, or some of them.

One of them, of course, was the regional control and as has been mentioned here several times this afternoon, I see no other possible way of controlling air pollution except by regional control.

When the member for Woodbine, who seemed to be rather poorly informed, was complaining about Toronto not being allowed to go ahead and operate on its own, he seemed to fail to take into consideration the fact that probably a considerable amount of the pollution that the people of Toronto are suffering from comes from Hamilton, or conceivably Kitchener or Brantford. Oshawa

probably is being polluted to quite an extent from Toronto and other points.

Only an area control can be at all effective to do anything of any great account in connection with air pollution control.

I am pleased to see there are provisions for the carrying out of research and the release of regular reports on pollution levels. I do not know to what extent this will be done. Perhaps when the Minister makes his statement on this, or during the committee of the whole House, by question we may find out what his intentions are in that regard.

But I know this is an extremely important thing and more of it must be done, not only to provide industries with the information they require in their efforts to control pollution, but the general public as well, because I have noted in my resolution, as I spoke to my resolution, so much harm can be done by people lacking proper information, and I see the provision is in here for the regular release of reports on pollution levels and research into it too.

Another point that I had in my resolution which I suggested should be done by the federal government, may in fact be partially taken care of. At least, I see through the work of The Department of Health that they may be approaching the time when the province and the federal government can together establish national criteria into the cause of pollution and its effect upon the individual. In spite of what someone said this afternoon, and as several have said they are doing nothing and they have done nothing. This is so much hogwash—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Knox: This department has done a tremendous amount of work right in our area at home. I hear them speak about the great work that is being done by the air pollution control people in Toronto and in Hamilton, but I never heard them speak of one thing they have done, not one single thing. I do not think they know, they just speak about it.

Mr. Young: Well, the Minister is still sitting on their by-law.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): We are glad they are working in the member's area.

Mr. Knox: In our area they are doing tremendous things in conjunction with the industries. They have had for 14 years now, the Ontario research foundation constantly on the job there, collecting air samples and analyzing them and working with the industries who have spent millions of dollars. This is a costly business, controlling air pollution. They have spent millions of dollars in order to control the pollution of the air because, of course, the petro-chemical industry is a high potential for pollution. These people are aware of it and they want to do something about it.

Not only that, but they are erecting a meteorological tower in our area which is an extremely costly thing. They have many air sampling stations or camps, or whatever you like to call them, where they can analyze the levels and so on of nine contaminants at a time. These are not just small, little diddledy things, these are expensive things. I suppose those air sampling stations and the tower will cost $200,000 at least, not counting the cost of operation.

Not only that, but there is a study about to get under way. I do not think it is quite under way yet. I know there was a meeting in Washington just last week with reference to a study of the Detroit-Windsor-Sarnia area.

Mr. Trotter: Because it is so bad.

Mr. Knox: They are going to start in here at least. As I understand their terms of reference, it is to deal with the effects of air contaminants on the health of the individual. This is a very long-range programme. It has been said that perhaps one may live in an area for 20 years and find there is no effect on one's health, no noticeable effect. But in another 20 years the air he is breathing today may begin to produce bad effects. This is the sort of thing the international joint commission is going to undertake. This is the kind of research that has not been done anywhere. It is time it was done and it is being done. The real one plugging for it is The Department of Health right here. Mr. Drowley of The Department of Health is likely to sit on that and he is going to be one of the most important people on that study committee.

So things are being done, and this is an absolute necessity. At the present time, as I pointed out in my resolution, they think that air pollution has an effect on our health.

Mr. Trotter: They do not think, they know.

Mr. Knox: No, they do not know.

Mr. Trotter: They certainly do.

Mr. Knox: They know things like this that people living in certain areas have more of a

certain kind of illness than people living in another area.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The member is refusing to face the facts.

Mr. Knox: This is all they know.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Think positively for a change.

Mr. Knox: They want to find out what contaminant it is that causes this, and over what period of time, and to what sort of people. This is the kind of information they must have. This is a start apparently, and I suppose that when they have begun to compile information of that nature, then perhaps it may be time for me to expect the federal government to produce some national criteria.

There is one other thing that is very necessary and which I think this bill may cover. I pointed this out in my resolution. It is very, very necessary that industries have some realistic standards to serve as guidelines because they require these when they go to draw up plans for a new industry, or they require to know what may be needed of them by the way of new installations over the next few years. They have to have this sort of thing for proper planning. I think there is a possibility that this bill may produce that, and I hope the Minister may comment on that sort of thing.

I know there were a couple of other things in my resolution but I feel sure only the federal government can produce them. I know that this Department of Health has been pressuring them to do so for many years and will continue to do so.

I hope that more research will be done. The bill indicates that they will make grants to universities and other organizations for research and the training of persons in the field of air pollution. This has been going on, but we need more of it. I hope it will be stepped up. We need more research done, and we need more people trained in the field of air pollution.

I do not want to say too much about the automobile part of it. I think that we should get controls on the automobile industry as fast as possible, for air pollution. It has been said that this is one of the major sources of air pollution. But at this point in time, I am very glad that the Minister of Health is not going to make me spend $55 for something to put on my car when we are very doubtful if it is of any use, and, in fact, may be increasing the pollution. I am glad he did not say to me: "You spend that $55 and I will find out later whether it is all right or not."

Mr. Young: Is the government of the United States wrong?

Mr. MacDonald: They have been studying the problem.

Mr. Knox: I have done a lot of research on this and there is an awful lot the government in the United States does not know, believe me, and this is one of the things they do not know.

Mr. MacDonald: Not on the fact. It is a little uninformed.

Mr. Young: I gave the facts from California this afternoon.

Mr. Knox: No, the ill-informed one sits beside you. But I want to say that I hope and I feel sure that my hope will be realized that The Department of Health will now pursue vigorously the air pollution control in this province. I think we have the vehicle here. Somebody else mentioned, I think, the member for Grey North, that very likely there would have to be changes made in this and other things added to it as time went on.

Now, sir, I suspect that is likely, but we have at least a basis here for good control of air pollution in the province of Ontario, as far as the province itself can go. We have the men to do it, they can supply the leadership and I have every faith that it will be done. I want to congratulate the Minister on bringing this bill in.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on this very serious problem. I come from an area of the province that has some of the largest industrial abrasive plants in the world. One plant that I make reference to is the Norton Company of Chippawa. They have a very large plant there with many stacks. For the past couple of years, when an industry was picked on by the public they talked about moving out. We were assured before a tour of that plant that there was no such thought in their mind. They wanted to cooperate with the authorities in the village. They wanted to cooperate with the province and they wanted us to know their story.

They spent in the year 1966, $167,000 to put in a dust collector. Mind you, as there are many stacks there, they only covered half a dozen of them. With this particular installation, they cleaned up the pollution

over one arc furnace and Jack K. Shurie, the manager of engineering services took us through this tour with the council. To show the picture, I have the clipping of the plant when it is belching out smoke over the small village, in an area where people will not build their homes. Then they gave us another picture of the same portion of that plant with the dust collector on it. They have cleaned up the situation 100 per cent.

The problem that they have to contend with is competing in the world market with their products. They want to clean up this nasty situation; that applies to all of the industrial or abrasive plants in Niagara Falls, such as North American Cyanamid. They have another product similar to this, I believe the carborundum plant and the Norton Company. I again, Mr. Speaker, took the matter up with the Minister himself. I realize this serious problem can be quite a political football. But we in this House have a problem to contend with on behalf of all the citizens of the province of Ontario and therefore I have no fault to find with the government for this bill.

I believe that industry wants to assist us by spending that kind of money. This year, they will spend an additional $150,000 and I understand their programme in the next five or six years is going to amount to approximately $1.5 million to clean up the smoke and the dirt and the nuisance of this particular plant in that area.

They are competing, as I said, on the world market with their product. The price must go up, the money must come from some area. I understand it to this point that they have built these particular installations which are considered as a capital investment in that particular plant, and so they can write it off over a period of years.

Industry could be encouraged to build such installations and have it considered an expense against that business, because it is not a profit-making section of their plant. They are cleaning up a situation that we all want cleaned up and therefore I think there should be a tax incentive. How do you do that? I know not how the Minister or this government will approach it. It could be a rapid write-off in a short period of time, it could be considered an expense against the business rather than a capital investment. This would assist them in the projects they are working on. As I mentioned to the Minister the other day I am sure I am not revealing a confidence, because this is over and above board to the hon. Minister. The people in these industries who would like to work to that end, ought to have the opportunity to come before the Minister and discuss their problem and how best to clean up this situation.

I hate to refer to our neighbours to the south of us, but in New York state I understand they have a rapid write-off and they have a tax incentive. They encourgae the industry to clean up a nasty situation they have have had to wrestle with for many years. Someone has brought this to the attention of the industries, so they now admit that they are doing something about pollution; they have brought these conditions about and want to remedy them. But look at it from their side of the table.

If they are going to compete with other industries who are not cleaning up their problem—and this bill may bring that about—this bill may encourage others, by way of a penalty if they do not. If this bill is designed to do that, they are on the right track. I believe that the public relations people of this government, and I think you have many of them, should sit down and talk with these people and say they will encourage you with two thoughts in mind. I do not make reference only to the plant in Chippawa, I make reference to every plant in the province of Ontario. If these industrialists who are helping us develop this country are going to go about this in a businesslike way, I think you, the government of this province, ought to sit down with them and give them the concessions that they believe they ought to get under these circumstances.

It is not a difficult problem. They are happy to sit down with you and talk about it. I would like to pass these pictures over to the Minister just to show him what one big industry can do with a small amount of money. As a matter of fact, the chamber of commerce, and many chambers of commerce throughout the whole province, are looking at this thing in the same way I am—in a very businesslike way. You ought not compel them to put their product on the market at a higher rate, because then they will not sell it. This is the first step to chasing industries out of the area. But if you can sit down with the industries and discuss it with them and take up the problem in such a way that they are encouraged by this government by a tax incentive, or expenditure not considered capital, but an expense against the business, then I think you have solved the major part of your problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have met with the member from Halton, I believe, the county warden there, the representative of the city of Niagara Falls and many others who have sat with this

hon. Minister and discussed this very problem. If he has ever been conscientious and sincere about any particular thing, this is a good example.

I say this clearly to you, Mr. Speaker. These are men of means—these are the men and the industries who have developed our country. They want to work with this government and I think this government ought to show them that they too want to help by giving them the cooperation of which I speak—that is, an incentive to go on developing their industries in our province.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have some remarks on this bill. If it is in order, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 16, by Mr. D. C. MacDonald.

RESOLVED,

That, this Legislature expresses approval of the general objective of the Duff-Berdahl report, the Canadian association of university teachers and the Canadian union of students, that changes in university government should be made to replace the traditional corporate structure with that of a community of scholars where students can develop their intellectual capacities to the fullest extent, but regrets the modesty of their recommendations to achieve that objective in a democratic society.

To this end the Legislature would:

1. Establish procedures by which the intellectual economy of universities will be maintained and strengthened, and that of other post-secondary institutions will be developed, consistent with democratic accountability to this Legislature.

2. Inquire into the role, make up and functioning of traditional boards of governors, and the advantages which might flow from a unitary structure of university government.

3. That existing boards of governors should be representative of the administration, faculty and students and of the community at large, rather than just the business sector.

4. Encourage existing boards of governors in universities and other post-secondary institutions to open their regular sessions to the public and press; and enact legislation to eliminate individuals sitting on the board of governors from using their position for financial gain to themselves or their corporate associations.

5. Establish an inquiry to consider ways and means of applying research on the learning process to Ontario post-secondary educational institutions: this commission to be composed of prominent educators appointed by the government, university teachers nominated by the Ontario council of university faculty associations, and outstanding students nominated by the Ontario region of the Canadian union of students.

6. Encourage initiative for all the changes implicit in the above proposals to come from within the universities, consistent with the autonomy and academic freedom which must be safeguarded in a democratic society.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the specifics of the resolution, I would like to make some general comments with regard to the position of universities in our society today.

In my view, the university has become the key institution in modern society. For the first time in history, it has become the most influential organization in both our social and economic life.

The intensified application of scientific and technical knowledge to human affairs has made immense contributions to productivity and human welfare, and brought about a breath-taking rate of social change. As the focal point in the accumulation and distribution of this knowledge, the university, flanked by a growing range of other post-secondary educational institutions, has become the dominant organization in our society.

For obvious reasons, therefore, it is vitally important that in their structure and in their attitude toward society, universities should be in tune with the times. Unfortunately, they are not completely so, and explosive forces are driving them to change.

In the past universities were private institutions. Their financing was a combination of philanthropy, religious and secular, with modest support from governments and student fees. But what universities did, what resources they had, whether they survived at all, was not primarily the concern of government.

"To put it in crude politico-economic terms," Dr. J. A. Corry, chairman of the Ontario committee of university presidents, has said, "the university belonged in the private sector of life; it was a matter for private enterprise."

Today, there is a fundamental change. The only ready source for the financial needs of universities is the public purse—as indicated by the fact that 85 per cent of their budgets are now met by government grants. Education is widely acknowledged as the most important single investment in our economic life. Universities are, therefore, of vital concern to governments.

"The community and the university are now fated to much closer relationships than ever before," concludes Dr. Corry, and he asks:

> What will happen to the ivory towers and the dreaming spires? We can approach an answer to this question if we see clearly what has happened.
>
> The individualistic age afforded a very wide freedom and independence to universities because they were thought to be serving only needs and aspirations of the individuals. That age has ended and has been succeeded by a collectivist age in which, in one department after another, "the invisible hand" fails to perform the work expected of it. All sorts of goals are now determined collectively instead of being left for individuals to discern and achieve.
>
> To be specific in illustration, health goals fixed by governments bring in health insurance and medicare schemes. We are now in the process of counting up how many doctors, nurses and other paramedical personnel will be needed over the next decade to make these schemes work effectively.
>
> Collective measures will have to be taken to ensure that these are recruited and educated in sufficient numbers. This is only one instance of how collectively determined goals will present targets for the university to fulfil. The university, now inescapably dependent on resources supplied collectively, i.e. large government grants for capital and operating purposes, will have to come to terms.
>
> Coming to terms does not necessarily mean governmental control of what is taught and how. A university may be obliged to educate doctors, but be left—and if governments are wise will be left—free to decide what to teach and how. But it clearly will mean governmental influences and social pressures never experienced in the individualistic age.

Now, I have quoted those views of Dr. Corry, partly because in my view they are "dead on" in their analysis of the fundamental change in the position of universities in society, but partly because when it comes to conclusions which emerge from the analysis, in my view the position of many is simply out-of-date, including that of many university presidents.

For example, in regard to university organization, the traditional corporate structure is in itself obviously out of tune with the new age and its demands. Unless it is reshaped along the lines of a community of scholars, unrest within universities will grow, and the energies of the whole university will be distracted from its important work.

For example, in regard to university relationships with government, our challenge is to establish procedures by which the intellectual autonomy of the university is maintained and strengthened, consistent with accountability to the public which is providing a growing proportion of its financial resources.

If universities, as the paramount institution of our times, lag behind in acknowledging and fulfilling their new obligation to society; if they are out of tune with the times either in their failure to reorganize their antiquated corporate structure or encourage the development of a democratic community of scholars, then they will provoke the unwarranted intervention which they fear.

My hope would be that the initiative for the necessary changes to achieve these objectives will come from within the university itself. Such initiative would be consistent with the autonomy and academic freedom which must be safeguarded. It is not my desire, nor intention, to interfere in the internal life of any university. But when these important objectives are only grudgingly accepted, or the efforts to achieve them are frustrated, then it is the right, indeed, the obligation of members of this Legislature to speak up.

Mr. Speaker, it is against the background of those comments that I would like to deal with the specifics of the resolution that is before the House.

It begins by saying—and I ask hon. members to note this carefully:

> That this Legislative expresses approval of the general objective—

and I interject here to indicate that the general objective of these next three groups is the same—

> —the general objective of the Duff-Berdahl report, the Canadian association of uni-

versity teachers and the Canadian union of students, that changes in university government should be made to replace the traditional corporate structure with that of a community of scholars where students can develop their intellectual capacities to the fullest extent, but regrets—

and I underline this—

—but regrets the modesty of their recommendations to achieve that objective in a democratic society.

Now, just let me pause there to underline this, because there has been a tendency in some instances to take defence behind the Duff-Berdahl report as though it were the be-all and the end-all, the radical, almost the final solution to the problems at the moment.

I want to suggest to you—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): No informed person in this province has ever said that.

Mr. MacDonald: I said there has been a tendency and, indeed, the administrative officers of the university in your own city took refuge behind the Duff-Berdahl report in fixing the limitations of what they wanted to concede, and the point I want to make and draw to the hon. member's attention is the extent to which people in all areas of university life recognize the limitations of the Duff-Berdahl report itself.

Let me quote first, for example, from the university teachers, and I am quoting from a report that was made by J. Percy Smith, the secretary of the Canadian association of university teachers, published in the December, 1966 regular bulletin of that organization:

> As the association grew, discovering its strength, it also discovered its deeper purpose. This was nothing less than the working of a revolution in the Canadian university life, through the demand insistent, but never irresponsible, that the idea of the community should displace the idea of the corporation in the organization of our universities.

On the next page, interestingly enough, he refers to a couple of conferences that he attended last year—shortly after the Duff-Berdahl report came out—and at one of these conferences, most of the time was spent on discussing the recommendations of that report. His comment on that specific experience was this:

> There, on the campus of a university that has had a long history of maladroitness and petty tyranny in its government, this conference was marked by the candour of its discussions and by the clear sense of assurance that we are moving toward the achievement of our purpose, and we are not going to be stopped.

If the hon. member is not aware of the fact, the campus upon which the conference was held, was the campus of the University of Western Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn for one brief moment to the observations of students with regard to the limitations on the recommendations of the Duff-Berdahl report. I want to quote a couple of them. One is from a student who published an article in the University of British Columbia official publication—which was so good as to be reproduced once again in the CAUT bulletin of December, 1966. The student is named Peter Cameron and his comments—two or three of them—rather briefly, are these:

> The report does not recommend changing the anti-democratic nature of the university. It merely shows how the same anti-democratic institution can be made to work more efficiently and less obviously.

Another comment is this:

> Duff and Berdahl are very concerned about responsibility, but unlike our old high school history teachers, they feel that responsible government and democracy are mutually exclusive.

A very pertinent point! And the same point is made by another person who used to be a student, Howard Adelman—who is now, I think, a member of the faculty of York University—who, when speaking to the Canadian union of students' 30th congress, 1966, held at Dalhousie University, said this:

> I offer as a law of human social economics that any community operated by an outside body whether it be welfare housing, university housing or the whole university as an institution, must operate more inefficiently on the whole than when the members of the community itself govern their own affairs. Democratic government of community institutions is more efficient than authoritarian government procedures, borrowed from the productive economic institutions.

Now let me turn finally to a comment from a university president, none other than Dr. Claude Bissell of the University of Toronto. In a report he made a year ago—and which he repeated at a meeting with an association

of his own staff in the University of Toronto —his observations were these:

> The brief presented by the association of teaching staff of the university government is excellent, but it emphasizes procedural, rather than substantive problems. It does not raise fundamental questions about the structure of university government which I think must be raised, otherwise we are in danger of merely pouring some new wine into some very rare old vessels. We must look critically and unsentimentally at our two governing institutions, the board and the senate.

A little later, Mr. Speaker, he said this:

> The present system of university government in Canada is a product of certain historical conditions and of a theory of government. The conditions could be described in this way: The university may be looked upon as an autonomous institution that can make decisions independent of outside pressure. Along with autonomy, one may safely assume a certain degree of leisureliness—

and I skip a bit to pick up—

> The dominant theory of government is that of separation of powers between the financial, which is the responsibility of the lay members of the board, and the non-academic administrators and the academic, which is the proper area for the teaching staff and the academic administrators. One might describe this as a system of double innocence—

If I may interpolate, neither pretends to know what the other is doing—and he picks up—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): You are repeating yourself!

Mr. MacDonald: It is just for the hon. member's benefit, so that he may get it!

Mr. Speaker, here is my final quote from Dr. Bissell:

> If we are convinced that the double innocence has become no more than a graceful fiction and if we recognize that both the academic and the lay estates have claims to participate in university government, logic compels us to ask whether the two-tiered system is necessary at all. I think that universities should now attempt to work out a system whereby there will be one body ultimately responsible for the government of the universities, not the two-tiered system.

Mr. Speaker, it is against the background of this general introduction to the resolution which challenges the Duff-Berdahl report as not being radical enough to cope with the real problems, not cognizant of some of the forces that are driving for changes in the universities, that I come to the specifics set forth in this resolution. I want to go through them briefly in the time remaining to me and make some comment. The first point:

> To this end, the Legislature would:
>
> 1. Establish procedures by which the intellectual autonomy of the universities will be maintained and strengthened, and of other post-secondary institutions will be developed, consistent with democratic accountability to this Legislature.

Now here, Mr. Speaker, is a real dilemma. I do not know what the answer to it is. The thing that intrigues me as I talk to key people in the organization of university faculties—and who are therefore professional research people—is that they do not know and, what is even more surprising and lamentable, they have have not really tackled the problem to find the answer. How do we resolve the dilemma of maintaining the independence of the university, which everybody agrees should be maintained—an autonomy with as little outside interference as possible—how do we resolve that basic principle with the principle which is basic to the operation of this Legislature? Namely, Mr. Speaker, that there must be some accountability in the spending of the money. As a Legislature, if public opinion grows up that the money is not being wisely spent, we inevitably are going to be forced to answer for it. We are going to be forced to intervene in the operations of the university to satisfy ourselves that it is being spent in the best way possible. That is the first extremely important problem.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker:

> Inquire into the role, make-up and functioning of the traditional boards of governors in the advantages which might flow from the unitary structure of university government.

In other words, I raise the whole issue that Dr. Bissell is raising consistently; are we really moving as far as we should? Have we really worked out the most effective kind of university government when we have a two-tiered system which is the double innocence of the board of governors pretending that their interest is only in the financial end and are not in the academic, with the senate pretending they are interested only in the

academic and not in financial affairs, when obviously you cannot separate the two? It seems to me that there is need for some study on this. I would suggest that study and debate within this Legislature might be a good beginning.

Third:

> Urge that existing boards of governors should be representative of administration, faculty and students and of the community at large, rather than just the business sector.

I do not think there is any argument from any quarter except on the issue of whether students should be on the board of governors. One of the most astounding things that I have heard of—I was not able to get to the committee meeting, though I understand it was even more astounding to see—was the state of almost apoplexy which descended upon the leaders of the government of the University of Western Ontario when the standing committee of this Legislature voted that there would be a student on their board—a genuine student, one who would be the choice of the students but not really part of the student body.

Since the time is very brief, Mr. Speaker, I want to put as an alternative approach towards the role of young people and how you involve them in the institution where they are getting their learning, the comment of the late, highly respected, Dr. Z. S. Phimister, formerly Deputy Minister of Education. He was commenting—and I emphasize this, Mr. Speaker—commenting not on the more mature people involved as university students, but upon students in secondary schools. I quote Dr. Phimister:

> Therefore, to turn over to student government what is appropriate to the stage of development of the student and to develop by gradual and thoughtful means of participation of responsible students in planning and carrying out the work of the school seems to me to be a worthy objective for both the near and the long term. I have seen a school in Europe where the pupils had a very large share in the control of the school, and I am sure pupils in your school are given large amounts of responsibility—

I might say, incidentally, he was talking to the secondary school headmasters' council at the time:

> —but I am confident that there are men in this room who could push this concept further and develop over a period of years a tradition of self-government and participation in school life which would do much to ease the burden on teachers, to create a sense of responsibility in the whole student body and would have far-reaching effects on the attitudes of students to schools, both while they are in attendance and after they leave.

Mr. Speaker, I take the philosophy of that quotation in reference to youngsters, relatively speaking, in secondary school, and say that when the person has become an adult, in attendance at the university, the proposition that he should be kept out of participation in the institution which he is so much a part of, and which is helping to create his life, is an antiquated idea. What terrifies me is the attitude among people in universities towards students, which is going to provoke a sense of animosity and an even deeper cleavage between the generations and of a revolt to the point where they will spend too much of their time in trying to buck the establishment, instead of being given their rightful place so that they can go ahead in a cooperative way to do a job within the university.

> Encouraging existing boards of education and universities and other post-secondary institutions to open their regular sessions to the public and press and enact legislation to eliminate individuals sitting on the boards of governors from using their position for financial gain to themselves or their corporate association.

Mr. Speaker, this is rather fundamental yet it is not readily accepted in university circles. When a university was a private institution, they could do as they pleased because it was a private institution. But when a university becomes a public institution, financed 85 per cent out of public funds, I suggest to you it is obligated to operate like a municipal council, like this Legislature, like any public group of people—openly, so that the public will know what is going on. What is more, Mr. Speaker, they should make certain that there is no conflict of interest between the private business and their public responsibility. There are situations within some of our universities in this connection which are little short of scandalous. I do not have the time to deal with them and I do not want to cloud the consideration of the principle with the specifics of any one case.

> Establish an inquiry to consider ways and means of applying research and the learning process to Ontario post-secondary institutions, this commission to be composed of prominent educators appointed by the government, university teachers nominated

by the Ontario council of the university faculty association, and outstanding students nominated by the Ontario region of the Canadian union of students.

Mr. Speaker, my only comment—that over recent years it has come to be recognized that much of the teaching in universities is perhaps not efficient. In McGill, you may recall reading of the report that a group of students set up their own Royal commission and analyzed the professors. It was pretty devastating in some respects. In the University of Toronto at the present time, Dr. Bough MacPherson is the head of a committee which is holding regular public sessions receiving representations from anybody who wants to make representations with regard to the effectiveness of the teaching process and related aspects of the university's activities. It seems to me that here is something on which we might give some leadership, in getting a study that would relate not just to the two or three that have initiated it, but to the broad field in this respect. One of the tragedies of universities is that we assume they are running efficiently, that their methods are the most efficient, when quite frankly they have never been examined. In many instances, they are inefficient. A more critical attitude is growing up, giving focus and body to it, would be valuable.

Finally, Mr. Speaker—this is not only the final point but it is the all-important one in relation to everything I have said—

> To encourage initiative for all the changes implicit in the above proposals to come from within the universities, consistent with the autonomy and academic freedom which must be safeguarded in the democratic society.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, my purpose in putting this resolution forward was to provoke a debate in this House, so that we could express our views and attempt to communicate to the people in universities what we feel are the directions in which changes must and should take place. And to say to them that, consistent with the autonomy of universities, we believe it would be far better that the initiative for those changes should come from you, within the university and we speak our minds to encourage you. But we do so in the belief that the forces for these changes are of increasingly explosive proportions and if you do not move, those forces are going to take over. Unfortunately, if they take over, the ultimate result may be the duplicate of Berkeley on our own campuses here. That would be regrettable.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I do not believe that for one moment.

Mr. MacDonald: It would be regrettable, because then I think it would distract the attention of all those in the university from their real and vitally important purpose. Encouragement to make these changes, with the leadership coming from within the universities, is the way to remove the possibility of that happening in the province of Ontario. I hope that what we say here may be of some encouragement for the initiative to be taken.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, Alfred Marshall, the famous British economist said: "Every short statement is misleading with the possible exception of this one". I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that no short speech on this extremely important and complicated subject can be completely correct or entirely meaningful.

The previous speaker's remarks and arguments are clever, subtle, articulate, persuasive, but they are wrong in many instances and they are very dangerous.

I am going to deal very briefly with the remarks of the hon. member, then I am going to touch on the half-dozen recommendations in his resolution. I will not deal with the important position that universities have held throughout the ages, nor will I take time to argue with his assertion that for the first time they are playing a most important role in the evolution and the development of our society. Nor will I deal with the fact that state or Crown has assisted universities since medieval days.

The hon. member quoted Professor Corry as saying that the community and colleges are fated to have closer connection in future. I think this is correct. I think this is correct in part because there are larger numbers of our young people going to university and, therefore, the university has widened the circle which it touches directly, and in fact has embraced every member of the community indirectly.

That is the reason that the remarks of the previous speaker are so very frightening to me. I know that there is going to be an increasingly close connection between the universities and the community, and I know that the Legislature will be under heavy and constant pressure to interfere in a variety of ways with the autonomy and the activity and the policy of universities.

As a matter of fact, we have seen that happen already in California.

Mr. MacDonald: You are bucking the forces.

Mr. White: I am bucking nothing. You listen to me for a minute or two.

Mr. MacDonald: I have caught your message already.

Mr. White: We have seen this in California. The previous dean of the graduate school of business at the University of California, now vice-president at York, has told me that 60 per cent of the young people between the ages of 19 and 23, I think it is, are in attendance at post-secondary institutions in that state. And so every family is being affected by the University of California and its enormous system of junior colleges and colleges.

And we see in that state, where the legislators scrutinize the expenditures of the university in such detail, that they will take issue on occasion with the purchase of a dozen rats for experimental purposes. That is the kind of public pressure that we may be faced with in this Legislature as the tremendous expenditures on universities and the increasing interest in universities reveals itself in this province.

That is the reason that politicians at every level, and probably most particularly here at the provincial level, have to act with restraint in dealing with university matters of one kind or another. There is no doubt in my mind that government has the right, and indeed the duty on occasion, to make its wishes known or to make demands upon a university.

Mr. MacDonald: Now you have advanced both sides of the question.

Mr. White: Oh no, I have not. In the Duff-Berdahl report, on page 72, the comment is made:

> It is a widely recognized fact that in Canada, as elsewhere, the role of governments in higher education is increasing.

On page 73, the report quotes from a statement to the university grants committee in Britain, which reads in part:

> The universities entirely accepted the view that the government has not only the right, but also the duty of satisfying itself that every field of study which in the national interest ought to be cultivated in Great Britain is in fact being adequately cultivated in the university system, and that the resources which have been placed at the disposal of the universities are being used with full regard to efficiency and economy.

I think, all of us would agree with that assertion which was accepted by all of the British universities.

That is quite different from the substance of this resolution, and that is the reason this resolution is such a very great disappointment to me. That is quite different from the attitude revealed by the leader of the NDP in the remarks that he has just now made and which I find shocking and completely inappropriate with respect to the relationship between the universities and the Legislature.

Mr. MacDonald: What should they be?

Mr. White: I am going to go into that in a little more detail in a minute.

Mr. MacDonald: Your time will be up.

Mr. White: I am going to go into a little more detail in a minute. I am going to say that the incantation "community of scholars" does not in any way disguise the heavy hand that the NDP would use in that community, and which idea is now broached in the remarks of the leader of that party.

Mr. MacDonald: Deal with the issue.

Mr. White: The limitations of the report of professors Duff and Berdahl are acknowledged. No one in any position of authority, in fact I would say no informed person in this province, thinks that this university Government in Canada report is holy gospel. Nobody thinks that it cannot be improved upon. Nobody thinks that the universities themselves will not move beyond the rather modest recommendations which touch the universities' structure and government.

As a matter of fact, the University of Western Ontario bill moved beyond the Duff-Berdahl report in several instances.

Mr. MacDonald: Why did they stick to the idea?

Mr. White: Perhaps we will have an opportunity to debate that bill in greater detail later.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be dealing with the first five of the six recommendations in this resolution in turn, but before I do so, I have got to say that recommendation number six is intellectually dishonest in stating that the initiative for all the changes implicit in the above proposals is to come from within the universities.

I agree with that phrase, but one cannot agree with that phrase and subscribe to the preceding five recommendations, which would have this Legislature "establish procedures", "inquire into the role", "urge existing boards", "encourage existing boards", "establish an inquiry", and so on and so on.

Mr. MacDonald: You do not want them to eliminate—

Mr. Sopha: I agree with you wholeheartedly.

Mr. White: It is completely inconsistent, and I think my friend from Sudbury agrees, to urge these five things be done by the universities, or to the universities, or for the universities by this Legislature and then intone—"encourage initiative for all the changes implicit in the above proposals".

That, I think, is not a bad definition of intellectual dishonesty.

In my view government should only act directly and only when a problem cannot be resolved internally by the universities of this province. The government should not act indirectly, and should not act unless the need for such action is very obvious, not only to the legislators, but to the members of the university community. Let me deal in turn with the half a dozen sections of the resolution.

The first would "establish procedures by which the intellectual autonomy of the universities will be maintained and strengthened, etc." The Spinks recommendation concerning a single university of Ontario was not accepted by boards, senates, faculties, or students, or, for that matter, by informed members of the public, for fear it would impair the autonomy and homogenize the universities which are now free of government control and which are highly individual.

Of course, this does not mean that we dispense with our primary responsibility of accountability in the expenditure of public monies. Nor does it mean that the government directly, or through some agency, will not refuse to finance a cyclotron, let us say, at Western because there is one already at McMaster. Of course there must be accountability in the expenditure of public funds. We have that now, and the expansion of interference in the activities of the universities is neither necessary nor desirable. The intellectual autonomy of the universities will be maintained and strengthened, my friends, if politicians like the member for York South keep their hands off the universities. This intellectual autonomy will be maintained and strengthened if NDP politicians do not jump in front of every mob of six or more students that they see walking past this door or parading on the campuses in this province.

Mr. MacDonald: Are you saying that the legislative assembly has no role to play at all?

Mr. White: No, I am not saying that, not at all. As a matter of fact you may be interested to know that I urged my own students at the university just a year ago to march on the Muncey Indian reserve near London. Of course public assembly has a role.

I am talking about the interference and intervention of your leader in the university activities of this province. That is what I am talking about. You are not fooling anybody.

Now, recommendation No. 2 has to do with an inquiry, an inquisition might be a better word, "an inquiry into the role, make-up and functioning of traditional boards of governors and the advantages which might flow from a unitary structure of university government."

The Duff-Berdahl report recommended against that.

Dr. Claude Bissell more recently has suggested a study of the unitary form. I think that is a very good suggestion. Other approaches, however, may be taken by other universities.

In the University of Western Ontario bill there is provision for an assembly of the university and this is not unlike what I think was called "the court of the university" in the Duff-Berdahl report, which would have representatives from the students, faculty, board, senate, faculty association, members from the community, indeed, members from this Legislature, sitting in that rather large assembly, meeting at least once or twice a year to consider matters of broad import to the whole community.

So we see a variety of forms attempted, a variety of structures established, to serve the university and the community as a whole.

An inquiry is in process, as the hon. member mentioned, at the University of Toronto, to which the public are invited to make representations. This, it seems to me, is the proper kind of inquiry made by the right people. Every university is looking at its individual pattern. Some will likely ask for a unitary form in the next few years, and

some will retain the two-tiered system because it serves their institution best.

Well, of course, this is the kind of complexity that is beyond the comprehension of the members of the NDP, who want to see everything so highly simplified and every university exactly the same, with its university government exactly the same. My point of view, and I am absolutely sure I am right, is that the 17 universities should be permitted to decide themselves what kind of a government they are going to have. In the process, they will make themselves more viable and enhance their contribution to the community at large.

Mr. Speaker, I am obviously not going to be able to cover each of the points in the resolution. Point No. 3 has to do with the members of boards of governors. I quite agree and I have made no secret of the fact with acquaintances of mine on the university campus including members of the board, senate, faculty association and students, that the boards should be diversified, and I think the government can assist in this fashion by choosing scholarly persons from a variety of vocations when the government makes its appointments to the boards of the different universities.

But I certainly would not want to see this government "urge that existing boards of governors, etcetera, etcetera," because that is another case where the problem can be best handled within the university itself. The full extent of the government's involvement should be the judicious selection of wise men from different pursuits to sit on the boards.

Point number 4:

> Encourage existing boards of governors
>
> —to open their regular sessions to the public and press—

I quite agree that some public meetings are desirable, but here again, I suggest that the change should come from within the universities and not be imposed on them by this Legislature or by any other government.

Point number 5:

> Establish an enquiry to consider ways and means of applying research on the learning process—

I think there would be some value in a commission to study post-secondary school education. One of the important duties of the senate is, however, to apply research on the learning process, as the University of Toronto is now doing, the University of Toronto being in the process of a massive study of the general degree.

It is the function of a senate and it is not the function of this Legislature to involve itself in intellectual and academic matters of that kind.

Research is being done by the Ontario institute for studies in education under the very competent Dr. R. W. B. Jackson. The province is supporting experimental programmes at Scarborough college which are designed around the use of television and evaluation and reports will flow from these programmes. Experimental cooperative programmes undertaken at Waterloo were overwhelmingly successful in the trimester system in engineering and that is now being extended to other areas, for instance, mathematics and social sciences.

Mr. Speaker, I am not able to conclude the material which I have here in my hand. I want to say in conclusion that it would be a perfectly dreadful thing if this Legislature interfered with the activities of the 17 universities and of the large number of community colleges which we are going to have in this province.

The way to safeguard their independence is to keep hands off. I implore the Legislature not to interfere with the universities. The universities have been a fountainhead of learning, culture and freedom through the ages. We can, and of course we must, intervene in critical problems when the need is obvious to everyone, including the universities, but until such time, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the greatest service we could render to the universities and to the communities is to let them run their own affairs which they have done so well for so long.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, now comes the time for me to comment on this resolution for this party and before doing so, I want to make observation to you, sir, that is really incredible that the young man, the young, energetic man who spends half the budget, is not even here. It seems he cannot take time off from opening a school somewhere with his entourage to attend upon the meetings of this House. There is no member of the Treasury benches who is absent more than he is, and yet he spends more than a billion dollars. You would think that he would come in here Wednesday afternoon to listen to the debate on an important subject such as this.

In carrying out my responsibility and being authorized to do so by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) who imposed it upon me, the first thing I must do is to say to the academic community of this province, many of whom no doubt have read this resolution in its 300 words, that if it were to come to a vote today at 6 o'clock, this party would vote against it without hesitation.

The first thing to be observed about the Duff-Berdahl report is that it is not a report to this Legislature. It is a private report commissioned by the Canadian association of universities and teachers, the association of universities and colleges of Canada and financed, as is so frequently the case, by an American foundation, the Ford in this particular case, who made a grant of $50,000.

So the moving of this resolution, and I suspect it was written at midnight—I hope my friend will not mind this allusion—and written with the aid of a candle and he got carried away with his own verbosity and at the end of it no doubt he is writing to entertain himself.

It boils down to the introduction by the member of York South of an extraneous matter into the affairs of the Legislature and an introduction in a formal way. Now in 300 words it could not fail, it could not fail to point to some matters which are of great concern and anxiety to people in the academic community.

He could hardly miss in 300 words to hit some of the problems, but they are matters which might appropriately be commented upon, and members of the House might express their views on them, during the estimates of The Department of Education, or the estimates of The Department of University Affairs.

The point I make is that he drags in a private report, made through a private body outside the Legislature and in a very formal way, by use of the notice of motion, attempts to provoke a debate here which cannot help but embroil the Legislature in an atmosphere whereby it might be inferred that the Legislature is intervening of its own volition in the free atmosphere of the academic community. That is why I and I hasten on behalf of the Liberal Party to say to these people with the strong intellect that inhabit that world that they need have no fear from us of the intrusion that is implicit in this resolution.

Mr. White: Nor from the Progressive Conservatives.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I agree with that. In short there is no more justification in my view in dealing on the floor of the Legislature with the Duff-Berdahl report in this way, than there would be in dealing with the report about the internal administration of the Unitarian church, which had been commissioned by the authorities that are in charge of that church's affairs.

As the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) has properly stated at another time, education is everyone's concern. To be alive in a modern, democratic society, to be alert, to be in the main stream, of course, the individual has to be concerned about the nature of our educational institutions and in the lengthy introductory remarks which he read to us today, he did not tell us anything that we did not already know and feel about the dominant and all-important place of the university community in our society.

He might better have spent his time, if he wanted introduction, in telling us the motivation which led him to put the resolution on the order paper. He might have devoted his time to dispelling any suspicion that might exist in the academic community in reading these 300 words whereby they might say "my heavens, we may expect an invasion of those things which are our own and private concern by that bunch of people that sit over there at Queen's Park."

That is really the thing that I, as a member of the Legislature, would fear most because let us remember who we are dealing with when we are talking about the academic people in our society.

We are dealing with the people of the very strongest intellect. We are dealing with the people who are gifted, with a keen perspicacity about educational affairs and those considerations in relation to them that affect them.

Let us remember how this Duff-Berdahl commission got started. It got started as a result of the stresses and strains that had developed in friction between the faculty and the university administration—these, no doubt, have been developing largely since the second world war—and they felt that through the objectivity of an independent survey, the faculty might be able to buttress their case for more participation in the administrative side of universities.

This was only tabled a little over a year ago —it has been in preparation three years—and it was received in March of last year. Therefore, it may be expected that in the fullness

of time the responsible people in the university will get their heads together, come up with some solutions which may require legislative sanction and, at that time, they will come to the seat of all power here and they will ask the Legislature for the endorsement of their proposal.

Of course, at that time this Legislature and perhaps those who take an interest in such things, will reflect very seriously about the nature of the proposals and the changes that are sought, and will approach them with a keen degree of objectivity from the determination of what is in the public interest.

When they come with their proposals, we will be impressed by the quality and the characteristics of the people who come, because we will know that the university community would not approach us unless there was a high degree of unanimity in their proposals, and without the most serious consideration being given to the nature of the changes they desire.

The important thing, of coure, is, the fundamental thing, and I agree wholeheartedly with the member for London South, that there must be no suggestion whatsoever, if we are to violate the principle of academic freedom, that the genesis of change comes from here. It is the wrong place for it to come.

It comes four or five hundred yards away, to mention one great institution, founded by the state incidentally, and from the other of the 17 universities throughout this province. We have already had one visit, where we had the opportunity, in solemn legislative committee, to subscribe our views to the legislation, and that we did.

I do not take the time, as my friend, the member for York South, apparently enjoyed this afternoon in doing, in applying any opprobrium or any criticism to the people.

They came in good faith to us, we listened with great respect to all of them and especially were we impressed, the members of the committee, by the quality and calibre of the students.

Here were reasonable, modest young people, articulate, people upon whom you could rely in their judgment and their views attracted the support of members of the committee and the support crept across party lines.

But I shall long remember the analogy used by the member for Russell (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) who very effectively made the point and no doubt the allusion in the example impressed itself upon the other members of the committee. But having said that, I make the point and it is dangerous, it is nothing short of dangerous in the view of the Liberal Party, to give the impression by support of a resolution such as this that this Legislature, any group within it, all of it acting collectively is in any superior position to members of the academic community to impose or suggest its view on them.

Note the resolution. At the outset it quarrels with the modesty of the proposals, so presumably the proposals of the Duff-Berdahl report, a report of two eminent Legislatures, did not satisfy the radical nature, it did not satisfy his radical nature. He puts that description on it. But then having gone through almost 300 words—you will note, almost 300 words—then it comes down to the concession of No. 6, an almost complete reversal. Having charted the way, so to speak, reorganized the board of governors, provided for public meetings, and made these suggestions, he pauses to invite our support, which we cannot give him in this form.

Then it concedes that the initiative for any such proposals which he has very gratuitously handed to the academic community—it is a gift, is it not, he is offering them a suitcase—come over to the NDP office, get a suitcase full of proposals from us and then go back and give the appearance that the initiative comes from you.

Of course it is fundamental, speaking for Laurentian, speaking for, referring or alluding to the fact that I am a member of the senate of Huntington University. The Minister of Municipal Affairs is on the board of governors of the University of Sudbury. It is fundamental that the genesis must come from that community and not from here. Not only us, responsible legislators, at the seat of all power, but the public in general all across the province can feel the deepest sense of confidence in the quality, the integrity, the ability of the people within the academic community that when they are ready for a fundamental change in the structure of university life—and here I am speaking of the administrative autonomy—then they will consider it very long and they will come to the Legislature and say, here is what we have agreed upon.

A remarkable thing about our universities. I was not satisfied in reading the report that Duff and Berndahl—one from Britain, the other from San Francisco—that they quite appreciated the way universities got started in this province. I am not satisfied they were familiar with the historical nature of university evolution here and that it was the state, in the first place, of the old province,

that started the first university a few hundred yards away. The first academic institution, of course, of any significance was one in which the state took an interest right from the outset, and indeed, provided them the land upon which to build—now that is very important in understanding university life in Ontario.

The other thing is that we must remember that each university in its own area has its distinctive flavour, its quality, its character. The universities are human. Some of them follow the European and Commonwealth tradition. For example, Trent, where they have imported cultural manifestations that are appropriate to Britain. An entirely different thing from Laurentian University, where some of the folkways of Trent would seem anomalous and absured. That is the beauty of the thing, that in many ways they reflect the area in which they are located and the people who make up their student body.

One must bear that in mind when one considers possible reform of university structure—and I do not really believe at this date that it is possible for any body, without the most searching inquiry, to come down with some formulatic scheme that will fit all 17 universities. I would have to look at any such proposal very long and very searchingly before I would be willing to accept it.

I have just one more statement. My friend here, you will recall that he talked very emphatically about the liaison between government and universities and the problem, the dilemma in a democratic society. I am hopeful that the university advisory affairs committee will be the appropriate body in which to iron out these problems in an atmosphere of compromise and understanding. If, indeed, that body is successful in achieving its object and getting at the truth of the problems that confront universities, maybe in the not too distant future we will be able to dispense with a Minister of University Affairs entirely and rely upon the good offices and the rapport of the committee.

Those are the ways in which I think the problems ought to be charted. I say on behalf of this group that these things will work themselves out in the course of time, but we are content until there is an urgent need, to wait for the people in that community, all across the province, to come to a concensus and then come to the Legislature where I assure the member for York South this Legislature will always jealously preserve its opportunity of applying its own independent judgment and objectivity in the public interest. That is where we stand on the resolution.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with second readings and then on with the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before that motion is taken, after Economics and Development, it is Tourism and Energy, and what department after that?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not have the list with me. We will let the member know tomorrow.

Mr. Singer: Well, it is not impossible that we might be facing that problem tomorrow and we would like the opportunity to do a little preparation in that eventuality.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I will get the information to the hon. member as quickly as I can.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 o'clock, p.m.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 62

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 13, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 13, 1967

Question to Mr. Brunelle re low water level in Lac Seul, Mr. Young 2121

Question to Mr. Auld re television films, Mr. Paterson 2122

Questions to Mr. Simonett re Cornwall sewage project, Mr. MacDonald 2122

Question to Mr. Davis re grants to school boards, Mr. MacDonald 2123

Question to Mr. Davis re college of applied arts and technology, Mr. MacDonald 2123

Question to Mr. Dymond re cost of quinidine, Mr. Gordon 2123

Statement re increase in salaries to civil servants, Mr. MacNaughton 2124

Questions to Mr. MacNaughton re Ontario civil service association negotiations, Mr. Gisborn 2124

Air Pollution Control Act, 1967, bill intituled, Mr. Dymond, second reading 2125

Pension Benefits Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 2135

Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading 2135

Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, second reading 2142

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Haskett, second reading 2142

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, concluded 2143

Estimates, Department of Tourism and Information, Mr. Auld 2148

Recess, 6 o'clock 2156

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors to the Legislature today, and we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Neil McNeil separate school, Scarborough, and Mooretown public school, Mooretown; in the west gallery, West preparatory school, Toronto, St. Denis separate school, Toronto, and also in the Speaker's gallery, senior citizens from the Aubrey Jones apartments, sponsored by the Kiwanis club of Hamilton.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), notice of which has been given.

In light of the present very low level of water in Lac Seul in the Kenora district, is the Minister taking any steps to rectify the situation?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, The Department of Lands and Forests is studying the effect of the fluctuation of water levels of Lac Seul on the fishery and recreational values of this lake and also the effect of limiting the drawdown on the water power values.

The outflow of the waters of Lac Seul are regulated and controlled by the Lake of the Woods control board which was established by concurrent legislation of the governments of Canada and Ontario in 1921 and 1922. One of the duties of the board is to secure severally and at all times the most dependable flow and the most advantageous and beneficial use of the waters of the Winnipeg and English Rivers.

Under 1958 legislation, Ontario is represented on the board by two members, Manitoba one member, and Canada one member.

Under The Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act, the Minister of Lands and Forests has no authority to regulate and maintain water levels on Lac Seul.

The subject of water levels on Lac Seul is to be discussed at the next meeting of the Lake of the Woods control board at Toronto on April 20.

A brief was recently submitted to The Department of Lands and Forests by the Ear Falls outfitters' association, respecting the fluctuations of water levels on this lake.

The board will hold a meeting at Ear Falls on Lac Seul on May 31. The outfitters will be able to meet with the board and discuss any matters affecting the regulation of the lake with the board members.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): I have a question for the hon. Attorney General, notice of which I have already furnished.

Will the Minister advise who has been picked as the commissioner to inquire into the Shulman case and when his duties will commence?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I could answer that, since it falls within my purview. I will make an announcement concerning this commission tomorrow morning.

Mr. Sargent: I did not hear that, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will make an announcement concerning the appointment of the commissioner tomorrow morning.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General promised yesterday to furnish today information regarding the number of inmates in the Don jail who are being held without bail and waiting for trial.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I hope I did not confuse the hon. member; I said I would get the information, but I did not intend or expect to have it at this time today. I will get it.

Mr. Sargent: I thought the hon. Minister did, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No.

Mr. Sargent: Well, that is par for the course.

Some time ago I asked the hon. Provincial Treasurer a question, tabled in the paper here before the House. He did not answer the question; he had some way of evading it. I would like to ask him again.

I asked him how much money the province paid—I did not put in the words Metropolitan Toronto, so he neglected to answer the question because the word Metropolitan was not in there, so I will ask him again—to Metropolitan Toronto over the past five years in subsidies on subway construction?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I understand that question is on the order paper; as such I think it is procedural that the answer be tabled in due course.

Mr. Speaker: The member's question is on the order paper, I do not have a copy of any such question today, or it would have been transmitted to the Minister's office. The member will have to wait until the answer is recorded in the order paper.

Mr. Sargent: He did not answer it on the order paper. He just said he could not answer because there is no subsidy paid to the city of Toronto; it was Metropolitan Toronto it was paid to.

I will ask him to furnish that.

A question to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme). He is not here. I would like to have the answer on this one. It is the same treatment I got from the Minister of Highways.

I asked him how much money has been paid out to the GO-transit system and how much money has been paid to the other cities in the province for their transportation systems. Maybe the Provincial Treasurer could answer that one.

Mr. Speaker: They will be placed on the record and it will be up to the Minister to answer.

Mr. Sargent: Will it take two months to get the answer on them?

Mr. Speaker: I am not responsible for the answers.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information.

Would the Minister advise if the government has paid for any television films of statements by private members of the Legislature during the past 12 months? If so, what members of this House have had such television film statements prepared and paid for by the government?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, the government has not paid for any television time for any private members. However, we have undertaken to fulfill requests from a number of television stations for new clips. There have been four of these and they were for the following:

The hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Racine), on May 31, 1966, having to do with The Ambulance Services Act.

The hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox), on February 3, 1967, on air pollution. That was from station CFPL.

I should have said that in connection with the hon. member for Ottawa East, the request was from station CJOH in Ottawa.

The hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Butler), on automobile insurance, on February 8, 1967, for CKCO TV in Kitchener.

The hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Thrasher) on February 9, on housing, for CKLW, Windsor.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the clip is sent and the station returns new film to us to replace the film which we sent to them.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, reports by the chairman of the select committee on company law, and by the chairman of the select committee on youth, were sent to 17 television stations in Ontario on April 3 and April 5, respectively.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I wonder—I did not ask this question, but I have been mentioned as having appeared on a programme on CJOH for which the government has paid. I really do not know—

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, the government did not pay for that, Mr. Speaker, nor did the government pay for any of the other three that I mentioned.

Mr. Racine: I see, thank you.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions, my first

to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. It is a five-part question.

1. What was the closing date for tenders on the major sewage project in Cornwall now being handled by the Ontario water resources commission?

2. When were the first awards of contracts made, to whom, and for what amount?

3. Was a portion of the project called for tender a second time?

4. If so, how many tenders came in on the recall and for what amounts?

5. How much of an increase do these recall tenders represent over the costs in the original tenders?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I will not be able to give the hon. member an answer this afternoon, as the commission is meeting at the present time, dealing with contracts for Cornwall.

I wonder if he wanted information on all the contracts or just one specific contract? There have been as many as ten tender calls on this particular job in Cornwall.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, my understanding was that there is a major sewage contract at the moment in three sections—that is the one to which I am referring.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe it has been called, each in separate sections. Would the member like the information on all calls?

Mr. MacDonald: I am interested in accordance with the questions on the original contracts awarded on two, the recall on the third one, and what the alternative or higher costs were and how much higher.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I will get the information that the hon. member requests and give it to him tomorrow.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Minister of Education.

First, in the latest year for which both figures are available, (a) what was the total amount of money spent by school boards for primary and secondary education and (b) what was the total of provincial grants to local school boards?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the last complete year for which expenditures are available was the calendar year 1965. The total expenditures for elementary and secondary amounted to $752,600,000, and the general legislative grants payable to the school boards, based on those expenditures were $373,000,000.

I should point out that the grants were paid in 1966, but were based principally on the attendance of the students at school during 1965 and on expenditures made by the boards in that year. I think this is the best way to compare them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: My second question to the Minister of Education is:

Can the Minister set at rest the growing rumours in the counties of Halton and Peel that the name of the proposed college of applied arts and technology has been before the Cabinet for some time and is still unresolved?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, may I say that living in one of the great counties mentioned, I know of no growing rumours. Secondly, I understand the name for the college of applied arts and technology to serve this region will be very shortly resolved.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): And what might it be?

Mr. MacDonald: Is there a contest among Cabinet Ministers for the name?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I can assure you there is no such contest.

Mr. G. T. Gordon (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health.

In view of the fact that the Minister of Health told the Legislature that the price of quinidine had dropped as much as 50 per cent since May, 1966, to about $6.55 a hundred, how does the Minister explain the fact that a woman in my riding who has been paying $4.50 a hundred for four years was suddenly faced with paying $15 a hundred in December, 1966, and now has to get the drug wholesale at $9 a hundred? How thorough was the Minister's investigation into the price of the drug at the time he made the statement to the Legislature? What, if any, further action does the Minister intend to take in this matter?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is usually very meticulous in catching answers. I am a little surprised that he asks how thorough was my investigation, since I made very clear that on two occasions I checked the prices locally—that is in the Toronto area. Unfortunately I have no way, as I answered yesterday, of

checking drug prices, nor have I any authority to check drug prices across the province, or anywhere.

If druggists choose to give me the answer out of courtesy, this is fine. However, in view of this rather startling price which the hon. member brings to our attention, and I have no hesitation in saying in my opinion, sir, it is exorbitant, we have asked for some further information from the retail pharmacists' association.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, on March 9 I asked the hon. Prime Minister, how many applications have been made to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council during the past 10 years to have decisions in respect to rezoning referred back to the Ontario municipal board. I wonder if the Prime Minister has the answer. This was a month ago.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I put that in the machinery for an answer to be produced, and I have to admit I have not really thought of it since. I will check today and see if I can have an answer tomorrow.

Mr. Young: A day or so was the word that was given here on March 9, so I—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is political licence, I suppose.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I am pleased to announce that the government and the civil service association of Ontario have successfully concluded negotiations concerning salaries for institutional classes affecting approximately 10,000 civil servants. Settlement was reached after several weeks of mediation on the basis of the report made by the mediator, Mr. Trevor Smith.

The settlement arrived at in mediation was referred to the association members who are employed in the classes concerned through a mail ballot supervised by the mediator. Over three-quarters of the ballots were returned and 70 per cent were marked in favour of accepting the recommended terms of settlement. The new rates have been implemented through order-in-council and will be effective for one year from January 1, 1967.

The increases are in addition to the interim change in rates which was made effective October 1, 1966. The further increases effective January 1, 1967, range from 8 per cent to 14 per cent, averaging about 10 per cent. The mediation stage in the negotiation process was introduced last year as a result of amendments made by the Legislature to The Public Service Act.

It is to be hoped that the successful outcome of this first use of mediation by the parties is another step forward in the development of an effective bargaining relationship between the government and employees of the Crown. I wish particularly to acknowledge the efforts and perseverance of Mr. Trevor Smith, the mediator, appointed by the Minister of Labour to handle this dispute.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): I would ask through you, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister answer a question in regard to the statement he made?

Mr. Speaker: If the Minister wishes to accept one, but it is not customary to ask questions on a statement by a Minister. If the member wishes to ask the Minister if he will answer a question, he may do so.

Mr. Gisborn: I so ask, Mr. Speaker.

My question is, when did the original cyclical negotiations begin in regard to this particular area?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I cannot say with any degree of accuracy when they started, but you heard me mention that there was an interim settlement made last October with the understanding that the final settlement would be negotiated by mediation, as I have just explained. I will have to get that information for the hon. member, and I will be glad to do so, but I cannot just tell him precisely.

Mr. Gisborn: Is there any provision for payment to those who retired during the term of negotiation and those who resigned, based on the retroactive pay?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I stand corrected on this and I will pursue that, but I think that anybody who was involved in employment during the negotiation process and retired before the final settlement would be remunerated to the extent that the employment period affected them. I think this is the customary procedure.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The seventh order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 67, The Air Pollution Control Act, 1967.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, 1967
(Continued)

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief remarks to make about The Air Pollution Control Act and the principle of the bill incorporated in it.

I noticed that the Minister (Mr. Dymond), when he introduced the bill into the Legislature on April 5, used terms which convey no meaning to me. Perhaps when he replies to the remarks which have been made on second reading, he could explain them in layman language for the benefit of those members of the House who do not have his expert knowledge in this field. The words which he used were that the bill would employ the concept of ambient air quality and that ambient air quality criteria will be set.

Having asked the Minister this—and I am sure he will have the opportunity to comment about the semi-scientific jargon which he used to describe the bill—I would like now to deal with it from the point of view of a person living in an area which is subject to substantial air pollution. This bill will do nothing to provide him with any protection. I draw attention first of all, Mr. Speaker, to the definition which is fundamental to the principle of the bill. It is divided, for practical purposes, into three categories. The last of the three categories is air pollution that may cause injury or damage to property, or to plant or animal life. I correct myself; there are actually four categories, the third one being plant and animal life. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that the bill very carefully preserves the present method set out under The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act with respect to the kind of air pollution which results from nickel-copper ore or iron ore, or from the treatment of sulphides, and that the only protection which a person will obtain should he suffer loss to his crops or to his vegetation or to his animals will be if he continues to go under The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act in that particular field. I think anyone will agree this contains the highest possibility of injurious affection, not only to the plants and vegetation, but to persons. I think the Minister should, on the principle of the bill, explain why he excludes the application of that part of the bill relating to plants and animal life, and why that particular industry? I am thinking of the Electric Reduction Company in the constituency of the hon. Minister from Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), and I am thinking of the International Nickel Company in the constituency of the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha). I think this requires specific comment as to why applications for compensation for damage caused by that type of air pollution should continue to be dealt with under The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act and should not be incorporated in this bill, which I had assumed was to be a single omnibus bill to deal with all aspects of air pollution.

But now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to my main contention, and that is that there is nothing in this bill which provides any effective method by which any individual can initiate an inquiry or a study if he finds that his comfort or enjoyment is seriously affected in any way by air pollution. The Minister will realize that under this bill, if I can have his attention—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): I am listening.

Mr. Renwick: Perhaps the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) could do me the courtesy of allowing the Minister to listen to my comments.

Mr. Speaker: The member should be speaking to the chair. He is out of order in his remarks.

Mr. Renwick: I accept your correction, Mr. Speaker. I would simply ask that if the Minister of Health is presenting this bill for second reading, I think it would be reasonable to expect that he would pay attention to the comments which are being made.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do not think it is necessary for me to reminded how I should listen or to what. As long as I answer the chair well, and answer the criticisms that are brought before the bill, I think I have fulfilled my function. I have no need to be reminded by the hon. member.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, you will note in the principle of the bill providing for provincial control of air pollution that that aspect of the bill relating to the health or safety of persons; relating to any discomfort which persons may suffer; or relating to the enjoyment by persons of their property, excluding damage to plant and animal life, is not framed in such a way that any individual in this province can initiate, request or have a procedure provided by which he can bring to the attention of the appropriate authority—the Minister of Health, under this bill—the extent of air pollution in the area in which he lives, and by which he can be ensured that this government will carry out the kind of study which would be necessary to determine whether he

is entitled to any protection under this bill from that air pollution.

I am referring, Mr. Speaker, specifically to my riding, which as you know goes down to the lake front and along the southern boundary, where there is substantial industry, including the steam generating plant of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. Now, if any evening one looks across that part of the city of Toronto you will see that the smoke stacks are belching smoke, and have for many years belched smoke. No one in that area has any crops or vegetation of any commercial value for which he could claim damage under section 11 of the bill.

But for many years, the people in that area have suffered discomfort and no one knows the extent to which they have suffered injury to their health. No one knows the extent to which they have suffered by being deprived of the kind of enjoyment in the use of their property and their home properties that one would expect such people to be entitled to.

What I am saying to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a gap in the bill, because there is no way by which any individual citizen, unless he comes under the very narrow application of section 11 of the bill, can in fact put forward a complaint which would require to be processed by the appropriate officers set up by the government to administer this bill.

It seems to me that this is a primary gap in the whole framework of the bill. It would seem to me that any citizen in any part of the province of Ontario, if he alleges on reasonable grounds that he is suffering discomfort, or may be suffering injury to his health because of visible air pollution, or by air pollution which leaves visible traces of its effects in the surrounding area, there is no reason why such a person should not have a clear cut procedure established in the bill by which he can bring this matter to the attention of the Minister or the appropriate officers.

Now, if we leave it entirely to the government—the initiation of any surveys or studies under the scientific concept which the Minister used in his opening address—then I do not think the individual citizen of the province is going to have the kind of clear cut right which he should have.

I do not mean determining himself whether or not the air pollution is as he alleges it to be, but the primary right to initiate the proceedings in such a way as will require the government to make certain that the survey or the study is made in that area within a reasonable period of time; that the report is furnished to the citizens of that area who make the complaint; and that the report is furnished to the owner of the particular property from which it is alleged, or the survey discloses the air pollution has its source.

It seems to me that the Minister should consider when he introduces this bill on second reading that it should contain appropriate amendments. These would provide a method by which the individual citizen, for example, in an urban area, as in the riding of Riverdale, could be able, either alone or collectively with his neighbours, to initiate a request to the government to ask the proper authorities to make the kind of survey and study within a reasonable period of time. He should receive a report of that study made on a scientific basis of the extent of the air pollution in the area; and the extent to which it is causing discomfort to the people in that area; to the extent to which it is causing danger to their health or safety; or to the extent to which it is affecting their enjoyment of their property apart from the question of the economic loss which people may suffer in areas affected by direct contamination by air pollution in the field of farming, or in other areas where an economic use is being made of plant or animal life.

I would ask the Minister if he would consider that the principle of the bill requires that the citizen be given this opportunity to initiate proceedings in that way. The citizen would have the assurance that he has a means open to him to derive the protection which it is the stated intention of the government to provide, namely, a substantial improvement of the quality of the air environment which people breathe and which affects the enjoyment which they have of their homes in the urban areas, as well as in the other areas of the province of Ontario. And those are my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two on the principle of this bill. When it was introduced I was quite happy that at last the government would take over the supervision and control of air pollution across the province. Certainly there have been many municipalities and persons interested in clean air and our environment who have called for this kind of action.

But after listening to the efforts by different members I am now convinced that the bill, as it is written, will not do the kind of a job that we expect to be done by the government.

In Hamilton, we have had an extreme problem of air pollution, and I can say, as

has the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) that industry in Hamilton has spent considerable amounts of money to reduce the air pollution from the plants in that highly industrialized area. But anyone who drives to Hamilton over the skyway bridge can see the polluted air from the factories must wonder how much is being done.

At the present time, the municipality of Hamilton has an air pollution committee, and I suppose that many municipalities across the province have their own municipal air pollution committees established by by-law. In Hamilton the committee includes one councillor, the medical officer of health, and a member from the municipal laboratory. The rest are so-called interested citizens. On investigating, I find that the interested citizens are representatives from management of the various industrial plants in this city.

I have had occasion to attend two or three meetings with delegations who have complained about air pollution in their particular area, and I found the committee to be nothing more than a mutual protection society for the industry. They listen to the complaints, then they mull over the proposition and usually they can find more excuses than you have fingers on your hand as to why nothing can be done about it.

One example was a complaint about smoke emitting from a brickyard plant in Hamilton that had been in operation some 100 years and they felt that it was about time that they stopped burning coal and went to gas or oil, which would reduce the emission from the stacks.

Of course, it was going to cost them a few more dollars a month to do this—and still the citizens are putting up with this sort of a nuisance. But in the case of industry spending a lot of money, I have looked very carefully into the situation.

We give them credit where credit is due but I found that where the affluent industry spends money, they have pretty well always made sure that the expenditure has been in line with methods of progress in reclamation of some by-product. This has been the case with one of the biggest offenders, I might say —the Steel Company of Canada, where they have the large open-hearth stacks and blast furnace stacks, and so on.

They got great credit for spending a couple of million dollars to put in precipitators to stop the flue dust from going across the beach when the wind is blowing in one direction, and across the city when it is blowing from the opposite direction. But in their expenditure, they certainly provided a method of reclaiming a lot of the flue dust which, in turn, was sent to a cinder plant and used over again in the furnaces.

Of course, the cost that they submitted to the public was nowhere near the actual cost to just prevent air pollution. Now I hope that the bill will have a greater influence on this problem.

There is no doubt that when it is left to the municipalities we have the question of municipal boundaries—and it has been said in this House that air pollution does not respect municipal boundaries—where one municipality does a really good job in controlling the pollution and the next one does not.

If one does not the next municipality has to suffer the nuisance from that pollution.

Another real block to the fact that the municipalities have not been able to really do anything tangible is that they cannot exert the necessary pressure on the industries, which are paying the tax load, to get them to spend great amounts of money.

It is just not in the book for the municipalities. Even Hamilton, as big a city as it is, has not been able to exercise the influence necessary and, heaven knows, that in small municipalities, the affluent industry is the controlling element in that municipality and no one tells them what they have to do.

But there is one principle enunciated in the bill that I think should be extended, Mr. Speaker, and that is the principle enunciated whereby compensation can be paid to persons for loss of crops, and for harm done to livestock.

I do not know why this principle cannot be extended to the loss of property or nuisance value to the citizens of a particular area in the community. We had a situation in Hamilton and this problem has been raised with the air pollution committee.

I went before them with a delegation and, subsequently, a further meeting was held after extensive investigations were made, and we pinpointed exactly where the emission was coming from—the carbide plant in Hamilton.

On the testimony of the experts from the Hamilton lab we ascertained where the emission was coming from. This was a contaminant something like lamp black and it travelled more than a quarter of a mile to the homes across the bay in Hamilton, and backwards into the city.

We found that it seeped into a home that had been completely renovated—the curtains,

the furniture and a brand new tile floor were absolutely ruined. They used every type of detergent to try and bring it out of the floor and it would not work, it had gone right into the tile.

We found, by investigation, that the company that was responsible for the emission had paid for the washing of a brand new service station twice and had even gone to the extent of purchasing three homes on one street because they could not control this nuisance.

People in that area find that they can scrub their homes thoroughly and five minutes after can take a tissue and wipe off this lamp dust in their homes. Now certainly if this exists, this principle of compensation should be extended not just to livestock and to crops, but to private property and to public property.

Certainly, I know that because of the damage done to the homes on the beach, the people, so far as I know, are in the throes of trying to take civil action. They are being advised by their legal advisers that it is going to be a costly thing to prove definitely that this nuisance, and this damage, is caused from this particular industry even though it has been ascertained to our satisfaction by municipal laboratories.

When they just say, "No, we will not admit it," you have to then start from scratch to prove it. This sort of thing is very costly and I would ask the Minister to give consideration to the principle of compensation, that it be extended to public and private properties, as well as is enunciated in the bill to livestock and crops.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this has been a most interesting debate and I have been quite impressed with many of the things that have been said. I am rather pleased to note that practically every speech is basically in favour of the principle of the bill and this is what we hoped for, this is what we strove for when we were writing the bill.

However, there are some very obvious concerns in the minds of many of the hon. members.

This is quite understandable because this is, first of all, a very troublesome matter and it is a matter with far-reaching implications. It is an illusive kind of a matter, too, in some respects so far, because of our progressive society, progressing economy and with very many and rapid changes which we are experiencing almost every day of our life.

I think some regard has to be paid to the historical background of the bill because there appears to be, as I listened to my hon. friends, some difference of opinion—I was going to say confusion.

I think there is a little confusion in all of our minds, too, relative to certain features of this bill, but there seems to be a marked difference of opinion in the minds of some, as to how controls should be effected.

Some seem to think, and some state and have stated quite consistently, that this should, from the start, have been provincially controlled. Some believe that it should be put back to the local control. And one other member, I believe the member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden), suggested we should leave those areas where there is at least an apparent measure of control, and step into the other areas.

Now, when the government first became involved in this matter of attempting to control air pollution, we believed, on the basis of the United States experience particularly, because this is what had been studied most extensively, that we should leave this matter in the hands of the municipal control and the legislation then was permissive and allowed municipalities to establish by-laws under The Air Pollution Control Act. This, I say, was done having regard to the United States experience, which in many cases, particularly those that had been investigated by the select committee of this Legislature in 1953 or 1954, had worked very well.

So this was the provision in our first Act. But after four years of this Act being in force, only 26 municipalities in our province had taken advantage of the legislation and had passed by-laws under the Act.

Out of those 26, add another three municipalities which continued to operate under the provision which allowed at least for the control of pollution by-products of combustion under The Municipal Act—a total of 29 muncipalities with a by-law—only four in the intervening time have really made an all-out attack on this problem.

It is rather interesting to note in spite of all we have heard about Toronto, that Toronto did not avail itself of this Act. It is quite true that I have the by-law produced by the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto upon which I am supposed to be sitting, sir, that does ask for the control of the total problem. But since 1959, or at least between 1959 and 1963 when this was available, no by-law was forthcoming.

It was about this time that we began to recognize that municipalities could not under-

take this problem. It is really too big a problem for municipalities and unless there was some kind of mandatory legislation compelling all municipalities to pass by-laws and to undertake programmes, any programme undertaken by a municipality in isolation could be of little or no good to it.

It is difficult for municipalities to retain adequately trained staff. It is too costly to provide laboratory facilities. They were quite unable to involve themselves in research. We therefore decided that that was not any good. Then we decided to try a division of the responsibilities, still having in mind the experience of many municipalities in many states in the union to the south of us.

Under the 1963 amendments, we made provision that municipalities could pass by-laws to control pollution by products of combustion. The province would take over responsibility for control of industrial emissions; we provided financial support to municipalities, sir, who got into the air pollution control business on exactly the same basis as we would support any approved programme of public health. We undertook responsibility for training staff for municipalities at the expense of the province.

In spite of this, sir, there was absolutely no more vigorous support of the programme and no new by-laws were proposed, no new programmes were begun. It was very evident, therefore, that we had to give new thought to the whole programme because the situation was steadily becoming worse.

Under this Act which we put before you, sir, as Bill 67, the province is taking full responsibility. After the experience we have had since the passage of the first Act in 1959, I believe, we had been pressed on many sides to take full responsibility for this matter. The mayors and reeves have endorsed resolutions that the province should take control. The manufacturers' association, the transport industry, chambers of commerce across our province, all have been unanimous in their opinion that the government should take control since it was the only body adequately set up to deal with a matter of this kind.

Uniformity of standards, something with which all of us have expressed agreement, the the application of the law and uniform enforcement, all seem to be basic to a good programme of control and all of those who approached us urging that the government take it over, emphasized that only the province was equipped to do this sort of thing.

I want to point out, sir, that this bill before the House now is not enabling legislation, as my hon. friend from Grey North suggested, this is legislation. If this House passes the legislation, the province is given and charged with the responsibility of initiating these programmes and undertaking the task of clearing up air pollution.

The hon. member for Yorkview pointed out—and I think very rightly so—the need for standards. It was too bad that we were just on second reading when only the principle was being discussed, but he is perfectly right and we are in total agreement with him that we do need standards because we cannot begin to undertake a programme of this kind without them.

The department has recognized this and we will accept, at least in the first instance, standards or criteria for air quality, ambient air quality, determined by the Canadian standards association. We may disagree with them, because they set standards which in our view may not be high enough, or they may set standards which in our view will be impossible of attainment.

Before I go further, sir, I am sorry that the member for Riverdale does not understand ambient air quality, I must admit it is one I have trouble with myself, but it is in the dictionary and I am quite surprised that an excellent legal light such as he is, did not consult the dictionary. May I for his edification and my own refreshment—I mean intellectual refreshment—define ambient air quality. It means the "quality of our atmosphere, expressed in the concentration of specific air contaminants which relates to human, animal or plant life." May I suggest that this is almost as professional jargon as ambient air quality itself. However, it is in brief, the air we breathe, the air surrounding us.

So we will look to the Canadian standards association to set up these standards, as the body best equipped to do so, but making clear that we may not accept, out of hand, the standards which they set. Our own people then, of course, will have to take into account the number of sources of pollution in the region, the land usage, the prevailing meteorological conditions, all of which will vary from region to region.

Those are the standards that we recognize are necessary, the standards which, at least in the first instance, we will use.

I was pleased that the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator), who has been assiduous in assisting his people in this programme, as

well as the hon. member for Yorkview, all emphasized the need for incentives. This has been a matter that has plagued us quite largely as we have been dealing with this. It is a matter which must be dealt with and I have been rather disappointed that up to the present time we have not been successful in our efforts in persuading our friends at the federal level that this is essential.

However, I have been assured that this matter is again under very intensive study at the federal level and I am hopeful that there will be incentives provided, as have been provided for those who are seeking to clear up water pollution.

The incentives that we think of are those mentioned by the two hon. members, such as rapid write-off of investment, tax incentives and so on.

There have been areas of question. For instance, one industry that we have ordered to build a smoke stack some 500 feet high to deal with the air pollution problem, is well served by a stack 50 feet high and cannot get any consideration for this larger stack because it is considered to be part of the structure. I think the industrialists rightly say that if it is not an essential part of the structure, they can get along very well with a 50-foot stack; but we have ordered that he build one close to 500 feet.

This is one of the difficult matters that we have to discuss with our federal friends and on which I hope to have some area of agreement before very long, because this is in some measure holding back our programme.

I think nearly every one of the hon. members who spoke emphasized, as we have done ourselves many times, the need for research. In the 1963 amendments, if I recall rightly, sir, recognizing this, we introduced and passed legislation which allowed us to initiate and support research. This is continued under this bill and is being undertaken in quite vigorous fashion, not only at the government level. I think it came out quite clearly in the words of many hon. members that industry itself is spending very considerable sums of money on this matter of research.

Now the greatest need in the view of us who are involved in this matter from the health standpoint is the need for chemical research. A great deal has been said, sir, about the cause of lung cancer. While I can understand the apprehension and the concern of my hon. friends, I have to say to them as a physician that I am not quite so ready to make sweeping statements out of hand because, on the basis of studies that have been done by professional people, many of the statements cannot be backed up.

Indeed, we have heard a great deal about the relationship between diesel fumes and lung cancer. We have just had compiled the results of numerous extensive studies by authorities well recognized – internationally recognized—in occupational health. These sweeping statements, sir, are not borne out by facts. For instance, the results of the study conclude that "no excessive lung cancer death was found when male transport workers, aged 45 to 64, were compared with similar males in the population of England and Wales and of Greater London." "The engineering staff; that is, bus garage workers in regular diesel fume exposure, did not show an excess of lung cancer." "Medical findings revealed no pulmonary malignancies."

These are summaries of reported studies, all documented in the professional journals. This, however, is not to say that there is no relationship between disease and air pollution. We are quite convinced that there is such a relationship and for this reason I say the area in which research is most sorely needed is in the area of clinical research, the matter which my hon. friend from Lambton West discussed yesterday quite extensively. Mr. Speaker, this too will be possible under our new bill.

A good deal was said about auto emissions, and I can understand the concern of my hon. friend; every one of us is bothered about it. Everyone wonders what on earth we can do about it. But there were some rather extravagant statements made. I can only put it that way because I am by disposition, a very kindly disposed person. I was accused of dragging my heels, or the government was accused of dragging its heels, with control by Detroit. The bluff and bluster across the way told us so yesterday. My hon. friend from Yorkview (Mr. Young) I think, read from letters from senators and then my friend from Yorkview paid me the great compliment of suggesting that I would be fighting the battle for industry. Well, Mr. Speaker, industry is a big boy. They do not need me to fight their battles.

However, I would point this out to you, sir, as calmly as is possible. This Act does not allow us to drag our heels, and it is certainly evidence that the government is not dragging its heels by any stretch of the imagination.

If I—or if this government—is said to be such a great friend of industry, then I say I am not. I had a letter from the industry some time ago, telling me about what they were

hoping to do in California and suggesting—if not directly, at least in a veiled way—that I might wait to see what came out of that. I answered, in part: "While we agree with some of the statements made in your letter, we are not in agreement with the total concepts expressed. We agree that we in Ontario can benefit by experience gained in California, Mr. Speaker.

However, I do not believe that we can wait until the United States has published all its data. Consequently, we would like to see a testing programme undertaken in Ontario in cooperation with our air pollution control services. I have therefore requested our Mr. W. B. Drowley, chief of the service, to contact you and ascertain what arrangements can be made to undertake such a cooperative programme."

I am neither supporting industry nor being controlled by Detroit. I can assure you that if the government had any idea I was being controlled by Detroit, or listening to Detroit, my place would be filled very rapidly, and so it rightly should be.

The letter from the senator was quite impressive. But, you know, senators are something like ourselves. Without intimate knowledge, we sometimes are tempted to write letters which we cannot back up by any solid factual information. I do not bother going to the senators and I do not bother going to the congressmen. I go to the state board of California, because it has to publish an official document. It says this, in fact, because I shall quote from it:

> Surveillance tests were conducted by the state of California on a fleet of 532 vehicles to determine the efficiency of the exhaust control services as related to the mileage driven.

The mileage driven is inherent in The State of California Act, and I digress for a moment. The California legislation states that "exhaust control systems must be such that annual servicing is not required, that the cost installed must not exceed $65". This law was passed after the approval of the engine modification systems and thus made necessary the withdrawal of the approval of muffler systems, since they require maintenance or chemical replacements every year. Recent information from Los Angeles county indicates that the engine modification systems which are supposed to maintain their efficiency for 100,000 miles are not meeting this requirement.

What does the state board report say?

> After the state board utilized all available authorities of data—

And this report is from the record of the county of Los Angeles air pollution control district dated December 1966, after the board utilized—

> —all available authorities of data in its consideration of control systems, with particular emphasis being based on surveillance. Initial tests of vehicles in public use resolved that exhaust emission control systems deteriorate in effectiveness with increased mileage and normal maintenance. The following table summarizes test data and shows that 52 per cent failed to meet the state requirement for hydro-carbons and/or carbon monoxide. In less than 2,000 miles, 37 per cent failed. Over 2,000 miles, 63 per cent failed. Over 4,000 miles, 69 per cent failed. Over 8,000 miles, 73 per cent failed. Over 12,000 miles, 73 per cent failed. Over 16,000 miles, 82 per cent failed. Over 20,000 miles, 87 per cent failed.

Servicing adds a great deal to the cost. Of course, we realize if vehicles were tested and serviced regularly, they might be kept efficient. But it was inherent in the bill that this was not going to be needed.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Could I ask the date of that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: December 1966. This report was published, the county of Los Angeles air pollution control district report, in December 1966. The general conclusion, and I continue from the report, is:

> —that there exists a steady increase in the percentage of failures as vehicles accumulate mileage and an extension of this trend indicates that at 50,000 miles essentially all of the vehicles will fail to meet state standards of 275 parts per million hydro-carbon and 1.5 per cent carbon monoxide.

Currently employed anti-pollution exhaust devices on motor vehicles in the state of California are not meeting requirements and maintaining efficiency for 100,000 miles without yearly servicing, nor is the frequency of servicing and cost known. In addition, there is to date no information available as to the performance of these devices under Ontario's climatic conditions.

It was for this reason that I suggested to the automobile industry that Ontario could not wait to find this out, that we had better

start testing here in Ontario so that our climate and conditions unique to Ontario would be taken into consideration, and we would not have to start after the California results were known. To summarize, the currently-employed automotive exhaust control devices do not maintain the desired efficiency without servicing. The cost of inspection and servicing has not been established and it is not our intention to make such devices mandatory until these questions have been answered.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that by any stretch of the imagination this can be considered as delay or heel-dragging, because we fully intend to press this matter forward as vigorously as we possibly can.

Mr. Young: Almost any part of an automobile requires servicing—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, but this is rather an unreasonable demand for service. Not only that, but on the basis of this report I would be inclined to think that these systems should be checked at least every 10,000 miles because there is an appreciable drop in the value of their efficiency. This comes to be a rather costly business when the operator of the vehicle has to get this done. At the same time, we might well be lulling them into a sense of false security believing that the device, or the system, was worth while and was effective.

Now, our Act allows under section 13 and subparagraph (c) in section 14 that as soon as an efficient control system is developed and readily available, at a realistic and feasible price, we can order it to be installed on used cars. This is not being done in very many places yet.

There has been a good deal said by one or two members about the huge expenditures in the United States. We have these figures, too, and it is rather remarkable to see that Ontario is well up with the top, and, in fact, far ahead of many others in the matter of expenditures. It is 15 cents per capita for California in 1966; 3 cents per capita for New York state and Pennsylvania; 1.3 cents per capita for Ohio; 1.5 cents per capita for Michigan.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): By industry—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: By the government.

Mr. Sargent: By industry is what I am talking about.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Industry is spending a very large amount of money. I am talking about the government expenditures at the present time. I am coming to industry's expenditures.

We have not got definite figures about what the automotive industry in Canada is spending. I do not know anything about this, but I do know, or at least I would surmise, that under the auto pact there is a great exchange of information, a very great exchange of the benefit of experience by the companies in the United States or wherever they may be located and branches of the Canadian plants.

Quite apart from that, the hon. member for Wentworth East himself spoke a little while ago about one of the large industries in his own area and the huge amount of money they spent. Now, I do not think we want to denigrate their efforts, Mr. Speaker, by saying they only got into it when they found they could reclaim something from the products of the control. I am not sure that this is altogether correct. It may be in some instances. But if in controlling the pollution they can reclaim something I think they are to be congratulated for that, not to be belittled for it. Of course, industry is going to reclaim something. They are going to reclaim all they possibly can, because this is part of the business of doing business.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You are missing the point.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would expect you to tell me I was missing the point anyway. The hon. member for—

Mr. Sargent: May I ask a question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, not at the present time. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) pointed out the amount of money that the Hydro had spent.

Of course the Hydro has not controlled the whole problem yet, but at least they are moving towards this, and they are spending very large sums of money—

Mr. Sargent: How much is large?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will tell you. The way I am right now, five dollars is quite a sum, my pocket is nearly empty.

Mr. Sargent: It is $100 million in New York state. How much is the Hydro spending here?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They are spending very large sums of money, and this will be increased as a result of the passage of this legislation.

Now, on the matter of enforcement. The hon. member for Parkdale complained that it is not adequate and I have to agree with him

absolutely. When one reads cases in the courts in this city and in other places where a fine of $5 is imposed, it is not even funny. It is so miserably small that it is not even a joke, but this is not the fault of The Department of Health. This House passed legislation last year allowing for very substantial penalties for disregard of the law, but if the bench will not impose those penalties The Department of Health has no power except to go to the Attorney General and complain in the hope that he can use his good offices to get the magistrates and judges to see the light.

Under this legislation, I am sure the hon. members have read that fines and penalties of $2,000, $5,000, and $10,000 are permitted. In addition to this there can be immediate closure of the plant until the source of pollution is cleared up.

Unfortunately, The Department of Health, I repeat, has no power to direct the magistrates in the imposition of fines. The member for Lambton West very clearly pointed up not only in his remarks yesterday, but in the very thorough speech he made on this subject which is a matter of great concern to him, the need for and the importance of a federal role in this matter of air pollution control, as indeed it exists in all pollution control.

We have emphasized this, and I have very good reason to hope that the federal government is going to become intensely interested and involved in this matter. I believe the federal government has an important and an essential role in the matter of the establishment of criteria of standards, and certainly in the control of interprovincial trains, interprovincial marine transport, and to encourage and stimulate research.

These are areas where the federal government has a very important role. I think that when it has established its role, and when it is performing its role the performance then should be left to the provinces since they are most deeply concerned.

I have already mentioned another very important area of federal concern, and that is the incentive of federal support—the incentive to industry. To this end I have already written to the Minister of National Health and Welfare asking that he direct the attention of his colleagues in the Cabinet at Ottawa. I believe there are four different departments involved in these very pressing and urgent problems.

The hon. member for Woodbine suggested that instead of bringing legislation to take over total control of this problem by the province, that we should leave Metro and such other places as they are and that we should move in where nothing is being done. This simply would not work.

First of all it would lead to duplication. It would lead to confusion. It would lead very definitely, as we have already seen, to differences in opinion as to standards and there is no sense in setting standards that are unrealistic or unattainable.

We have to be realistic about this matter, and there is no use of saying you must attain this standard if it is impossible of attainment at the present time. I am quite in agreement with the hon. member for Riverdale, or was it the member for Wentworth East, who said that any source of pollution can be controlled. This is quite true, but if the controlling of it is such that it puts the industry completely out of business then we have to work with the industry to find a more realistic and a more practical and feasible type of control. A dichotomy of responsibility simply would not work and we feel that this is the only way. We have tried leaving it to municipalities alone. We have tried division of authority. Neither one has worked.

We think this is the only way left for us to try. By passing this legislation, the department or the government can undertake control on an industry-wide basis. If we find that one particular industry—as we have already found in our studies, and indeed this is to be the basis of our control of existing sources of industrial pollution—or that certain types of industry are very great offenders, it will be our responsibility, our duty and our aim to undertake control of those industries on a province-wide basis, rather than picking out a section and saying we will try to control all the pollution in this section. We do not believe this is the way to approach the problem.

Then with provincial control, we believe that we can move into any area at any time to undertake any problem in this regard.

The hon. member for Riverdale very logically asked why we had left out the sulphur fumes, the sources that come within the terms of this particular piece of legislation. We did this deliberately at the present time. We, too, look forward to the time when all possible sources of pollution will come within the four corners of this Act, but we find on study that the arbitration under The Sulphur Fumes Arbitration Act has been most successful. It is doing a good job at the present time, and we feel we are going to have a big enough job tackling what we have undertaken here. When we are ready to take

this over, then we will be in a position to come back to this Legislature and ask for support. I hope these hon. members who have expressed so much interest will be there again, sir, in their same places to give us their support.

There is no indication that this legislation has been inadequate or not workable. There have been no claims under the Act that we know of in the past five or six years, since any claims that have arisen have had possible solutions between those offended and the industry.

Again, there was a matter of very great concern to the hon. member for Riverdale and I believe very justifiably—you see, I was listening after all—and that was the matter of the individual, the possibility or the ease by which the individual can complain. We believe that this is covered under section 2(a) of the Act. Any complaint can be lodged with us in this regard, exactly as it can be lodged concerning any matter that comes within the purview of the department's responsibilities. And then under sections 8 and 10 of the Act too.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, what section was that, please?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Section 2(a). The Minister may investigate any pollution problem. Then, under section 8, a provincial officer will be able to survey any source and report. Not only will they on a day-to-day basis be investigating and seeking out sources of pollution on their own, but they will certainly be listening to complaints and immediately investigating complaints.

Section 10, of course, is a very forceful section in the legislation. It gives the Minister authority to order immediately that drastic steps be taken, even to the point of closing the plant, so that the source of pollution shall be cleaned up completely.

I think this would answer the question by the hon. member for Wentworth East, when he spoke about the particular instance where a very bad source of pollution was causing much damage in homes far removed from the plant. A case of that kind on complaint, if it were not possible for the industry to deal with it very promptly and immediately by itself, then under this Act the Minister can order immediate action, even to the point of closing the plant.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is good legislation. There is not any doubt that as we go along we will find there are gaps. But I can assure you that our department is prepared to apply to those gaps the same vigour we have tried in this whole matter and see that they are closed rapidly. I commend it to the attention and serious consideration of the House.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister what document he was quoting from in respect to the California situation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The report of the county of Los Angeles air pollution control district, dated December, 1966.

Mr. Young: I have some documents here from the California motor vehicle pollution control board, December 1, 1966, and there seems to be some disagreement, they are much more optimistic. This is the source of my information.

Mr. Sargent: May I ask the Minister a question? The Act says—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: I want to find out when the Act comes into force, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It is really a committee of the whole House question. We speak once on the principle of the bill when it comes before the House. We are departing a little bit from that today and I would like to continue properly.

Mr. Sargent: Well, he nullifies the whole thing, the activating of this whole programme by two things—

Mr. Speaker: The member may ask the Minister if he will answer a question.

Mr. Sargent: All right, will the Minister answer a question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I do not think so. I have not nullified anything, Mr. Speaker, I simply answered the points that were brought up as my hon. friends discussed the principle of the bill. If there are any details, I will be very happy to deal with them when we come to the proper time.

I may say, sir, that this bill is going to the standing committee on health.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I was going to ask the Minister, it will be going to the standing committee?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1965

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton moves second reading of Bill 70, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill 71, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in regard to the principle of this bill.

I had expected the licensing of some of these items such as set out in section 2 of this bill might come under the consumers' bureau that has been set up. But I can see the sense of doing it the way the government has done it and I am most happy to see it, particularly having to do with such items as hearing aids.

As you may recall, Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session I was discussing the misuse and the abuse caused by salesmen of certain types of hearing aids. The government has taken a considerable length of time in bringing about this legislation and I regret that in this Act as well, I believe the Act comes into effect on the day named by the Lieutenant-Governor. Now, if we have the same delay in bringing about the principle of this bill as we did in the consumers bureau bill, we are still going to have a long wait.

But in the hope and expectation that the hon. Minister means business when he is going to enforce the licensing of various hearing devices—and I assume also this will include under this section artificial limbs and various items needed in the health field—assuming he means business, we can look forward to the immediate implementation of the principle as set out in the bill.

I want to emphasize to the Minister the importance of licensing and I am again going to use the example of hearing aids, because it was a specific example that I brought to this House, and I think, Mr. Speaker, in some measure it was as a result of my speech on the Throne debate that this section has come about. There have been very serious abuses in the sale of hearing aids, in selling to people who do not need them and also in selling at an excessive price. I do hope that when the Minister sets out to enforce section two of this bill that he looks very closely at the whole hearing aid business.

Now, in fairness to the men who are in the hearing aid business, they want to be licensed. This has been my feeling as I have discussed this matter with them. The majority of the men who sell hearing aids, as far as I can learn, want to have a business that is policed first by themselves, and secondly by the government. But the main responsibility is going to lie with the government.

To just give you an example, Mr. Speaker. When I complained about the sale of hearing aids of a particular company that had the franchise for the sale of Beltone, the head office cancelled their franchise and I received telephone calls and they said: "Well, you have cleaned that up." But the truth of it is, the matter was not cleaned up because the same people who were abusing the trade and abusing the people they were selling to merely set up shop at the sportsmen's show and changed their name from Beltone to Puretone and they were back in business two weeks afterwards.

It just shows that this section is needed, because if the government does not license the men who sell hearing aids they will, after being reprimanded or stopped on one occasion, find another out. So this section helps —in fact goes a long way to controlling the abuses in the hearing aid industry.

But what is most regrettable, Mr. Speaker, is that it takes so long for these things to come about. Had we had an active consumers bureau, many people would not have been taken advantage of even in the last year, and it is my hope that the Minister, through this bill, will implement it immediately.

Again, I point out the weakness—it does not become effective until a day named by the Lieutenant-Governor. How long that will be, we do not know and it is a problem that we in the Opposition are highly concerned about, because there are literally hundreds of people that are misused and abused by people who have no ethics in business whatsoever. I have been amazed by the correspondence that I have received as a result of the interest in this particular problem. I hope that the Minister will not only pass the Act and have it proclaimed, but at the same time will see to it that inspectors and proper personnel are made available to enforce the legislation, because we can go to the Attorney General's office and find that there are many cases that the fraud squad are now trying to investigate

that will certainly give him all kinds of information of what just has to be done under this section.

There is one other item, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to draw attention to briefly. That is under section three where the government is now going to give grants for public health services. I do hope that these grants for public health services will include the setting up of the apparatus so that the public health officer can have screens for the general population in his area.

We know that in two areas—I believe in Scarborough, and in the Fergus area and, I believe, in the area of the member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton)—attempts have been made to screen the population. To do this, costs money, and originally when a public health officer wanted to begin such a screening system—I believe it was Dr. Dale in Wellington South, or in Fergus, Ontario—he could not obtain grants from the provincial government to do such work. Then in turn he went to the federal government and the grants were forthcoming.

At that time the man who made the grants possible was a Dr. Charron, who now happens to be the Deputy Minister of Health for Ontario. I rather suspect that the good advice of bringing in section three came from Dr. Charron and the Minister was listening to his Deputy.

By a screen system, I mean a system where the medical health officer can literally screen people for lung cancer, or for poor eyesight, just as we have screened people by the X-ray for TB. The X-rays for TB have been highly successful, and by having such a system we have been able to discover many cases of TB at an early stage where they can be cured. This has gone a long way in turning TB from a major threat to the health of the people of the province to be rather a minor threat. Mind you, it is still a threat, I do not minimize it, but it has certainly been brought under control. It is no longer the scourge that it once was.

This was made possible in the main because of a major effort to find the people who were suffering from TB.

We now know that it is far cheaper to nip a disease in the bud before it spreads. If we discover a disease, be it cancer or anything else, soon enough a great deal can be done for the patient, and it is far cheaper, especially for the taxpayer, if we can prevent disease and spend our money on prevention rather than having to spend it on the cure.

So grants made under section 3 can be highly important and I hope that the Minister might be able to give us more information on the subject, whether or not he intends to use, under the principle of this bill, such money to bring in the screening of our population as begun in Scarborough, and again as developed to a more considerable extent by Dr. Dale. Having been on the select committee, looking into the problems of aging, this business of screening and of the public health officer being aware of the problems of aging, can be of very great importance in helping people who are of senior years in maintaining good health and living and enjoying life for a much longer period. This again, Mr. Speaker would tie in with the hearing aids.

We know that many people cannot afford hearing aids, or they do not know if a hearing aid is required. Yet if the public officer of health has the facilities where these people can attend, or even better where the public health officer has an aggressive programme to seek out people who need help, we can be of a tremendous service to the people in the province of Ontario and in certain fields, especially to those who are getting on in years.

So this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is good legislation. But it is like anything else, it depends how it is used. It could very easily be nothing more than a façade. Sometimes, particularly in an election year, we on this side of the House get rather cynical of legislation that is brought forth—of this type and at this stage in the history of this House. But it can be used for a very good purpose.

If the money is not made available, section 3 means nothing. A bill normally could be much broader and much wider than this bill is. But if the will and the energy are there a great deal of good can be done and I, for one, will watch closely to see how much is done and how strongly it is enforced. At least it is a beginning in some fields that have been neglected far too long by this government and it is, perhaps, a mincing step forward, but it is better than nothing and I have come to expect from this government that the best you can expect is the mincing step. It is not good enough for the problem we have, and the problems that we have to solve, but at least it is in maybe a negative way to look at it better than nothing.

It does not come to grips in its principles in the whole picture, with the vast problem that we have in the province of trying to control, and trying to regulate the sale of various items that have to do with the health of our people such as hearing aids, artificial limbs.

But what is even more important is the general principle of tremendously expanding the services of the public health officer. The duties of the public health officer and similar public offices are bound to expand in the next few years, and this is a grudging, mincing step forward in this respect and in saying that it is at least a little good, we support this bill.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the apparent ambivalence in the mind of the member for Parkdale is mirrored by the member for Scarborough West. On one occasion he described this Act as good legislation; and on the next as a mincing step forward; and thereafter as a grudging, mincing step forward, if I quote him accurately. I must say that that sense of confusion necessarily obtains when viewing this particular Act. We will have to support this Act on second reading, Mr. Speaker, because the principle, as it were in theory, appears to be a reasonably good principle, but this Act is a bitter disappointment—and I want to put that to the Minister in the strongest possible terms—this Act is a superficial, skeletal piece of legislation not worthy of a government which is in one particle, interested in the field of health.

It is typical of a government which views health as acute illness and in the hospital setting only, but has entirely neglected the field of preventive medicine and the possibilities inherent in that area. I want to take a look at some of the aspects which flow from the principles inherent in this bill, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is important, even if only for a few moments.

I note with some interest that in the Minister's accompanying statement, and it is a much better elucidation of the principle than the bill itself, he says that legislation now before the House will require municipalities not now receiving such services, to provide these either by establishing a health unit, or joining with an existing health unit.

I smiled when I saw that sentence, Mr. Speaker, because if the Minister will remember the debate of last year and the frenetic interjections of his colleague, the suggestion that we should impose public health services in some areas of the province was anathema to the government—but one year later they have, of course, reversed themselves by succumbing to the irresistible logic, inherent in the provision of these health services.

We now, at least, have the basis on which to move, but only the basis, because all that this bill does, Mr. Speaker, is to provide a little more money, and the money will not expand the nature of the service one jot.

It may mean an increase in salary to the municipal officer of health and it may mean an increase in salary to some public health nurses, but it will have no practical effect on the programme whatsoever.

Indeed, if my memory serves me correctly, less than one week ago, when the public health grant came through for the city of Toronto, the controller of the budget, Mrs. Campbell, lowered the budget by an amount corresponding to the provincial grant, so that the total amount of money spent on public health, is exactly the same today as it was then. The province has made no viable contribution to the nature of the service whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, it is the nature of the service we are discussing—that is the principle—that is important to this bill, not the contribution of X number of dollars. I cannot say too strongly that the government participates in the undermining of health through the population of Ontario, there is no other way of putting it, by refusing to implement the preventive health features in a public health programme.

Again, the Minister alluded to what the principles would mean in his opening statement and he suggested that there were to be a number of advisory committees and task forces, made up of persons expert in their own field, to advise on specific programmes. Then, in casual albeit vigorous fashion, he let loose a stream of different types of programmes that might come into being.

Let me take a look at a few of those programmes, Mr. Speaker, and let us analyze the reality as they stand in Ontario in 1967.

Dental health services—Mr. Speaker, fully 80 per cent of the public health units in the province of Ontario do not provide dental services to the population which they serve and under no circumstances will this Act permit them to provide it, so that what this Act does is to maintain a stagnancy in the field of dental health services.

Maternal and child health services—what will this Act do in the field of maternal and child health services? Did the Minister say anything about the infant mortality rate in Ontario, Mr. Speaker? Did the Minister suggest that some real effort, financial and in terms of human resources, would be put into a project of trying to lower the infant mortality rate in Ontario?

It is not a rate, Mr. Speaker, of which any province can be proud. The province of

Ontario rate of 20.5 per thousand live births is a very poor rate indeed. As the Minister himself pointed out on other occasions, there are several jurisdictions in the world, Scandinavia being an obvious one to choose, Western Europe being another, where the infant mortality rate has been reduced to 14, 15, or 16 per thousand live births.

The province of Ontario, with all the affluence and resources at our disposal, still has a level of 20.5—but it is worse than that, Mr. Speaker.

Looking at the vital statistics for certain health areas, province of Ontario, 1965, which is the last year for which the report is available, one learns that in the county of Grey, the infant mortality rate is 36.7; that in Renfrew it is 28.6; that in Kingston it is 30.9; that in Stratford it is 33.

These are infant mortality rates that are exceedingly serious in their implications for live births in the province of Ontario, and I quite accept the suggestion that there are major fluctuations from year to year, but a careful analysis of the vital statistics in the province, Mr. Speaker, will demonstrate that our infant mortality rate is high, relative to other western societies; that there is far too much fluctuation from year to year in various counties; and that what the Minister should be directing himself to is a determined effort, a herculean effort, to lower the infant mortality rate in Ontario, particularly in acute areas where the problem has been singularly depressing over a period of time.

That is true for certain counties, rather than the ephemeral and facile statement, that something will be done about child health services. What will be done about child health services? The child health clinics, Mr. Speaker, the child care centres attached to the public health units across Ontario are dwindling in size—dwindling significantly in size.

Yesterday, I took the reports from the various public health areas in Ontario and looked through some 40 or 50 annual reports, the most recent available for this province.

It is difficult to find a single report which does not point to the fact that the maternal and child health services are in a state of serious decline; that the clinics are not attended; that immunization programmes are not always carried through via the clinics; and that, indeed, certain of the services that should be provided cannot therefore be provided.

One would ask the Minister, what does he have in mind, and in what conceivable way will this Act help to assist in the provision of maternal and child health services? In no way whatsoever, Mr. Speaker! There will be no extra money, no extra inducement, no appreciable improvement in the guidelines.

As a gesture, I suppose, a gesture to the current and rather more mature public thinking, the Minister threw in family planning clinics. Mr. Speaker, let us face it, unless the Minister instructs the public health units involved to establish family planning clinics, there will be very few indeed within the foreseeable future, because for whatever reason, usually the apprehensions and the hesitancies, which I think are unjustified, on the part of local medical officers of health and local communities, family planning clinics have not taken root in Ontario except in my borough in Scarborough and I believe in the county of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon), the county of Brant.

Family planning clinics have not taken root in the province of Ontario and the Minister does not demonstrate how he will achieve the very important objective of adequate dissemination of birth control information in this province and the servicing, particularly of low-income families who come to public health services for assistance. One cannot leave this as always in the vague ambience of permissive legislation, knowing full well that absolutely nothing concrete will be achieved. Again, it is superficial and it is skeletal, and it is disappointing, Mr. Speaker; it is entirely misleading and the Minister knows it. Imagine having a task force on family planning clinics. One envisages a large group of people marching into an area to establish clinics for family planning when, in fact, all the Minister needs are certain officers of his department to instruct individual health units to set them up. I would say, Mr. Speaker, on a mandatory basis one should have family planning clinics attached to every single public health unit in Ontario, and that there should not be the extent of qualification and flexibility which the Minister knows full well prevail. Because just as the member for Parkdale pointed out, one now moves on hope alone, on the possibility that there may be multiphasic screening clinics for older people when they are now confined exclusively to Scarborough and to Fergus. There will be no appreciable improvement in that area either.

Cancer detection: What cancer detection, Mr. Speaker? Which of the public health units are now engaged in cancer detection? What moneys are available under this Act which will provide even for Pap tests to be done on a regular basis at public health units? What kind of audacity is it to throw this

type of bill before a Legislature surrounded in the trappings of promises without the bill ever seeing the promises through? All of us know in this House that there will not be that kind of a programme unless the Minister institutes it, and provides specific moneys for it; this kind of holus-bolus grant simply reduces the budget or leaves it doing precisely what it did before.

Multiphasic screening programmes: I need not go into that, the member for Parkdale mentioned them. Suffice it to say that again if one looks through the vital statistics in the province of Ontario, one sees a very depressing pattern in certain counties and certain areas of illnesses due to age. The patterns are there to be discerned by any observer who wishes to take action, but the Minister does not wish to take action, Mr. Speaker; that is why the bill is left in this amorphous and generalized way.

Community mental health: Now there, Mr. Speaker, is the biggest joke of all. The fact is that there is a serious rupture, a serious breakdown between the public health units in the province of Ontario and most of the Ontario hospitals. Referrals for after-care, in particular, still do not come from the Ontario hospitals to the public health units. As a result, our mental health after-care programme, for which the public health unit is eminently suited, lies in limbo, and a great many people are gravely harmed because of it. Not in a direct way, but in a very obvious indirect way that if the service were available, the incidence of mental illness would be reduced.

Just in case the Minister wonders of what I speak, Mr. Speaker, let me refer to the various reports in the units that I was looking at yesterday, to tell you the number of people who engaged in mental health after-care in the public health units: one can get the flavour, the sense of involvement. Oshawa, in 1966, 16 people; North York, 29, Bruce 5, Halton 41, Hastings none, Kent 34, Peel none, Lennox and Addington 2, Muskoka 18. Ontario county, the Minister's own, with the Whitby Ontario hospital in the riding, had 5 referrals for mental health after-care to that public health unit. The township of York in its report says on page 3:

> There are no adequate local facilities for the admission of mentally ill patients and only very limited out-patient service. Worse, there appears to be no immediate prospect of any betterment of the situation.

And for the annual report of Kitchener, The Department of Health, reads:

> We would wish that a routine for the comfort and support of patients discharged from Ontario hospitals were established. This department receives some reports, makes some calls, and it assists in some cases in rehabilitation, but there is little set pattern and we have the impression that that a good many of these patients are left to their own devices and must therefore suffer to some extent. Furthermore, we do not feel it is good medicine.

I ask the Minister to reflect on those remarks from one of his public health units: "Furthermore, we do not feel it is good medicine."

These opinions have been forwarded to the Ontario Department of Health and to the superintendent of the Ontario hospital at London. A lot of good it will do, Mr. Speaker, because this department has been impervious to setting up programmes for mental health after-care for many years. And there is absolutely nothing in this bill which will suggest any change whatsoever.

What is true, Mr. Speaker, for mental health after-care, of course, is true for the referrals which would normally come to the public health unit for all kinds of mental health care. And one of the saddest features of those reports—and they are a compendium of the health in the province, Mr. Speaker—is the constant reiteration that there are no services for children, there are no services for adolescents, there are no services for adults within any reasonable radius of the local public health units. One gets a great many programmes announced in this House, like the famous white paper at the opening of the session for children with mental and emotional disorders, but not a single thing has flowed from that announcement or from any other government programme. The integrity of this bill is impugned—indeed, frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is negated—by the refusal of the government to move in any of the important areas of mental health over the past two years, let alone over the past two or three months. The same refrain is repeated time and time again in all the public health reports that can be viewed.

The next thing that was thrown in as part of the principle of this bill, Mr. Speaker, was accident prevention, including medical aspects of home and road accidents. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that there may be only four or five units in all of Ontario that are engaged in accident prevention in any serious way in terms of the analysis of accidents, automobile accidents in particular, and in terms of the involvement of police on the spot, and studies

deriving from the accidents to ascertain causes of death. I know my colleague, the member for Yorkview, raised these matters with the Minister last year and at that time he just speculated in general terms about the possibility.

But the point again is that one cannot go on speculating forever, and that one undermines the health of the province by refusing to come to grips with this kind of proposition. What specific figures are available show that in certain areas of the province, the motor vehicle accident rate per 100,000 estimated population is terribly severe. The average in Ontario would seem to be 23.8 per 100,000 population, but I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to observe some of these counties: Bruce, 44.6; Elgin-St. Thomas, 45.7; Kent, 50.2; Simcoe, 45.3; Wellington-Dufferin, 52.8.

Mr. Sargent: What about Grey county?

Mr. S. Lewis: Again, Grey county, 33.6, which is considerably above the average rate. It is a very simple point, Mr. Speaker, that the principle in this bill which pretends to provide motor vehicle accident analysis and prevention is negated by the refusal of the department to come to grips with what picayune statistics it has.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this is not apparent in the principle of the bill. These matters were suggested as programmes which can come four-square within the permissive limitations of this bill. The hon. member is completely astray from the priniciple of the bill.

The bill is to provide increased grants from government sources to help public health units institute these programmes.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough West has allowed me the opportunity to introduce my group. May I do so now?

Mr. Speaker: I wish to finish this bill first, if the member does not mind.

The member for Scarborough West seems to be making sort of a sweeping coverage of health in general rather than sticking to the principle as it appears in this bill. I do not have the bill before me, but I thought perhaps he was going a bit far afield and wonder if he could be a little more cogent in his remarks regarding the principles involved.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will refer you to the appropriate section. It is really in section 3, The Public Health Act is amended by adding thereto—and what the Act purports to do, Mr. Speaker, is to provide money for the public health units in given municipalities and local boards, in order to implement certain programmes. That is the principle of the bill.

I am discussing those programmes. They follow on the principle. They are the principle. Without it there is no principle. However, if it will relieve the Minister, I have come to the end of the discussion of individual programmes.

What I want to do in summary, Mr. Speaker, is to make this point: that public health in Ontario is a sorely neglected feature of medical care, that this bill will not enhance public health one iota.

If anything, it will set public health back on its heels, because it will allow local boards of health to cut their budgets and simply absorb the increased provincial expenditure without, in any sense, re-appraising the programes involved.

Until the Minister has the courage to come into this House and say these programmes must be provided for the citizens of Ontario on a mandatory basis, as the basic components of a reasonable preventive health service, then all of these bills are entirely inconsequential, except that they add a few dollars to one municipality or another.

I am sad to say, Mr. Speaker, that this bill, too, has the flavour, the obvious flavour, of a pre-election gambit on the part of a desperate department, because everyone knows that the public health division of The Department of Health has been in a state of disarray for some considerable time.

It may endeavour to pull itself together and its intentions may be honourable, but all its intentions will be frustrated by a bill which simply grants certain funds and makes no provision whatsoever for the programmes except to acknowledge their need by reference to certain task forces, the new favourite phrase of the Minister of Health.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, one does not know what to do in a situation like this. You support the principle knowing full well that the regulations which come will probably negate the principle, but in the hope that something may flow from it some day, that the bill is at least here, we will vote for the general principle of public health. What we are pointing out, Mr. Speaker, and if one could move an amendment on second reading, I would do so at this time, is that until the programmes are specifically included on a mandatory basis, then the bill does not mean a thing.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I do want to make some remarks in answer to those

made by the hon. member for Parkdale, who was very obviously interested in the terms of the bill and might see some good in it. I think that the hon. member for Scarborough West, he too can see some good in it, but, well—

My hon. friend from Parkdale was a little concerned about the time. I am reminded of what Napoleon's general said: "What is difficult, my emperor, is done; what is impossible takes a little time." Of course the matters of licensing these facilities is going to take a little time and for that reason these sections of the Act will come into operation on proclamation.

We have to do a very great deal of digging and searching and seeking for information in certain of these areas at least and in more of them than we anticipated we would have to. We have to ascertain how much training those who are professing to give the service have already got, who we can include within the terms of the regulations as capable and fitted to provide the service, and things of that kind. Therefore it is going to take a little time to prepare our regulations.

But I can assure you that it is the intention of this bill that we move forward as quickly as possible, because I too have been aware of the fact that many people have been exploited—I think this is the only reasonable word I can use, in dealing with certain of these people.

Unfortunately, of course, the actions of a few have brought disrepute on a section of our society that is sincerely and conscientiously trying to do a good job and provide services for those who need them.

One of the things that we intend to do with these facilities is to, as soon as possible, as soon as reasonable standards, again, are established, seek their accreditation and no facility coming within the purview of this Act will be allowed to operate unless it is officially accredited.

We intend, by our regulations, to hold the employer responsible for the actions of his employees in some of these cases where there is an element of business brought into it as well as the professional or technical side.

We too have given serious thought to encouraging the Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs to undertake this. But there is an unclean mixture of technical services and quasi-professional services, as well as the business side. When we can reach the place where we get these straightened out, then we will have further discussions with our colleagues, to the end that they may take over that phase of the operation which they are better skilled to deal with.

Now the increase in grants, and I understand—at least I think it is about the only part of the statement made by the hon. member for Scarborough West that I did understand and did appreciate—the matter of municipalities reducing their share of the cost of public health by the amount of our increase.

This is going to happen, there is not any doubt in my mind. It is going to happen in some measure. We are going to try to discourage it all we can. Our grant to them will always bear a percentage relationship, so the more they get from us, the more they must keep theirs up. It is quite true that the city of Toronto at first blush, when the grant was announced, reduced their own budget by the amount of our grant, but let us bear in mind that the city of Toronto had already planned its public health programme for the current year—and was considering the budget that was attached to that programme.

So I would presume that the programme had been progressed or moved forward already and therefore the money that we provided was completely and totally unexpected as far as the city of Toronto was concerned. They have never had it before and I can understand them reducing their budget by the amount of our grant, because I repeat, their programme was already developed and placed before the council.

I believe it was the member for Parkdale who made a good deal about the multiphasic screening programme conducted by the Wellington-Dufferin unit and pointing out that the moneys to support this came from federal health grants. This has happened for a long time, sir, and Dr. Charron was the director of that branch of the service in Ottawa.

We are very fortunate that he is our Deputy now, but we have been thinking of this for quite a long time and we have been supporting programmes of this kind when we got the requests from health units to do so.

My hon. friend from Scarborough West betrays the typical socialist tendency to force people to do things.

Mr. S. Lewis: You have just forced them.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: He is going to drive people to do things. He is going to be the alpha and the omega. He is going to tell everybody what to do and how to do it. He only knows all power, all knowledge, all wisdom is vested in him.

Mr. Speaker, you do not operate in the health care field in this way. I repeat what I said last year, what I have said every year since this hon. member came into the House. The men who direct these units are specialists in their field of medical training. They know more about public health than I do.

I am advised by them, and I am quite certain that I would face a minor revolution, maybe a major revolution, if I got to the point where I said, "You are going to do thus and so". I do not have to say that, these are well skilled men, they know their business, they are expert in the field.

I repeat, they know far more about it than I do and I am quite certain, unless my hon. friend took a crash course, that they know more about it than he does.

Mr. S. Lewis: One of them thinks you are a Stalinist.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We do not interfere—and this might be a good place to say to you, Mr. Speaker, when I spoke to them after hearing the diatribe last year about how badly used they were, all they did was laugh at the hon. member's statement.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to dictate to them—we are going to urge upon them that we together have to take a completely new look at health services and, to that end, programmes which have outlived their usefulness, they will be urged to drop and they will be encouraged to adopt new programmes.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if I might interrupt at this time. The member for Grey North has some guests in the east gallery and I would ask him to introduce them.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the House that we have today 40 students from grades 12 and 13 of the Owen Sound collegiate institute, the beautiful Georgian Bay city, and with them is their teacher, Mr. J. C. Stevenson, who is a great ex-athlete and the father of Don Stevenson, who is the director of the economic planning branch in The Department of Economics and Development. I want to welcome them, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the opportunity to say "welcome".

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The member for Scarborough West complained about the maternal and well baby clinics not being attended in certain areas. I wonder if the hon. member ever stops to think, sir, that this is quite possible because there is a very good service rendered by the practitioners in the area already.

I think he has to relate a statement of this kind to morbidity rates in the area. Is there a high incidence of illness among new mothers and infants in these areas? Is there justification for his statement that clinics are not well attended, therefore the health of the people is suffering? The health of the people in these areas may be excellent because there are adequate family health services available and people may choose to go to their own physicians rather than go to the public health clinic.

The need for the public health clinic from the standpoint of services of this kind is going to reduce as we go along. Indeed, I am quite certain that there is a visible decrease in the demand for services in the last year just by virtue of the introduction by this government of Ontario medical services insurance.

Many people who, perforce, had to go to public clinics, can now go to a physician of their own choice, to his own office, and get the services. I could go on and make comments on many of the things he said but I, too, would be straying from the principle of the bill.

The principle of the bill is that we are going to increase our support of local health services; we are going to encourage local health services to review, re-assess, re-appraise their programmes to the end that they keep abreast of the times, keep ahead of the times; and not to dictate to them what they shall do, but rather to encourage them to do the things that we believe are more necessary, today, in this part of the twentieth century, than they were some time ago.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE INSURANCE ACT

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 60, an Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport) moves second reading of Bill 72, an Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act,

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The eighteenth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. J. F. Edwards in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(Concluded)

Vote 409 agreed to.

On vote 410:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, very distinguished Chairman, I welcome you to the chair, sir. I would like to ask a couple of questions about this vote 410, the advances under The Ontario Housing Corporation Act. Does the Minister have any figures of estimated needs in the Metropolitan Toronto area for low-rental public housing projects? Or, I will put it, units, I fall into the trap that many people do.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): I think, as we said the other night, there is a survey already under way which we are helping to finance. It is a survey of Metro Toronto, with the metropolitan council, to find out what the actual need is. I think this came out of our discussions the other evening when we talked about the previous Metro survey and the fact it was being analyzed now by a further group, to determine what is the actual need.

The survey was there but no one was satisfied with the facts and figures and I think we said it would be through in about six weeks to two months. I understand the completed survey will be made in about three months. We will have a set of figures on what we think the Metro needs are.

Mr. S. Lewis: Does the Minister have any idea how the survey appraises the situation in general terms, what are the components for assessing it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: As we understand it, it is a total survey by the Metro housing committee council on all the needs in the city and surrounding Metro areas. I think it is going to be quite comprehensive because, in view of the people moving in and moving out, I think any survey we would have today would have to make allowances for a number of new residents who are coming into this city. I have heard figures myself, estimated at roughly 50,000 a year. Now, it could be 75,000, it could be 40,000, but I would think you will have to wait until the survey is finished before there are any accurate figures on that.

Mr. S. Lewis: Could the Minister speculate on the minimum figure per year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not have any idea.

Mr. S. Lewis: What about the figures for the number on the waiting list of the Metropolitan Toronto housing authority or what numbers the Ontario housing corporation has on the waiting list for Metropolitan Toronto? Does the Minister have that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: On the Metro register list, the member means?

Mr. S. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, the last figures we had here were roughly between 6,000 and 7,000 with one group to be checked out.

There are quite a few senior citizens and married people without children on that list. As you know, we do not handle senior citizens in Metro, we handle senior citizens outside Metro but perhaps some of the difficulty in that waiting list, is that there are a great many elderly people who want to remain together and need accommodation—and they are in that Metro registry list of families awaiting accommodation.

I would think that the last figures I had a look at would be close; out of the 6,000 or 7,000, I would say perhaps 5,000 have families. Now, that is increasing at the rate of 500 a month. On the other hand, there are more people being housed so we are keeping pace with some of the figures on that registry.

Mr. S. Lewis: They are increasing at the rate of 500 families a month?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Five hundred applications, I presume they are all families of different sizes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right. All right, I will leave it there for the moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, there is a question I would like to ask the hon. Minister and I think this is the right place to ask it. It is in respect to houses along Highway 401 in which the Ontario housing corporation has a capital investment.

I had a request from one of these men who is renting one of the houses owned by the Ontario housing corporation and the request was whether it was possible for him to purchase this house without the necessity of tender.

The problem is this, and he is typical of several people in this category: He has a family, two children and a grandparent living with him; another one of his neighbours has four children. They are desperately trying to find other accommodation.

They are supposed to leave within a reasonable time and the hon. Minister and his department have been good enough to let the deadline go by, I think April 1 or May 1 was the deadline, until the end of the school year so that the children will not have to change schools—and this is very much appreciated.

Their problem is to find other space where children can be accommodated, either rental-wise, which seems to be impossible, or purchase-wise, which seems to be beyond their purse. I quite realize the importance of the tender system in disposing of property.

I think this is a good system, but like other good systems there may be exceptions to the general rule, and I would ask the Minister, in a case where people are now housed in these houses, and are finding them fairly satisfactory, and are having problems, because of the size of their families and because these houses are no good for their kind of accommodation, whether or not it might be possible to—instead of the tender system here—to do this—to call for two evaluations by independent evaluators and get those evaluations and then seriously consider whether or not those evaluations might be used as a basis of selling to the present tenants if those tenants wish to buy.

Mr. Chairman, I quite realize the problems presented, I quite realize the difficulty which the Minister faces in the whole tender setup in disposing of these properties. But I think this would overcome the difficulty of any charge of patronage or favouritism—I almost combined those two words. But surely there is a way by which human interest here can be served and I would like the Minister's comment as to whether this kind of disposal of some of these properties where the need is great, might be considered.

Mr. Chairman: While the Minister is commenting, may I suggest to you that we do not want to open up the entire vote on housing. We are under the capital disbursements at this time and we do not want to revert. I know that the—

Mr. Young: This is where the Ontario housing has a capital investment, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I will be glad to comment on that. As you recall, we handle those houses for The Department of Highways and they are not sold on a tender basis. They are advertised through real estate agencies and the man living in the house can make an application to buy through a real estate agent the same as anybody else.

If there is any specific case where a man is there and he is well located, certainly our people would be glad to have him contact us and find some way that we can arrange through the agent in charge of that particular sale to give him preference. This is the way it has been handled. There are no tenders and I can assure you there is no favour shown to anybody. I appreciate the man's position. He gets in there and he rents it on a 30-day basis and if somebody comes along and wants to buy that house, we want to get rid of it. We want to get it off our books, it is not public housing as you appreciate, we want to get it off our books and get that Highway 401 situation closed out. I would hope as we go along with the rest of our programme if he has that problem, that we could find a house suitable for him and a family his size. But they are not sold on a tender basis, they are advertised, as you know, freely in the daily papers.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, the part of this letter which went out from your department says this: Because we are dealing with public funds we are required to accept the highest or best offer submitted and in view of recent marketing conditions in many cases we have received offers in excess of our asking price.

Now the difficulty that these people face is that they do not know what other people are offering and one man might offer $20,000, say for a certain property, and the present owner has put in his offer at $19,900. Logically, he should be able to afford $100 or more than the other person because he does not have the expense of moving, but he does not know, and so if these offers are made, unless they are open offers, and on a bid basis, then the occupant has no way of telling whether he is in a position to buy or not. This is the problem that the gentleman faces who came to me today. The Minister perhaps will—

Hon. Mr. Randall: All I can suggest is that they are listed with the real estate board and as far as we are concerned we want to dispose of those houses, as I said earlier, and get out of it. I would suggest that if you have any special cases—there are not many of those

houses left as you know—they turn over at a very fast rate and we are pretty well completed in that project—there will not be too many to worry about, but if there is anybody there now that you know of, let us have details. We are quite prepared to see if we can accommodate them.

I appreciate what you say, it would cost a couple of hundred dollars to move and that is the difference between having to move and letting somebody else take the house—we are quite prepared to look at it and see if we can assist the tenant affected. I will make a copy available to you.

Mr. Young: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 410 carried?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, how many of these capital projects or units will become available between April 1, 1967, and December 31, 1967? Do you know that—public housing units? How many will become available—let me confine myself to Metropolitan Toronto. Have you any idea?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The other night we included the units that would be available in the three seasons, summer, spring and fall—

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh that was the seasonal breakdown, was it? I got confused at one point.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well then, do you know how many—those are the ones as I recall for which money would be made available subsequent to April 1, 1967. What I am wondering, sir, is the number of units that will become available between April 1, 1967 and December 31, 1967, on the basis of starts.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You will recall that the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) asked if we would table that complete report on the starts, the starting dates and the completions. That has already been done—that is the report we talked about the other night, that was four or five pages—going back to 1965 and right up to the end of this year. That is all incorporated on that report. We attached a copy to go in *Hansard*. I presume it will go in tomorrow.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I would remind the Minister of the figure which I have just found between January 1, 1965, and March 31, 1967, there were 3,656 started or built, and from April 1, 1967, to December 31, 1967, to which much of this money would apply, I have no doubt, there are to be another 6,343 for a total of 10,000 units.

Leaving the latter figure aside for a moment because none of those starts have been made and because one is not sure of the completion date, what we are saying is that from the point of time that we are now discussing at this date in the estimates, April 13, 1967, and December 31, 1967, the maximum number of units that could become available on the open market—public housing units—would be 3,656.

I presume it will be lower than that because some of them will already have become available but suppose we take the optimum figure and suppose we also take the Minister's own estimates of 500 families being added to the housing registry every month, there are nine months left in 1967 and nine times 500 is 4,500 families.

Now 4,500 families are in need and the total number of units at the best possible interpretation would be 3,600. What happens to the other thousand families?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well I think you can play with figures all day and I could not tell you what is going to happen to them except that there are many people moving out of Metro too. There is always a group moving in and out as we found out the other day in our discussions of the emergency families we took care of last year there were something like 1,585 and 730 of those got eviction notices and they were spread through the various municipalities.

Now there is, while people are coming in, those people as a rule are finding accommodation in apartments or what have you, but the majority of people we are talking about are the cases who need public housing. I think you and I are talking about the same people.

I would suggest that we would be taking care of the number that we have outlined here and I would hope that as our programme goes through the year we can find other accommodation, either through purchase or construction, and the housing per month in Metro right now indicates we are housing 140 families a month on the average. Sometimes it is up, sometimes down, but we are now averaging 140. At that rate, it is 1,500 and some odd in the year, so we are housing a considerable number of these families.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is not public housing.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, and then of course private enterprise. I think now with the

change in the release of more money available in the money market for mortgages, we have already seen an indication that the private developers are going to take a more active interest in providing accommodation. Again, I come back and say I believe this is one of the reasons where I think that condominium is going to share some of the load in housing for some of those people on that waiting list we talked about, whether they be single families without children, or senior citizens.

If there is a step up in the building of senior citizens' units in the city of Toronto, that again will take some of those people off that list.

Mr. Chairman: I should like to remind the Minister and the member for Scarborough West, that I do not want in this vote to get into the generalities. I would like to stay with the specific advances under the vote.

Hon. Mr. Randall. I think I have given pretty well all the information I can as to what we can do. We know what the units are, the estimate we have produced. We are stepping up as fast as we can. If we can better those figures, we will. I am quite certain that we are going to have lots of problems, but I think we are finding accommodation for a great many people, more so every month than we did last year.

We have already pointed out the number of starts. The completion dates are shortening. I think if Expo is closing up there are going to be more workmen and contractors available for private construction in this area. We are going to have to roll with the number of people that are looking for housing and step up our efforts, which is what we are doing.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the thing I want to ask the Minister is, why does not your effort meet the demonstrable need? What is stopping you? You would be the first to admit, I am sure, that there will still be a shortfall. There will still be people who require low rental public housing desperately, who will not have it by the end of 1967. Why does your advance for projects fall short of meeting the need? What is the explanation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know how much experience you have had in business, but you cannot wave a magic wand and build that many houses. Every country I have been in around the world is short of housing, more so than Canada and the population is increasing in all the countries in the world. They need more housing.

We do not have any magic wand. I do not know if your party has or not, but it is absolutely impossible to do more than we are doing. The money is available, we have got the energy, the effort, we are doing everything we can. The land is the greatest problem in the city of Toronto, as you well know, unless we are going to tear down all the major centres in the city of Toronto, such as the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) suggested.

Maybe we should tear down a lot of warehouses, but when you go down to Wellington Street and start to tear down those warehouses, you are tearing down properties that are on acreage worth $400,000 and $500,000 an acre. Now the problem of housing is to get people spread out of the major core downtown. Again this comes back to satellite cities and as I pointed out, we are moving in those areas.

We have no magic wand and all I can say to you right now, when I am finished here and perhaps you have got the job, 10 years from now, you will have, I think, exactly the same problem.

Mr. Chairman: I hesitate to interrupt, to intervene or interject. I must suggest to the member for Scarborough West and to the Minister that we do not want to go back over the same debates that we had formerly. I would ask them at this time if they will stay with vote 410, from the standpoint of the capital disbursements.

Mr. S. Lewis: I thought perhaps, Mr. Minister, that the Chairman became agitated over the prospect of my step into power in 10 years. Perhaps that was not it. But it is very charitable of the Minister and we disagree only in the number of years, but agree on the fact that we will get there.

The point is that this is the advance for projects, capital advance for projects under the Ontario housing corporation, Mr. Chairman, and the point I am trying to drive home is very simple: There is not enough capital money advanced here to fill the demonstrable need for public housing and the Minister has indicated during the course of this debate that there is land in Metro—I agree, not in the downtown core—but there is land in Metro jointly held by federal-provincial authority, some of it serviced, which the government could build on and would build low rental public housing units.

I am not suggesting in any sense that they have to correspond to a ghetto environment. I am suggesting that it could be like county council housing in the United Kingdom that can be very attractive homes indeed, to which no stigma whatsoever attaches and about which people feel an immense pride. That could be done by the province of Ontario and should be done in the quantity necessary to meet the low rental housing crisis, which at the moment is staggering.

As the Minister has said, Mr. Chairman, and what urges me to make the point on vote 410 in the capital advances is that 500 families are added to the list each month and he has just admitted that he is only housing 140 a month on the average.

That means in Metropolitan Toronto, 360 families per month on the average are part of the shortfall. Even for the rest of 1967, if you multiply that by the number of months, you have 3,240 families who will not have housing. When you add that figure to the 5,000 to 6,000 already on the waiting list, you have a minimum of over 8,000 families requiring public housing by the end of 1967 and insufficient funds in the capital grant to provide them with the homes.

Mr. Chairman, there just is not any conceivable excuse. The government has the land, it has the wherewithal, it has the services. If it wants to go out and build low rental public housing units, it can. It prefers to leave thousands of families in a state of housing crisis, frequently resulting in summary eviction, family breakdown, confinement to the armoury, all the trappings of a very sad housing situation, rather than going out and doing the job that should be done, which is building a minimum of 15,000 or 20,000 units of public housing per year.

Because all of us know that in addition to the demonstrable need, there are a great many people who have given up even putting their names on the list. There does not seem to be any point in it whatsoever.

We have adduced from the figures given that the government of Ontario has set aside a capital advance sufficient to build roughly 2,000 public housing units a year. At the best, Mr. Chairman, that is 8,000 public housing units a year.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me correct you. I think you are wrong in your arithmetic. In the first place, we are building 4,000 housing starts in 1967, and we are ahead of what Metro is asking for. I am talking about Metro now.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are ahead of what Metro is asking for and the municipalities tell us what they want. We recognize that probably they need more than that, that is the reason why we are stepping up the programme.

Our capital budget is $16 million, which is 10 per cent. We add to that the 90 per cent we borrow from the federal authorities, that is $160 million.

I do not know if you have had experience of spending $160 million on housing in this kind of an era, but I would say to you that is ample money and if we need more money, I can assure you, I can go back to the Treasury board and get our 10 per cent increased and I have had lots of assurance from central mortgage and housing that they will put up theirs.

So our job right now is to put the energy and the effort into it and it is what we are doing to try and fill this need for housing. But again I go back and say to you, we get our request from the municipality after they have made their surveys. If their surveys are low, we check with them.

I am sure that their surveys can be stepped up when we get this three months survey from Metro. There will probably be additions to that. The money is there—the capital budget is ample. There is no shortage of money. The shortage is the hours, the time and the energy to get this job done in the shortest possible time.

Again I say to you that it is not easy to spend $160 million at the wave of a magic wand. Money is not the answer to many things. If money was the answer we could solve all our problems. Money is not the answer. The answer is to get the services and all the other things done that are required to build houses. This is just the problem.

Mr. S. Lewis: But you have serviced land held jointly with the federal government.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. It is the serviced land we are talking about.

Mr. S. Lewis: But it is not all the serviced land you are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have got to acquire more serviced land, that is what I just said.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well precisely, Mr. Chairman, the point is if the government wanted to set aside in advance to build 10,000 public housing units this year—and I assume they

would all be attractive units, I am not talking in ghetto terms—the government could.

The government has the serviced land and the government has the wherewithal, it is simply a question of will and of energy. The Minister himself used the term, time, hours and energy. And that is the key. Whether the Minister meant to blurt it out or not, that is the key, because the land is there and the money is there, but what is lacking is the conviction that this project must be achieved.

What is lacking, frankly, is an appreciation of what is happening to the families who are on the waiting list and cannot receive the public housing to which they are entitled. At the best possible interpretation, you are falling behind at the rate of 8,000 families per year and you cannot let it go that long, Mr. Chairman. It just cannot be tolerated. We have already seen in this House, Mr. Chairman, that the Malvern project will not come to fruition and that there is nothing emergent from the HOME programme in 1967, how much more critical can things become?

Now we find that we are dropping at the rate of 360 families per month between those who sign up on the registry, and those who are actually housed.

I appreciate the Minister's difficulty in bringing his Cabinet colleagues around to the fundamental truth of the situation, but they must be told, Mr. Chairman, they must be told and directed, that the houses are to be built. Mr. Chairman, without uttering one of those enormous banalities that offend this particular Minister, I want to say to him, when he says to me, "Would you wave a magic wand?" or "What would your answer be?" I want to provide him with the simple truism that the answer in this party would be to build houses—it is a simple, easy solution.

We know where the land is and we know that it is serviced, and we know that the government can do it. If there was one jot of sensitivity and understanding of the problem among the Minister's Cabinet colleagues, all the required homes would be built. There is no reason whatsoever to have this kind of persistent shortfall with all the aggravated social and family conditions that come from it.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that to see this kind of an advance, and for the Minister to say we could have more money—it is just promoting a desperate situation even further, it is deteriorating before your eyes.

To suggest that the private developers will take up the slack, we have all seen the fall in housing starts in January and February of 1967; private development is not going to take up any slack whatsoever. Apparently what we have is a critical situation becoming even more critical, and knowing the energies of this Minister, I want to credit him, I hope he will accept it from me.

I want to credit him with his own wish to see it through, somehow, somewhere, in that extraordinary Cabinet of which he is a part, a total callousness, an entire insensitivity, a complete incomprehension of what it involves in providing low-rental public housing units in massive quantities.

This is a deplorable budget in terms of the requirements. I do not know what is left of the Minister's housing budget, there is nothing left to his housing programme, it is not even meeting one-tenth of the social needs.

Votes 410 and 411 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Chairman, as I rise to present my estimates to the House for the 1967-68 fiscal year, I am able once again to report to the members a substantial increase in tourist spending in our province, and an equally worthwhile increase in border crossings by American visitors.

I am delighted to say I have been reporting these annual gains with monotonous regularity during the last four years, but nevertheless I think hon. members once again will be interested in the vital statistics of the tourist industry during the calendar year 1966.

Tourist spending reached a record high of about $1.6 billion, which is approximately eight per cent greater than in 1965. The breakdown for 1966 spending is as follows: United States visitors $400 million; other foreign visitors $40 million; Ontario travellers $1,080 million, and travellers from other provinces $80 million.

Vehicle entries at Ontario border points during 1966 totalled 6.7 million, up 6.5 per cent over the previous year's total of 6.3 million.

Mr. Chairman, my department will not lay claim to responsibility for the whole of these gains, since I am sure it is obvious that our fine summer weather in 1966 gave us a big boost. Nevertheless, the statistics do reflect

substantial increases in vehicle entries and in tourist spending during the winter season, particularly January, February and March.

We feel this reflects the success of our efforts to promote Ontario as a year-round vacation area by spacing our advertisements over a longer period and by featuring our winter attractions in many of them.

Speaking of the advertising branch, the major non-domestic market for Ontario tourism is the United States, and in particular those very populous states contiguous with our border, from New York to Minnesota. A measure of our success in this market is available from the dominion bureau of statistics, which reports that during the past five years, while population in the United States was up nine per cent, Ontario's income from United States travellers in Ontario was up 75 per cent.

Much of our advertising will continue to be placed in this vital market, and regional editions of United States publications will enable us to concentrate on our prime market —the 10 adjoining states I mentioned a moment ago.

A continuing flow of research and statistical information enables us not only to select the proper geographic market for Ontario tourism, but also the particular householders in that market most likely to be prospects for an Ontario vacation. These prospects can be defined in a number of socio-economic ways—primarily income and education—and also in terms of the number of previous visits they have made to Ontario. We have learned that a former customer is likely to be a repeat customer.

Our theme in the United States will continue to be "Friendly, Familiar, Foreign and Near—Ontario, Canada." We hope that what we say in words and pictures to our tourist prospects will continue to present an exciting and valid impression of our province in general, and in particular of our first-class, out-of-door attractions—beaches, parks, lodges, fishing and hunting—as well as our more sophisticated resort, fine dining, historic and cultural attractions.

We will continue to measure the impact and readership of our advertisements in order to increase their effectiveness in promoting Ontario tourism.

In Canada and in Ontario, our advertising programme will again feature particular parts of the province. This geographic division will be repeated in our literature programme, to which I will refer in more detail in a moment.

Special photography was planned and set up in advance for each of the 1967 advertisements, with the result that a very high order of photographic quality was achieved this year.

Funds were provided in our budget last year to permit special promotion of Canada's major Centennial event, Expo '67, and we are seeking funds for this purpose again this year. Of course we are doing this in our own self-interest, since Ontario tourism promises to benefit greatly by the additional visitors travelling through the province going to, or coming from, Expo.

To encourage visits to Ontario after Expo '67, last fall we erected illuminated, full-colour displays in commuter centres in four major United States cities—Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Chicago. This spring, in six major markets in the middle west—Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, Minnesota and St. Paul—we will publish full-colour advertisements on the Ontario Adventure Vacation Route to Expo '67. All of the ads will feature an illustration of the Ontario pavilion.

In Montreal itself, beginning this spring, we will have a streetcar, bus and subway card programme encouraging a visit to the Ontario pavilion and urging a stop at our travel information kiosk there, to obtain complete details on travel in Ontario from our attractive red-coated travel counsellors.

Expo is not our only special travel promotion this year. We also plan an advertising programme in the major southern Ontario market to encourage travel throughout the province, and especially through northwestern Ontario, to the Pan American games in Winnipeg in July.

Another major campaign during the next fiscal year will be a series of advertisements on the attractions of northern Ontario, utilizing the people of our north to make a dramatic, colourful and compelling story for tourism. Retained to do this work is one of the world's great portrait photographers—Yousuf Karsh.

Our budget in this fiscal year is $760,000. We estimate we will require $990,000 to carry out our advertising programme for Ontario tourism in 1967-68.

A major change in our publication policy is the decision to publish a group of route books of the province, describing particular itineraries for the benefit of travellers. These have been given the same names and cover the same areas as our Canadian advertising series. For example, The Wilderness Way of

the Voyageurs describes an itinerary from Manitoulin Island to Sault Ste. Marie, around Lake Superior to the Lakehead, and westward along the Lakehead-Fort Frances-Kenora triangle.

Another publication is Champlain Country, which covers that part of Ontario from the Ottawa valley westward to the French River and Georgian Bay. Also available for distribution in the immediate future is the publication Heritage Highways—Sur la Route des Pionniers, a booklet describing a travel itinerary from Niagara Falls to the Gaspé, published jointly by ourselves and The Department of Tourism, Fish and Game, province of Quebec. Incidentally, this publication has a section on Expo which is designed in such a fashion that it can easily be removed in 1968.

Among recently proposed publications which we plan to issue this year and for which we are now requesting funds are:

A publication on Queen's Park describing our parliamentary form of government and illustrated with pictures of many of the symbols of government such as the mace;

A full colour, four-page brochure in which our coat-of-arms, flag and provincial flower are briefly described;

A revised newly illustrated, Historic Ontario.

A selection has been made of the illustrations from this publication and we have produced a portfolio of historic sketches, suitable for framing, for distribution to guests in our province. A smaller version of this portfolio has been simply printed and will be available for distribution to school children.

Development branch: During 1967-68 the tourist industry development branch will operate 19 reception centres at border crossing points, an increase of two over last year. These will be temporary centres at Hill Island and Point Fortune. Seven centres will be operated year-round, and in addition, the interior reception centre at Barrie now is being kept open 12 months of the year.

The centres provide counselling service to the guests of the province, acquaint them with the many vacation opportunities in Ontario, make them feel welcome, and encourage them to remain here for longer periods.

The development branch field staff of 33 counsels tourist industry operators and offers advice on improving facilities, arranging financing and generally working to increase the tourist plant in both quality and quantity. Our staffers cooperate with regional tourist councils and regional development councils to improve local tourist attractions and to build new ones.

The work of this branch is not, perhaps, as well known as some of the others in our department, and I would like to outline for you a few of their varied chores.

The branch assists in the production of local and regional tourist literature; conducts hospitality seminars with people in the tourist industry and with potential workers among high school students; licences and inspects hotels, motels, camps and trailer parks to ensure that the travelling public is provided acceptable accommodation at the advertised prices; and assembles data for semi-technical publications such as Tourism and Your Community, and How to Conduct Special Events.

The branch also investigates and attempts to correct any complaints about tourist industry operators. Its members spend a great deal of time speaking to service clubs, helping with local fairs and exhibitions, making television and radio appearances, and generally selling tourism on a community level.

Information branch: The information branch will exhibit at four ski shows in the United States during the fiscal year, and will staff 12 sports, travel and boat shows. A third exhibit has been purchased to permit this expansion of the branch's activities.

Travel counsellors will be sent to 11 eastern and mid-western United States offices of the Canadian government travel bureau during May and June. The counsellors will provide a personal, detailed travel information service about Ontario to thousands of prospective visitors.

Nine travel counsellors in new, streamlined red and blue uniforms will staff The Department of Tourism and Information travel kiosk adjacent to the Ontario pavilion at Expo '67. This staff, by the way, has capability in four languages.

Since my friends across the way already have labelled 1967 the year of the slogan, I have another one for them, "ORCHIDS For Expo", designating the method by which regional Ontario literature is being accumulated for Expo distribution. ORCHIDS stand for Ontario Regional Council Hospitality and Information Distribution Service.

As you may know, Mr. Chairman, my department provides tourist operators with an inquiry list of those seeking information about an Ontario vacation. We are continuing to expand this service so that we can give subscribers the most detailed information

about the specific requirements of the prospective Ontario visitor. It is then up to the recipients to complete the job of selling their services and facilities.

Publicity branch: Our publicity branch is to be expanded this year with the addition of an outdoors writer. It is our hope this will permit us to take advantage of the growing demand for material on hunting, fishing, boating and camping.

The press relations section has begun the publication of a catalogue of Ontario travel articles on a variety of subjects that will be available to all North American media. The publication is called Synopsis, and its first issue has been extremely well received.

The special promotion section, which cooperates extensively with the Canadian government travel bureau, anticipates visits of about 150 prominent travel writers and broadcasters during the year. The section will also welcome three travel trade missions of 16 persons each. One will be a French-Scandinavian group, another Australian, and the third will represent the American automobile association.

The branch expects to arrange and conduct programmes for at least six groups of broadcasters and journalists from the United Kingdom, and the continent. In addition, our staffers will be working with several major communications groups who will be convening in Ontario this year.

These include the television, radio and news directors of North America; regional groups of the society of American travel writers; the broadcasters promotion association, and the American association for state and local history.

The publicity branch is also considering special tours for the American automobile association, Ontario's ethnic press, and a group of weekly journalists from Quebec.

The film section plans two new films for the year—a new Algoma area film to replace one made in 1955, and a period film of the Kingston area. Through three outlets—the branch's own distribution programme, a commercial distributor, and the Canadian travel film library—our total film audience now approaches 50 million in Canada and the United States.

This year, the film section will also begin a programme of televisits, which will be a series of one-minute film clips produced specifically for television distribution. It is expected that broadcast stations will use these films at no charge to the department.

Research branch: Mr. Chairman, since the establishment of our research branch in 1963, the activities of our researchers have steadily increased, and this year we expect that the branch may undertake at least 12 different projects.

Hon. members may be interested in hearing a few of them.

We will undertake a survey to determine how many tourists visit the town of Stratford during the year, how much money they spend, and why they come. Special emphasis will be focussed, of course, on the impact which the Shakespearean festival has on tourism.

The travel habits and expenditures of Ontario households will be analyzed in the most extensive study to be undertaken so far by the research branch. From this study we expect to learn how many, and who, of our Ontario prospects travel abroad, and how many and who travel in Ontario. This information is important from the standpoint of learning the extent of the competition we face for our own domestic tourists.

During 1967 we will continue our analysis of the travel habits of United States and Canadian tourists who visited our reception centres in the previous year. We shall also continue to calculate the occupancy rates of all types of tourist establishments on a monthly basis.

I know our northern members will be pleased to learn that the potential for tourist development in the Patricia, Lake of the Woods and Rainy River vacation areas will be thoroughly researched this year.

Finally, I might mention our tourist establishment inventory. In general terms, the purpose of this programme is to provide the identification, detailed examination and evaluation, both qualitatively and quantitatively, of existing recreation sites and facilities in Ontario, as well as the potential of available sites. Cataloguing these will provide an inventory of the supply of recreational facilities and services available to meet the growing demand for recreation in Ontario.

Centennial planning branch: From the formation of the Centennial planning branch in September of 1964, our primary purpose has been developed essentially in two areas.

The first is to create, assist and promote the Centennial theme; to concept and develop enthusiasm in communities across Ontario and to give guidance to them in planning and organizing Centennial ceremonies and events during 1967, through the establishment of

strong local Centennial committees; to continue assistance to local Centennial committees in implementing their year-long programme of events; to originate and distribute prepared guidelines for many and varied activities which could be developed for Centennial year, and to publish a newsletter for the quick interchange of ideas as they developed in all areas.

The second is to introduce and provide guidance at the local level for the implementation of the various national Centennial programmes in Ontario.

The complexion of our operation in this branch has changed as we entered Centennial year. Field work in communities now is generally redundant. This branch is acting in an advisory capacity on specific requests from communities and completing the final details for implementation of the national programmes.

In addition we are working on special projects such as the visit of Her Royal Highness Princess Alexandra.

In view of the change and reduction in our overall work load, staff and programmes will be phased out during 1967. But a great deal of work still confronts the branch.

A travelling crew will set up inaugural and opening ceremonies, direct crowd control operations, and assist in parade planning and entertainment features at 20 Confederation train stops and 140 Confederation caravan stops. Continuing liaison will be maintained with all community committees prior to the arrival of the Confederation caravans and train.

Starting in January, our promotion action team undertook to ensure maximum ticket sales and attendance for 76 performances in the Canada festival programme in Ontario. It has also begun the implementation of the Ontario performing arts programme, planning inventories and securing sponsors for 202 performances sponsored by the province of Ontario.

An active sports advisory committee has involved all major sports groups and associations in the Ontario sports festival, covering the key Ontario events during 1967, in promotion, publicity and planning. The establishment of the Ontario medal of excellence to be awarded to the top athletes at competitive meets, is the highlight in the Centennial sports programme.

Winners of these outstanding awards will rally at three or four points across the province, towards the end of the year, to be saluted and recognized for excellence in their particular sport.

Many other programmes still in the planning stage, will be announced periodically as the year progresses.

Huronia historical development council: A major event of the Centennial year will be the opening this year of the fully-restored Sainte-Marie among the Hurons at Midland. This 17th century outpost has been rebuilt by the Huronia historical development council in conjunction with the University of Western Ontario.

In vote 2102 members will be asked to approve an expenditure of $900,000 for historic sites, of which $860,000 is directed towards Sainte-Marie, the Upper Lakes museum at Wasaga Beach, which should be completed this year, and the reconstruction of the military and naval establishment at Fort Penetanguishene.

The Centennial centre of science and technology: Mr. Chairman, the creation of the Centennial centre of science and technology is proceeding at a satisfactory pace and it will accelerate through 1967 as the project moves toward completion.

I think it is fitting to use the word "creation" because this centre definitely can be regarded as a challenge in creativity. It will be the first of its kind in Canada and it is going to be a valuable, permanent and highly attractive place of public education and recreation.

The centre should help Canadians to a much greater awareness of science and the growing impact of technology on their lives. Such outstanding educator-scientists as Dr. Omand M. Solandt, chairman of the science council of Canada, and Dr. Harry G. Thode, president of McMaster University, have underlined the importance of such a centre to the social and economic progress of an increasingly industrialized country such as Canada.

I might add that these men are backing up their convictions by serving actively on the centre's board of trustees.

Planning, design and production of exhibits and displays is accelerating at the centre's temporary quarters covering 70,000 square feet at 8 Prince Andrew Place, Don Mills. Production facilities already include woodworking, metalworking and paint shops. An electronics section is being added this year.

Fabrication of a number of major exhibits is well advanced and some smaller display units have been completed. Some displays of

international calibre are being purchased and outstanding items from the Ontario pavilion at Expo '67 will be revamped at modest cost for centre use.

In addition, a growing number of progressive Canadian industries and industrial associations plan participation in the centre. Many are arranging to build their own exhibits to basic centre specifications. Others will be contracting the work to the centre's staff.

The industry committee of the board recently launched a drive to inform a broad spectrum of business and industry of the function of the centre and the unique opportunities it offers. This activity will be intensified during the next six months.

Response has been excellent and the committee believes that its initial target of $2 million worth of industrial participation will be exceeded.

The progress on the project is perhaps most readily visible at the site itself, at the southwest corner of Don Mills Road and Eglinton Avenue.

The contract for construction of the three buildings was awarded to Pigott Construction Company, the low bidder, for $21.7 million in March of 1966. Work on the reception building and the main exhibit building has moved ahead steadily. The foundations are in, the steel has been erected and most of the concrete for walls and roofs has been placed or poured. Work on the third, or core building will begin this spring.

Meanwhile, Metro Toronto conservation authority has done extensive flood control work along the Don River and Metro parks commission is busy developing 160 acres of adjoining ravineland as Ernest Thompson Seton park.

On the recommendation of the scientific advisory board and the organization and methods branch of the Treasury department, important administrative changes have been made over the past few months and the scientific and administrative staffs greatly strengthened at senior levels.

Last September, Mr. William T. O'Dea, an electrical engineer and one of the leading experts on centres of science and technology, was appointed director-general.

In January, Mr. Andrew Zakrzewski, an engineer and automation specialist, became director of professional services; Mr. Taizo Miake, an industrial and architectural designer, became director of interpretation; and Mr. Alfred Hemmingway, an engineer with management experience, became director of administration.

The directorate is supported by a group of scientific advisers drawn from various universities in Ontario and elsewhere.

In addition, the education liaison committee —appointed by The Department of Education to ensure the closest cooperation in the centre's educational services—is becoming more and more involved in the planning for exhibits and programmes that complement the school curriculum and, above all, involve the student in exciting and rewarding experiences.

Department of public records and archives: The primary role of the department is the acquisition and preservation of unpublisher records of enduring value relating to the history of Ontario. Unfortunately, with the movement of descendants of older families, many important documents are being destroyed or dispersed. During the coming year, the archives intends to make a special effort to trace and acquire such records.

A particular effort will be made in the case of 19th century municipal records and early files of 19th century newspapers. Frequently, only single copies of these newspapers are available, and many of these are in danger of destruction or serious deterioration.

I am pleased to tell the House that during 1967 the historical branch will complete a major permanent exhibit illustrating the growth and evolution of our system of parliamentary government.

The documents, pictures and models which will comprise this display will be housed in two rooms at the eastern end of the main floor of our Parliament buildings.

Mr. Chairman, I feel this exhibit will be of considerable educational value. It should constitute a major attraction to the thousands of persons who visit our Parliament buildings each year.

As the members are aware, September 17, 1967, will be the 175th anniversary of the first meeting of Upper Canada's first Legislature at Newark, now Niagara-on-the-Lake. We hope to formally open our parliamentary exhibit on this date.

I might say the interest in our history engendered by the Centennial year has been particularly obvious with relation to the functions of the archives. Last year the number of persons working in the research room of the archives building increased by more than 25 per cent. Many time-consuming projects were undertaken by our staff on behalf of other government agencies, municipalities, local historical societies and interested individuals.

Among the special projects which will be undertaken in 1967 is the microfilming of the many Tweedsmuir histories compiled by local women's institutes throughout Ontario.

A records services branch has been established within the archives to give advice and assistance to all government agencies, and this branch also will operate a central depository for storage of their dormant records.

A records management committee reporting to Treasury board has been set up to guide and control the scheduling and disposal of government records. This is a comparatively new and highly technical field, and therefore we have contracted with a firm specializing in records management to assist in the inauguration of the programme and the training of staff.

During 1967-68 the historical branch will continue its programme of commemorating subjects of provincial significance by means of historical plaques. To date, a total of 469 of these plaques have been erected, and it is expected we will add another 40 in the coming year. Naturally, we will be most concerned with commemorating those events and individuals associated with Confederation.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my appreciation to the members of our archaeological and historic sites board for their continued invaluable assistance during the year in advising me on matters related to history and for helping to select suitable subjects for our provincial plaques.

Among the various Centennial projects undertaken by Ontario municipalities are a considerable number of new museums, or additions to existing museums. In many instances our staff of museums advisers have played an important role in the planning of these buildings. We will continue to offer technical advice as these museums reach completion this year.

I might mention, Mr. Chairman, that the members are being asked again this year to vote funds so that we may be able to make limited matching grants to the more than 70 museums owned and operated by municipalities, regional conservation authorities and Indian bands.

During the year the archives will continue its support of an extensive listing and inventory of the province's remaining pre-Confederation buildings of historical and architectural significance. This list is being compiled by the school of architecture of the University of Toronto, and should prove useful to all persons interested in historical preservation.

In the Speech from the Throne, His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor noted that the government this year planned to introduce legislation to establish the Ontario heritage foundation. Shortly, I hope to be able to put this bill before the House, so that the foundation may be set up and its members given authority to acquire and manage properties of historical, architectural and cultural interest in our province. It is expected members of the archives staff will assist the foundation with any relevant historical research carried out in connection with its programme.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth year that I have had the privilege and honour to speak on behalf of the Liberal Party on the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information.

In previous years, my colleagues and I have not only been critical of many aspects of the operation of this department but at the same time have tried to offer some alternatives and suggestions to the hon. Minister and his department for the improvement of the industry within our province. In this our Centennial year, I feel that it is an added honour to be the lead off critic for this department, this department which is so involved in the direction, or possibly the lack of direction in our province's many Centennial events and projects.

This is the department that must shoulder the responsibility of any failures in our celebrations or in the failures of construction of any of our projects. Now as an optimist, I would hope that there would be no failures in the countless events marking the Centennial of the birth of our country and that the planning of the thousands of people throughout our province will be coordinated into the greatest birthday celebration in the history of the world.

However, as a realist, I know that my colleagues and I, and indeed many of those sitting on the government benches, are very disappointed, are somewhat ashamed and embarrassed, and really feel that we have let our people down in the Centennial year because of the poor planning, the controversy and the lack of foresight of this government in the erection of the province's major project —the Centennial science centre.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Shame, a real shame!

Mr. Paterson: My leader, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has spoken on this

failure and I would assume that when the section of the estimates arrives where this project can be talked about, that this Minister will have a major task to defend the blunders of this Cabinet concerning the lack of planning and apparent disregard of the public purse in the construction of this, what should have been the *pièce de résistance* in Ontario's observance of her nation's birth.

One would suppose that in this session with a provincial election in the wind, the remarks made by the critics of any person speaking on the department would no doubt constitute in part the party platform in relation to the topic at hand. In the three previous years that I have been critic of this department, as I stated at the outset, I have not only criticized the operation of the department but feel that my colleagues and I in the Liberal Party have offered imaginative and constructive suggestions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Paterson: Now the press has circulated many of these ideas and they have been reasonably well accepted throughout our province. In fact, I believe the department has accepted and even acted upon many of these ideas.

However, should we Liberals be granted the range of government in the forthcoming expression of the people I have reason to believe we will receive this mandate. If such is the case we will have the prerogative of running this department, and I feel that given the mantle of leadership, a Liberal Minister, if chosen, could not only do a better job, create and initiate better policies, but also generate more enthusiasm within the department and give our populace the true leadership they require to make this industry move ahead at double the rate—

On the off-hand chance that I should personally be given the reins of this department, and this is possibly reaching, I would first straighten out many of the problems that now exist, direct the personnel into channels of imaginative and profitable endeavour—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Paterson: —and lead the various departments of this particular Ministry into a full coordination and absorption into the department of other Ministries, thus eliminating the position of Minister of Tourism and Information.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): You will keep the exectuive system though.

Mr. Paterson: It is, I think, an honour to our province, and possibly to the taxpayer, to have a Minister of Tourism and Information. But I feel that the real cost has been to the Ontario industry, to rural Ontario and to the undeveloped portions of our province. To me tourism is economic development, it is inflow of much needed dollars to all parts of Ontario, and I feel that this Minister and the department have not, and cannot, play the dynamic role that should be played to take full advantage of tourist dollar inflow and to generate economic activity in the less fortunate parts of our province.

A committee of key people from the industry could advise a Minister of Economic Development (Mr. Randall) on the policies that should be pursued. Surely the information and promotion branches, the development branches, the travel research branch, and yes, after the experience of Expo, the Centennial science centre, could be handled more effectively, more efficiently and at a considerable saving to our taxpayers by The Department of Economics and Development. I would expect good results if this were the case.

The sections of public records and archives, the theatre branch and the St. Lawrence parks commission, could certainly be easily placed in some other department with no ill effect on the work that they pursue. In this manner I feel that tourism as we know it would be better served.

More effective programmes could be initiated in all parts of our province, more tourists would be enticed to Ontario, and more people in all parts of the province would share in economic development, and at the same time, possibly, we could cut down government expenditures by up to a million dollars in achieving these better results.

This is my personal basic dream for tourism in our province—to utilize the economic powers to fully develop this industry for the benefit of all the people and I am certain that it may be a dream of many of the people of our province that some attempt might be made to economize in government. However, I must return to the present situation in these estimates.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to you, the failure of this Minister and his Cabinet, to provide the tourist industry with a programme of positive and dynamic leadership.

I would like to point out to you, sir, that this government has not fully taken into account the amount of leisure time that is becoming available to the work force of

North America, especially in the urban areas of our province and the large jurisdictions within a few hours' travelling time of our borders.

I would like to point out to this House that this government has not fully taken into account the spending power that is now available to satisfy the recreational needs of the people, the lack of outlets in our province and the lack of access to other outlets where these funds could be employed.

My party recognizes the mobility and changing desires of the present generation and anticipates their needs. This government has not recognized change, nor has this Conservative government fully recognized the tremendous influence of tourism and the tourist dollars on the economy of Ontario, especially in the have-not areas of this province.

Further, this administration has failed the people; it has failed to educate our populace to the importance and demands of the tourist industry and the role that they, the people of Ontario, should be playing in welcoming people from other parts of our province and other jurisdictions.

Far too many people could not care less about the tourist industry in Ontario and it rests on this government's shoulders—the fact that these people have not been educated or shown the benefits indirectly, or directly, to themselves.

To this point this government has failed our people who love and cherish our history. They have failed to awaken them to the need to preserve and develop our historic attractions into real tourist attractions. These attractions, when properly developed, attract almost as many people as does our wonderful Ontario scenery.

This Department of Tourism and Information, according to the annual report, has even failed to hire and train sufficient staff to represent our province in several of our major Canadian travel bureau offices. I feel that this government has misused the taxpayers' money, as they have not put out to tender our provincial advertising and promotional materials to the fullest extent, and as such, in many opinions, have received second-best advertising and promotion at excessive cost.

This government has failed to give us a completed provincial Centennial project, and here again has failed—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Paterson: In 1964, the Minister forecast tourist expenditures of $3 billion in Ontario, during our Centennial year. I think this has been revised, but I would hope that this objective could be reached although I have serious doubts. In an article in the *Globe and Mail* of October 21, writer Arthur Bryden reported that officials of The Department of Tourism and Information felt that Expo was going to cut into foreign tourist expenditures in Ontario by as much as 40 per cent.

This was not the statement in the Minister's statement preceding me, but if this is so, the areas along Highway 401 will benefit, yet northern Ontario will suffer the most—the area that can least afford to have an economic set-back.

I hope that the expectations of the officials of your department have been revised and that northern Ontario will again have a good year.

Several press statements late last fall, and the Minister's remarks today indicated that the tourist industry was jubilant about the reasonably good year enjoyed in Ontario because of the good weather.

Some small appreciation was paid to our friend, Old Sol the sun. I have no hesitation in saying that almost all the credit for the increase in tourism in Ontario was due directly to the weather and not to the efforts of the Minister of Tourism and Information. Right now we are running up a huge imbalance of tourist trade to the sun and sex of Florida. This is competition that is pretty hard to beat.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Paterson: But this is the job of the Minister to counteract this and get the people to stay in Ontario.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, you must simply offer bigger and better attractions to keep our people at home. You have got to merchandise, such as the Minister of Economics and Development merchandises our attractions to keep the countless thousands of Ontario visitors to vacation right here in our own province.

As I stated earlier, if I had the reins of this department for a period of time, I would direct efforts into imaginative and profitable endeavours for this industry and I would like to deal with these remarks after the dinner hour with your permission, Mr. Chairman.

It being 6:00 o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 63

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 13, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 13, 1967

Statement re the Shakespearean festival, Mr. Edwards 2159

Estimates, Department of Tourism and Information, Mr. Auld, continued 2159

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 2191

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1967

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Just before starting, I would like to say a word of welcome to the young adult group and their parents from St. Timothy Anglican Church and also the members of the Beta Sigma Phi sorority and their husbands who are here tonight, from Eglinton and from Armourdale ridings.

The member for Etobicoke (Mr. Braithwaite) told me that under the Speaker's west gallery we have the members from the 461 guide company and the 20th Humber West cubs. We are glad to welcome them here tonight.

Just previous to the supper adjournment, I understand that the member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson) had deferred his position to allow the member for Perth to make a statement.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the Speaker and the kind consent of the member for Essex South, I would like to draw your attention to yet another booklet which you will find on each of your desks.

It refers to the Stratford festival, which is in its 15th session. Its fame is bringing in upwards of 350,000 people from all parts of Canada and the United States and around the world each year.

This theatre was built in 1957, following five years in the theatre tent in a beautiful park setting on the Avon River. This year it operates from June 12 to October 14. The festival has been graced by visits from Her Majesty and members of the Royal family. This year the renovated Avon theatre will be in operation from July 7 to September 2.

This is prompted by remarks which the Minister made in connection with a survey that is being made and how much money the tourists spend in Stratford, why they come, and a special emphasis on the impact of the Shakespearean festival. I would like to extend a very hearty welcome to any of you who have not attended this festival. I am sure you would not want to miss this thrilling experience after having once been there. I would also like to bring to your attention, since the Minister just incidentally referred to the town of Stratford, that it is a good-sized city and I am sure you would enjoy yourselves for the occasion.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member, are there going to be any plays in French in Stratford this year?

Mr. Edwards: Non, non.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION

(Continued)

Mr. D. H. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, before the dinner hour, the interest of many of the members of the House was renewed in the problems confronting The Department of Tourism and Information. I alluded to the problem the Minister (Mr. Auld) has in relation to the deficit of United States tourism dollars, by persons travelling down to our neighbours to the far south during the winter months.

At the conclusion, sir, I indicated I would like to bring forth proposals which might help offset this tremendous bit of advertising that they have going for them, which is very tough to compete against.

I have roughly a 10-point programme that I would like to draw to the attention of the House that I would like to see initiated to assist the tourist industry in our province. The first point is, I would like to see that sport fish were put back into our lakes, rivers and streams and that programmes were initiated so that these fish could propagate and flourish. I would also ask that game be put back into our woods under conditions that it too would flourish.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Not just wolves, a few deer too.

Mr. Paterson: The reason I state this, and I believe it was verified by your Mr. Klopchic in his work, is that at one time hunting and fishing in Ontario was its greatest attraction and was the foundation of our tourist industry in this province. When rebuilding a

department, one would start at the very foundation, a foundation that not only attracts visitors and provides recreation for our own citizens, but also provides for the development of the north and the camp and resort activities, and jobs for a good many citizens.

Good hunting and fishing was and still should be the cornerstone of Ontario tourism and it is basic for extending our tourist season.

The third point I would like to make is part of a programme that I would lead in developing. It would be to put launching ramps at the ends of our roadways and other strategic locations, build small craft harbours where they are essential and necessary, and see that campsites, trailer parks and lodges were developed by private industry in economically feasible areas and by government in areas where private capital could not go until proper development was begun.

Further I would put into operation a systematic plan to develop new resort areas with hundreds, and yes, possibly thousands of low-priced serviced cottage lots to be sold to those who would build family cottages in planned resort communities within a reasonable time. This same development could be encouraged near existing hamlets and resorts as well as new developments. Ontario is a family vacation land, yet little or no emphasis has been placed on cottage development since this department came into existence.

Think of the advantages to our northern lumbering and construction industry, the advantages to our own population in personal ownership and lower cost family vacations that could extend for weeks for the wife and children. Think of the impact on our small resort communities, with families staying for weeks, possibly months, instead of a few days as is the case at the present time. And realize the revenue from the United States summer residents who would be attracted by the chance for low cost cottage lots up here in Ontario.

Fifth, I would establish a travel industry loan Act, not only to develop new areas and attractions, but to redevelop by the use of low-cost long-term financing of original tourist areas that may have become obsolete and run down. Financing may have to be given as it is given to manufacturing industries to help create modern accommodation and attraction in these areas.

Further, I would propose and work towards the province assuming the ownership and full management of the Trent and Rideau waterways and all other waterways within our provincial boundaries. But in exchange for this with the federal government, the province would turn over jurisdiction of the Great Lakes, on the condition that the federal government build and maintain harbours of refuge along our shore line. This would give Ontario the chance to better promote and develop these inland waterways in conjunction with local conservation authorities to the benefit of local cottagers and permanent residents of these watersheds.

The next point is one about which I as a member have had a great number of complaints. I would investigate the arrangements—

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): Would the hon. member for Essex South permit a question?

Mr. Paterson: Certainly.

Mr. Olde: I was just wondering if the hon. member for Essex South has the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) with him. He speaks of "I". Is this the policy of the Liberal Party or himself?

Mr. Whicher: Of course it is.

Mr. Paterson: As critic of this department, I am throwing these out as my personal ideas and when we assume the mantle of office it will be a Cabinet decision to follow through these matters.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Paterson: As I stated in my seventh point I would investigate the arrangements between The Department of Highways and the gasoline companies that have bid for and operate the service centres along Highways 400 and 401, in order that these could possibly be revised, and in order that the restaurants who lease space and are paying, I believe, up to 20 per cent of their gross as part of their rental, would not have to pay these excessive overhead costs. In this manner we could cut the cost of the food that is being offered currently in the establishments and try and ameliorate the shortage of staff for these companies. Mr. Chairman, a family of ordinary means can hardly afford to stop for a hamburger and a drink of pop at some of these centres, let alone have a substantial meal, and this is the case in most of these centres with the exception of one or two.

Mr. Whicher: Tory policies!

Mr. Paterson: The visitors that travel this route to Expo this summer are due for a rude awakening when they stop at many of these centres and they are probably going to lose a lot of time due to the lack of staff in many of these centres. This is a real shame, and the blame for the high cost and poor service lies squarely in the policy of this government and the conception of those service centres initially.

Further I would call for tenders for advertising in promotion materials and have the decision made by a panel assessing the best advertising and promotional concepts to get the best results at reasonable cost. No longer would the favourite advertising agency of the political party be handed these plums. They would have to prove in competition that their plans and promotions were best and that our taxpayers would get value for their money.

I would move our tourist information centre at 185 Bloor Street East to a high traffic area in the Queen-Yonge area of downtown Toronto. I believe your statistics, Mr. Minister, show that only an average of 15 parties per day visited the centre based on a six-day week. I do not feel that this is service to our people.

And my last point that I would like to make is: I would make arrangements with the Ontario Northland Railway, the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway to initiate a rapido type service to our main vacationland areas out of Toronto.

Initially, I would propose two lines, one to North Bay, the other to Sudbury, with about four stops north of Orillia. Other lines such as Haliburton and possibly Owen Sound, could be investigated and put into operation.

The reason I suggest this, Mr. Chairman, is that it would tend to alleviate much of the traffic and much of the frustration on Highway 400, with a wife and children possibly meeting the husband or taking dad to the nearest rapido centre just a few miles from their summer home. Large numbers of persons could be moved quickly and economically each weekend to these resort areas of the province, and this could even be a year-round operation.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I would continue to press for the four-lane highway through to North Bay, and similar high speed dual highways from the St. Lawrence up to our nation's capital and beyond.

Now, this 10-point programme that I would initiate if I were Minister of Tourism and Information is the basic skeleton of a wide ranging, imaginative programme to pull Ontario tourism to the forefront. As I have indicated at the inception of my remarks, this government has failed the tourist industry. It has failed to meet the needs of our province, it has failed to properly assess the impact of tourism on the economy of Ontario, and I feel certain that a Liberal government and a Liberal Minister of tourism could do a much better job and we await this opportunity.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, I was very interested this afternoon when the Minister of Tourism and Information gave us his opening remarks. Shortly after the dinner hour I had an opportunity to glance over the content again. I emphasize the word "glance" over the contents.

While I think the remarks were well prepared and showed some thought on the part of those or he or they who were interested and took part in the preparation of the remarks, I must say that while they dealt with a fairly large number of subjects in the context of Canada and of Ontario, I do not believe that they devoted as much time and as much thought and pinpointed it, if you like, on the problems of tourism in this province as they exist.

However, I am sure that the Minister will, in this Centennial year give very complete attention to tourism in all its aspects.

Now, the remarks I have to make tonight are remarks that I think could be of value to the tourist industry in all Canada, but particularly in the province of Ontario. If I concentrate my remarks on some centres of Ontario, perhaps to the exclusion of others, I do not do it with any intent of neglecting those other areas of the province, but rather to bring attention to the part of the province which elected me to represent them in this House.

In this Centennial year we have special opportunities for the development of our tourist industry and we must not neglect them. Not only will more Canadians be heading for central Canada from the west and the east, but thousands of our American neighbours will be funnelling up through our ports of entry on their way to Expo '67 in Montreal. More Ontario residents will also be on the move, planning trips which take in some of the various Centennial events throughout our province, as well as combining Ontario travel with a trip to Expo.

Are we fully prepared to take advantage of this opportunity? I am disturbed by the fact that the Minister of Tourism and Information told the House over a year ago

and I would ask you to mark this, Mr. Chairman—on March 10, 1966 to be precise—that a joint Ontario-Quebec publication was being prepared for the American and southern Ontario market describing the route from Niagara Falls to Expo and Quebec City, but it has not yet come out.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Chairman, if I might send my hon. friend a copy I would be delighted to do so that it might save him a little time.

Mr. Freeman: Has it been a secret?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): You mean it has just come out?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It has been in issue for some time.

Mr. Freeman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I would thank the Minister for this presentation at this time—another very beautifully prepared brochure, or small book, filled with lovely pictures. I would enjoy studying this at my leisure, Mr. Chairman, and I would hope that it contains some more valid information, and some more worthwhile information than some of the other publications that have come from that department and some of the other departments of the government.

Now that it has come out and it does appear this month, I suggest that it will be too late to influence the holiday plans of many potential tourists. I find it hard to understand why it should take over a year to prepare such a vital publication.

Now, as I said before, Mr. Chairman, during the more than a year which has passed since this matter was first broached in this House, may it prove to be well worth while and time and money well invested so that it may turn out to be an earth-shaking brochure, something that is going to bring hundreds of thousands more visitors to this province. Let us hope so.

I am also concerned about whether sufficient effort is being made to acquaint visitors from the midwest and western states and provinces with the scenic and recreational attractions of the northern Ontario route to Expo '67. The major booklet prepared by the Canadian government travel bureau for the American market entitled Invitation to Canada virtually ignored this route.

I am not too sure, Mr. Chairman, how many of the members of this House have had an opportunity to see this very expensive booklet which was produced by the federal people. I do not know whether the Minister's department had any hand in its preparation, but certainly it is a very beautifully prepared book, but it left out many of the salient attractions to this province and particularly to the northwestern and northern part of this province.

It seemed strange to me in perusing this book to realize one thing—I suggest this is something the Minister should pay particular attention to; it is something for which the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) has given much of his time and the manager of the northern Ontario development council, I am sure the member would agree, has spent a considerable amount of time in this area—and that is the Mississippi parkway, the Great River road.

This is an astonishingly important thing affecting not only many, many hundreds of thousands of Canadians, but millions of Americans. This new route, while in the stages of construction at this time, has not been realistically mentioned in this book published by the federal government, or produced by the federal government.

The city of Fort Frances, an entry point from the north midwestern states and western states into Canada, is not even shown on the large map which is contained in this book. Another entry which is close to the Lakehead city in the area which I represent is not mentioned in the booklet. No roadway is shown to Pigeon River; no highway from Duluth and up around lower Lake Superior is shown coming up into our part of the country. No airways are shown.

I think this shows a lack of cooperation between the federal and provincial governments which really is astonishing and completely deplorable. This sort of thing needs sound and sincere attention on the part of those whose duty it is to look after these important matters. It has not been done. These omissions place an additional responsibility on the Ontario government to see that the northern route is publicized.

I would hope in future years, whether I am a member of this House or not, Mr. Chairman, that whoever in our government, federal or provincial, has to do with expensive publications of booklets and advertising our province and our country in the United States and in other places throughout the world, that they will give greater attention to these important matters.

As Canadians we are all anxious to see that our Centennial showpiece, Expo '67, is a re-

sounding success. It is not simply a Quebec or Montreal show, but is Canada's window on the world and is the only "first category" international exhibition ever held in the Americas. We must do our part to make it a success and to see that as many people as possible view its specacular architecture, space age exhibits and cultural and recreational attractions.

I hope that our reception centres throughout Ontario are being geared up to promote travel to Expo. I would suggest that the ones on main routes be equipped with direct telephone lines to Logexpo so that they can arrange reservations in advance for anyone dropping in to a reception centre. They should also be able to make bookings for theatrical and sports events at Expo by telephone.

A visit to Expo '67 can and should be a rich educational experience for anyone, but for our young people it can open up new horizons and provide the stimulus which will lead them to seek higher goals of achievement in their lives. While many children will be taken by their parents to Expo, and others will be fortunate enough to participate in trips organized by schools and other groups, it should be our objective to see that every Ontario youngster has an opportunity to participate in what is a "once in a lifetime" experience.

I am not suggesting that we should pay the full expense of sending every school child to Expo, but I do think that a great deal more could be done than is now being planned in the way of low cost, organized trips with chartered buses and trains, dormitory accommodation in Montreal schools and universities, exchange accommodation in Montreal homes, tent cities and so on. It may be that it is now too late to plan this kind of a mass trek to Expo for our Ontario children before the summer holidays, but there are two full months of Expo after the new school year starts in September and what better way would there be to start off the fall term than with a mind-expanding tour of Expo '67?

This proposal may fall within the responsibility of The Department of Education more than The Department of Tourism and Information, but I suggest that is should definitely be part of our Centennial programme which comes under The Department of Tourism and Information. The provincial government should provide the initiative and the organizational staff for the project, and might even make small grants available to assist youngsters who have a long way to go to Expo, such as those at the Lakehead and in northwestern Ontario.

Another way in which The Department of Tourism and Information can take advantage of the Centennial to build up our tourist trade is to feature some of the outstanding Centennial events occurring in this province. The 59-page calendar of Ontario Centennial celebrations which came out a couple of weeks ago, and which starts at Ailsa Craig and proceeds to Zurich, is too detailed to do this job properly, though it may have its uses as a permanent record of Centennial projects and plans.

I rather question the wisdom of the department in mailing 10 copies of this rather weighty publication to every one of the 108 members of the Legislature, thus using up over 1,000 copies of what must be a fairly expensive publication. Members could have been sent a sample copy and advised that additional copies would be sent if they wished them. At any rate, such a publication has limited usefulness, particularly when it comes out three months after the Centennial year has begun and many of the events listed were already over by the time we received the list.

What is needed is a special campaign either through advertisements, small leaflets or special promotions at reception centres to highlight the really outstanding events in the province which might attract tourists from the United States and other provinces, as well as alert Ontario residents to the unique attractions in their own province. These include the Ottawa parade, ball and regatta connected with the May tulip festival, the opening of the reconstructed Dundurn castle in Hamilton, the Centennial gem-boree at Bancroft and the re-enactment of the signing of the first Indian treaty at Sioux Narrows near Kenora, complete with Indian dances and ceremonies.

The department should also attempt to obtain reports from each community on which events prove to be the biggest drawing cards.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister's department is already doing this. If not, I strongly suggest that this might be a very valuable contribution to the future of tourism and to the people of Ontario.

The most popular ones need not be offered only once every 100 years, but could be made permanent tourist attractions. The department has a big role to play in helping communities to develop these major attractions both with financial assistance, pooling of ideas and coordinated promotional efforts.

Tourism has a tremendous potential in Ontario but we—and I hope the government agrees with me in this—are only scratching the surface. Last year according to the figures given in the department's annual report, total tourist spending increased by 7 per cent. But in the same year our estimated gross provincial product went up nearly 10 per cent. Visitors to our reception centres were only 5 per cent more than in 1964. This below-standard growth of the industry is somewhat surprising in view of the fact that the work force both in Ontario and on the North American continent is increasing, longer vacations are being granted, earnings are rising and car ownership is growing.

It is extremely difficult to gauge exactly how much economic activity is generated by each tourist dollar spent, but we know that there is a substantial multiplier effect from such spending. Moreover, outlays by foreign tourists help our balance of payments significantly.

But the industry could play a still greater role in our economy. In this day when we are being urged to build an economically independent Canada through specialization, the tourist industry offers an ideal form of specialization. No other country has the same product as our magnificent lakes and rivers, our varied recreational areas and our unique culture. Tourism is an industry which lends itself to regional development. In fact some of the greatest potential for it lies in north and northwestern Ontario where facilities are not crowded, the lakes and rivers are not yet all polluted and fish and wildlife are plentiful.

Other underdeveloped areas of the province also often have untapped tourist potential. Because it is mainly a service industry, it is a creator of jobs and offers special opportunities to residents of Indian reserves who often have particular skills which can be utilized in the industry and who live close to areas with high tourist potential.

However we will not remove the sandbars which are slowing the tourist tide until the government realizes that it has a much bigger role to play in the process. It is not enough to spend $2 or $3 million on tourist promotion and make token grants to a multitude of regional tourist associations and museums. In the total budget of $10.5 million provided for The Department of Tourism and Information for 1967-68, less than 10 per cent is earmarked for the tourist industry development branch.

The international organization for economic cooperation and development which embraces 12 countries of western Europe and the United States and Canada has just published an important study of the world-wide tourist industry as a factor in economic growth. It came to the conclusion that countries can no longer hope to profit from the growth in the demand for recreational and travel facilities unless their governments are prepared to put time and money into the development of proper facilities and to work within the context of a national tourist plan.

Ontario has no overall tourist plan. Its only research unit in The Department of Tourism and Information is mainly oriented to studying the travel habits of potential visitors and it has a budget of only $141,000. What is needed is research to pinpoint the areas with the greatest tourist potential, and the development of a planned programme for providing the facilities needed to achieve the full potential of those areas in the shortest possible time. This will involve more than token grants to tourist associations or advice and training courses for tourist operators from the Ontario development corporation.

To start with, it will require more attention to the traditional role of government in the tourist field—the provision of good transportation facilities. This is no longer limited to good highways, though they are still very important. The boating fraternity is a growing one and demands improved navigable waterways and marinas. The air age calls for the development of landing strips for light planes, particularly in our northern areas. The train is not yet outmoded and the latest possibilities for developing more tourist excursions and traffic over the Ontario Northland Railway should not be overlooked.

We are missing out on considerable tourist traffic because of the weak links in the trans-Canada highway through northern Ontario. When American travellers hear that the road is frequently under repair they choose the southern route through the United States. Immediate steps must be taken to put this vital life-line in first class shape, particularly the section from Nipigon to the Manitoba border, which is causing the most trouble. This is specially urgent for the local residents in view of the curtailment of the CPR passenger service on this route, but it is also of importance for the tourist trade.

While a second trans-Canada highway through northwestern Ontario from Longlac to the Manitoba boundary may still be a long way off, there is no reason why work cannot start on linking up and paving the gravelled secondary roads in this area to provide access to the rich resources and the tourist

potential of the area. Now that the federal part of the first trans-Canada highway programe is virtually complete, Ottawa must be pressed to provide some kind of national assistance for this kind of road in the interests of national unity, economic independence and resource development.

My friend, the member for Essex South, spoke recently on the subject of marinas. We should also seek federal aid in this sphere. Hon. members will recall that a much publicized election promise was made by the federal Liberals in 1965 to provide substantial grants for a marina at Vancouver. With our network of waterways and canals in the southern part of the province, we must provide the necessary facilities to attract boating tourists.

Another responsibility of government, Mr. Chairman, is to ensure that we have clean air and unpolluted lakes and rivers to offer the tourist. This is becoming an increasingly serious problem, and both sewage and industrial waste are destroying many of our recreational areas. The government's record in this field is one of too little and too late, and the new legislation introduced this month looks more like pre-election window dressing than the kind of crash programme needed now.

The development of provincial parks is, of course, another area in which the province is expected to act. This is mainly the responsibility of The Department of Lands and Forests, though the Department of Tourism and Information continues to oversee the St. Lawrence parks system. I fail to see why the administration of this system and the Niagara parks system should remain separate from the operation of the other 96 provincial parks and require separate commissions. It is something this Legislature should look into in greater depth.

The government should also draw to Ottawa's attention the fact that this province does not have a single major national park. We are missing out on federal promotion of national park vacations by this omission and both governments are neglecting the opportunity to develop a national showpiece in our scenic northland. Ottawa aid for provincial park development may also become available under the federal-provincial ARDA programme if it can be demonstrated that the park plans are connected with the working out of an alternative land use plan. The government should make sure that we obtain whatever assistance is available under this programme.

While I am on the subject of federal-provincial cooperation, I think it is time something was done about the Pigeon River reception centre. I know this is a thorn in the Minister's side, and the side, probably, of many of the senior members in his department.

At this important border-crossing point south of the Lakehead the provincial government is still operating from a mobile van while the federal government has a large permanent building. Either the two operations should be combined, and I would hope it could be combined, or, if this is not feasible, a permanent provincial building should be erected adjacent to the federal building.

Probably many of the members of this honourable House are not aware too much of the fact that some three or four years ago—I never did ask the Minister of Tourism and Information where he secured this strange vehicle—but it has been suggested it was used as a tourist reception centre when the new highway was constructed from the new location in Pigeon River to the main road. It has been suggested by more than one person, both Canadian and American, that it could only have had possibly two places from which it might have come. One, it is strongly suggested that it is a left-over from Barnum and Bailey circus, and the other one that it was borrowed from the Smithsonian institution. It was really a wonderful advertisement for this province.

I am told that the new van is going to be used this year because it is impossible to get the land situation straightened away for the construction of the new reception centre. I know the Minister and the government has problems here with the person who owns this land, and with the proper location for such a centre. I do not feel, Mr. Chairman, that any duly concentrated effort is being made to establish a worthwhile, sound and attractive tourist reception centre at this very important point.

I know that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) has visited this area and I am sure that he would recall, not too long ago, when the new bridge from the Canadian area to the American side was opened. As a matter of fact he officiated on that occasion, and I believe that his fine retentive memory will recall the fact that there was an excellent plaza arrangement in that complex. I believe he would agree with me, and I am sure that the Minister of Tourism and Information would agree with me also, that we are missing out on a very important thing if we do not cue in on this construction of a proper tourist reception centre in the

Pigeon River area, and as soon as possible. I know, Mr. Minister, through the Chairman to you, that the people in the whole northwestern Ontario area, to say nothing of just the area in and around the Lakehead, are looking forward with a real degree of anxiety and interest to seeing a proper and worthwhile building erected that would be a credit to the province of Ontario instead of the situation as it exists today, when we as Ontario residents should hang our heads in shame.

Another area in which joint action is needed is in dealing with the problem of American hunters and fishermen. I was glad to receive just today, as a matter of fact, a report from The Department of Lands and Forests at the Lakehead by Mr. Wingham of that department. I have great confidence in the people at the Lakehead in The Department of Lands and Forests. I am sorry the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) is not here to hear me pay that compliment to his efficient staff in the Lakehead area.

Mr. Wingham and his people are making a fairly exhaustive study apparently of the situation as it affects American hunters and fishermen. The results up to the present time of that study are not results that would bestow upon the American hunters and fishermen too much credit for true sportsmanship. There are always some who will let the majority down, but we will hope that much more attention is paid to this very important matter.

These American hunters and fishermen are flying into our inaccessible lakes. Very fine, if they are doing a sportsmanlike job while they are in there, but too often the case has been that they have gone far beyond their catch, both in game and in fish. While The Department of Conservation in the state of Minnesota is doing what it can to assist Ontario and northwestern Ontario to control the situation, it is a pretty difficult thing with some thousands of light aircraft available to the American hunters in getting into this part of the province.

The free and easy policies of the Canadian federal air transport are in effect depriving Canadians of any benefits from this type of tourist and making it difficult for the provincial government to enforce its conservation laws and protect our fish and wildlife. The air transport board permits foreign-based charter airplanes to compete with Canadian-based operators on the ground of reciprocity. In fact, reciprocity is something of a myth because the market for Canadian charters south of the border is limited; Canadian operators are subjected to more stringent regulations by Washington than Ottawa imposes on foreign-based charters, and Canadian costs for planes, parts and fuel are generally higher. As a result, the bulk of the business is going to United States-based carriers who bring in all the food, boats and equipment needed for their parties and who are not required to file a flight plan or to stop at a Canadian check point on their way out for inspection by conservation officials. The provincial government should make strong representations to Ottawa to end this exploitation of our resources. The more business is siphoned off from our own air carriers and tourist outfitters in this way, the more difficult it becomes for them to expand and meet the needs of our tourist trade.

Good tourist accommodation is essential to the development of tourism. The OECD report which I mentioned earlier urges a strong role for government in this field. It suggests that governments should direct their efforts mainly to assisting private investment in tourist facilities through preferential interest rates, tax reliefs, subsidies and credits and special help with land purchases. Where enormous costs are required, it proposes that private investment be supplemented by government investment and cites the fact that semi-public tourist developments are catching on in France, and other countries with half the capital being put up by the government.

The Ontario government gives tourist operators little help beyond licensing, management advice and personnel training seminars. The Ontario development corporation generally confines its assistance to advice and guaranteeing bank loans. Since under-capitalization is the most serious problem of the Ontario tourist industry and many operators find it difficult to obtain loans at reasonable rates, a provincial programme supplementing the help available through the federal industrial development bank should be considered.

The government should also assist municipalities in favourable tourist areas, sir, to provide the additional services needed for tourists—marinas, health inspections of tourist facilities, emergency hospital services, and so on. The anomaly created by the fact that one-eighth of our tourist establishments are licensed under the liquor licence board and subject to inspection by the board while the rest are inspected by The Department of Tourism and Information should be removed. I believe, listening to the Minister not too long ago in standing committee, that he is aware of this problem. I would hope that he and

the other department involved in this matter would get together and get this situation ironed out. It is not a healthy situation; it is something that should receive real attention and be brought under one inspection staff so that the people who are operating these establishments are not taken away by an inspector from one department in the morning and by an inspector from another department in the afternoon, going over precisely the same territory. It is a great mistake.

The government should also assist municipalities in other areas, in other ways.

The development of tourism in the province must definitely be tied in with the regional development programme. The government gives lip service to this but continues to subsidize and this I think is important, Mr. Chairman, 32 regional tourist councils in the ten economic regions. Most of the regional councils are too small for effective tourist planning, sir, and grants should be re-structured to encourage them to coalesce.

The kind of imaginative regional planning needed was exemplified in the proposal made by my colleague, the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. F. Young) for the Niagara Falls area. After participating in a conference called by the New York state committee on housing and urban development, he suggested that the province establish a regional government for the whole Niagara area which would be in a position to cooperate with New York state bodies in the development of this tourist mecca on an international basis. The conference envisaged the building of a modern convention centre, enlarged park and recreational facilities, joint action against pollution and a general programme to develop the full tourist potential of the area on both sides of the border. This sort of imaginative regional tourist planning is possible only with the development of larger government units.

One of the disadvantages which our tourist operators suffer is from the shortness of the season. We all realize this. With the growing interest in winter sports and an increasing number of people taking two vacations a year, this can be changed by developing winter facilities. At present, I understand that only three provincial parks have winter attractions and less than $20,000 was spent by The Department of Lands and Forests on such attractions. I stand to be corrected if this is not so. The Department of Tourism and Information should encourage the development of winter carnivals similar to the Quebec city one, ski and snowmobile events, sleigh riding, tobogganing and ice fishing facilities, and other attractions to make Ontario a year round vacation land.

In short, Mr. Chairman, The Department of Tourism and Information must develop a more active partnership between the provincial government and the tourist industry to realize the full economic and social potential of tourism. Of course, I recognize that other government departments have very important roles to play as well and that is why we need a Cabinet coordinating committee in this field to get them all working together to this end.

Let us not forget, Mr. Chairman, that tourism in this province of Ontario with a growing population, can go far beyond its present potential—in excess I believe of a billion dollars a year—to a much more impressive figure. To do this I would suggest to the hon. Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, that some thought should be given to the problem of staff. I have come in contact with many of the department's able people in various parts of Ontario, particularly in the north and northwestern part of the province. I think it is rather pitiful when you see the young, eager, aggressive and efficient personnel who are engaged by this department, and when you hear the salaries that are paid them.

I would hope that the department is able to offer dollars and possibilities to them for the future, because if the department cannot do this, I fail to see why and how they are going to continue to retain the services of people of the quality they possess at the present time.

I would like just briefly to mention the fact that The Department of Tourism and Information this year has an increased budget of slightly in excess of $2 million. I would hope that in the Minister's remarks he might be able to pinpoint or cue in on this to show the members of the House just where this more than $2 million additional in budgetary funds is going to be spent, what it is going to be spent on, and how much thinking has been done with regard to it. I would hope that the additional $2 million that the taxpayers of this province are going to be called upon to produce is not going to be wasted money.

I would think that in The Department of Tourism and Information this should be considered investment money—rather than money that is just being spent out of hand—and the opportunity to increase tourism to the point

where worthwhile investments in this department could be used to add to the tourist potential that we presently have.

I would also mention the fish and wildlife situation in the province under the new Minister; I am very glad to see he is back at his desk. In this respect I have every reason to believe that we are going to have much greater care, and much more thoughtful care, given to the problem of fish and wildlife in the whole of the province, but particularly in northwestern Ontario. I believe and hope that he, being a resident of that very favoured part of this great province of Ontario, will do a most outstanding job in removing some of the blights that have existed for the past many years in these areas in fish and wildlife, and that his contribution to The Department of Lands and Forests will long be remembered by the government of the day and whatever government succeeds this government, but particularly of the people of the province at the present time and those who succeed us.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, if I might make one or two comments about the remarks of the hon. member for Essex South, and the hon. member for Fort William. Just before I do so, though, I did not want any misunderstanding in the House tonight. To all the members who received copies of the April issue of *Field and Stream* and the current *New Yorker* issue, I just wanted to say the purpose of it was not to entertain you while I was speaking, if it was as dull as it might have been. It was to illustrate one article which was produced with the assistance of our department. The one in *Field and Stream,* and the first of the special northern series in the *New Yorker.*

The member for Essex South spoke of ten points that he suggested the government should undertake and I would like to comment briefly on three which apply to my department. First let me say, Mr. Chairman, of course the job of The Department of Tourism and Information is the promotion of the province within the province and without, to encourage people to travel in our province. Our authority in that field is limited to promotion, although I may say we are actively engaged in two committees which apply to two of these suggestions which the member put forward.

One had to do with tourist towns in areas of summer cottage developments, and there is a committee of people from our department and Lands and Forests and ARDA working on certain research and certain proposals that may come forward which I do not suppose would likely be initiated by our department but in which we do have an interest. I may say that the suggestion that my hon. friend made is one which has been pursued for some time. I think it has a great deal of merit. Of course, The Department of Lands and Forests has been doing more in the summer cottage subdivision programme, I understand, and perhaps the member could pursue this further when the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests are discussed.

In regard to the question of loans, this is now covered by the Ontario development corporation. I think three or four loans to the tourist industry have already been made, one for, as I recall, a ski lift at Wawa; one for the restoration or the reconstruction of Fort Albany as a tourist attraction, which is being done at the Soo; and two for actual tourist accommodation for food adjuncts to tourist accommodation.

Here again on the Trent-Severn and the Rideau waterways, we have two committees working, one which is made up of people of provincial departments and one which is made up of some of those federal gentlemen. I think seven departments are involved. I might say it is a jurisdictional nightmare and it is going to take some unravelling. If my hon. friend, as he mentioned this afternoon, becomes my successor for that hour and a half it is going to take him to dissolve the department which he also mentioned, he will have one of the shortest tenures in history. If he looked into the cost of operating the Rideau and the Trent-Severn, I do not think he would be particularly anxious to take it over from our federal friends.

The three points which he mentioned which do apply to the department had to do with having proposal from advertising agencies. In effect, this is what we did originally when we engaged the James Lovick agency, which now does the department's promotional programme. Each year it presents to us one major outline of the overall immediate plan and advertising programme for the year, and I can assure him that any time we do not feel we are getting the very best service from the agency, we will look around for another one. In fact, we have had other proposals from other agencies from time to time.

In connection with our travel information centre at 185 Bloor Street East, I must say that we are looking at that matter very carefully now. We knew that it was not the world's best location when it was established but it was part of the space which came with the building to which the department moved and it seemed worthwhile to see what could

be done there. What our next step in that connection will be I am not prepared at the moment to say, but we have not been completely disappointed with the results, although we do feel perhaps there are other ways of getting more information to people in this area.

The hon. member for Fort William was speaking at some length about the booklet of the federal government bureau, about which there has been much complaint in the northwestern part of the province. He pointed out that this is a federal booklet, it has nothing to do with us. I would say that there is the closest cooperation between our department and the Canadian government travel bureau and I alluded to two or three aspects of this in my opening remarks earlier this afternoon.

I mentioned that we will be having our own travel counsellors in a number of their United States centres where they are giving us space so that we may give personal, direct information about Ontario to people who come into those centres. I would think it would be presumptuous of us to go to any other government agency—federal or run by another province—to ask them to let us get the material which they are producing in travel promotion. Any time that we are asked for information or photographs or editorial assistance, we are delighted to give it, but I think it would be rather unwelcome, as I suggest, to edit the publications of other government agencies, or in fact anyone else, unless we were invited to.

Mr. Freeman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder—would the Minister permit a question?

I conform with you in your remarks. I would preface this by outlining what the question will be. It is necessary to do it in this way, I assure you. I suggest to you that Ontario is the greatest contributor tax-wise to the federal government, as provinces go, and I would ask you this question then on that basis.

Why should you not have more access, more cooperation between the federal department and your department in Ontario, so that when amounts of money are being spent by Canadian taxpayers and Ontario taxpayers, this money can be spent to the very best possible advantage. I think that you, as a sound thinker, would agree that there is a great area of discrepancy.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, as I say, we may have different philosophies in this connection. I can only repeat that we have had very close cooperation with the other provinces and with the federal government in a number of fields, in the research field particularly. I would hesitate to attempt to tell somebody else how to run their show, in effect, but I would be delighted and I know our staff would be delighted to give any sort of comment which they were asked to give.

Let me go on to the booklet which my friend was mentioning. I had a copy with me this afternoon, because I wanted to mention that in this field, this in itself is a first. This is the first time to our knowledge that two provinces have joined together to produce one publication for both jurisdictions. It has taken some time to do this. As my hon. friend can realize there were a number of problems to be ironed out. We are delighted with what has been done here. We think it is going to be very effective, and as I pointed out this afternoon, the centre section which has to do with Expo can be removed and this booklet will be good for several years. We think it is the kind of thing we should be doing more of, because the traveller is not particularly interested in boundaries, real or imagined. He is interested in an interesting trip and this is what has been produced in this booklet.

Mr. Paterson: May I ask the Minister if he is doing the same thing with the state of Michigan, or am I under a false impression?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We are working with the state of Michigan and we have not made actual decisions on just exactly what form the cooperative efforts might take at the moment. By the same token we are working with Manitoba.

My friend from Fort William mentioned the Centennial events, but I might say that this booklet was produced so that we would have a calendar of all the events in the province. This is not for circulation to every visitor. There are two ways in which we let the visitor know what is happening: one is the monthly events folder, which covers a three-month period, and the other is a special Centennial folder, which will give those Centennial events that are taking place from April 1 to December 31. I do not happen to have a copy of that with me tonight.

I might say that in compiling this large calendar, there were some problems, because we started gathering the information, I think last October or November, to get it put together. A number of the events were subject to change, in terms of date and in some cases

actual location. There has been a supplement produced for it which I think was completed about last week. You will note when you read it that the front page says to check the supplement and check with the local committee to see that some change has not been—

Mr. Paterson: I wonder if I could interrupt, Mr. Chairman, and ask to whom these books were sent? In my own case, I tried to give them to the secretary of my Centennial committee and the chairman and the municipal offices, and they already had copies of these and I hardly knew how to dispose of the extra copies.

Hon. Mr. Auld: They were sent to all the Centennial committees around the province —the 836 that there are, I believe—and the members. The reason for sending a small quantity to each member was because generally in these things we have found as soon as we send one, we get requests for another 10, or 12, or 15, and we felt in this case that we might be assisting the members in saving them a little time.

The member for Fort William mentioned about the special events that were taking place, and hoped they would be continued, those that were successful. As a matter of fact, he also touched on the fact that to promote more winter tourism there should be more events. We embarked on a programme to this effect two and a half years ago, encouraging communities to have winter events, whether they be winter carnivals, fishing derbies, husky races, fur trappers' festivals—which has been a great success in North Bay, for one—skidoo races and a whole host of other things.

I believe that one of the reasons for the particularly encouraging increase in United States border entries, which we had last January, February and March—as I recall, something in the area of 25 or 26 per cent—is due to the fact that there have been more and better skiing facilities developed in the several major ski areas in the province, and that there have been a series of winter carnivals which have grown and become more successful and given people interesting things to do in the wintertime. I have said on a number of occasions that I expect many of the events which have been developed for Centennial celebrations this year will become permanent annual events and will certainly enhance our industry as the years go by.

The member mentioned that he felt that the St. Lawrence parks commission and the Niagara parks commission were perhaps unnecessary and should be with Lands and Forests. I would just point out to him that the St. Lawrence parks commission was established as a result of an agreement made on December 3, 1951, between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario and this was in respect of the generation of electric power on the St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence power development and the seaway. Article 15 of this agreement provided that, and I quote:

> Ontario will establish a commission to supervise the execution of such work as may be appropriate, consistent with the execution of the work to safeguard and enhance the scenic beauty of and historic associations with the International Rapids section.

This agreement was approved by the Legislature of the province on April 10, 1952.

Mr. Freeman: Was that agreement to continue to perpetuity?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Presumably until such time as it is unmade between the contracting parties. That appears in the front of the annual report of the St. Lawrence parks commission.

In connection with Pigeon River, I am frank to admit that we have had a considerable problem there. Again through the cooperation of the federal government, last year we were able to get permission to put our trailer adjacent to the plaza at the bridge, which is the ideal location for tourist information, after being about five or six miles up Highway 61.

Mr. Freeman: Fifteen miles.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Fifteen miles, which was not as good a place. My friend knows the topography in the area. He may know that the federal authority owns all the land up to about half a mile from the bridge entrance. It had agreed to make available to us one section of this property just about at the end of it. After a study by The Department of Public Works there are certain problems of drainage, fill and water, which meant that to build an information centre there when the smoke cleared away was going to cost some $182,000.

Mr. Freeman: They were most generous to offer you that type of property.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Perhaps. However, as a result I have been in touch with the hon. Mr. Winters to approach the federal authorities to see if some of their property closer to the bridge plaza, which will not require a

great deal of fill and which does have water, would be made available. I can state that one of the two priority locations for new centres in the province is Pigeon River, and we are very anxious to see it done.

The last point I might comment on was the question of regional tourist councils and area development councils—

Mr. Freeman: Would the Minister permit just another question? Do I understand, sir, that you stated that Pigeon River was on your priority list for the construction of a new centre?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes.

Mr. Freeman: I am glad to hear that. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Regional tourist councils and their relationship and cooperation with area development councils is an extremely important point. We have been working with both the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), and his officials, and our own regional tourist councils to get coordination of efforts. I think that we are having success in this connection, but I might say that as far as attempting to encourage the regional tourist councils to take over larger areas, the great pressure has been to divide up some of these areas. The problem particularly in the north and the northwest part of the province is that some of the geographic areas encompassed by the boundaries of the tourist councils are so great that it is almost impossible, even though the population may not be terribly large, for an effective organization to continue because you cannot get people to come 200 and 250 miles to a meeting. We have had strong representations from the Patricias, Kenora, and Algoma areas to divide their areas, even if the grants are divided, and we have been giving consideration to this. I think, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could deal with the vote.

On vote 2101.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I have several questions of the hon. Minister on this first vote. I might just refer back to the statement where in my 10-point programme there are only three or four items which he could deal directly with. I feel that this underlines my whole proposition that I would try to channel the efforts of this department mainly back into economics and development and treat tourism as an economic tool. The fact that he cannot deal in these areas must be very frustrating to those who are purely interested in developing tourism in the province—that all these facets must be put to work for the benefit of the industry.

The other point I might comment on—I realize the high cost of operation of the Trent waterway as such—but I would hinge my premise on the fact that the federal government would develop its harbours or refuge programme more fully on the Great Lakes. I think this would offset this operation. I am sure the province, in a simple jurisdiction without the eight federal bodies, could do a much more effective job of promoting and operating the system. It would be better for the people in the area, especially the cottagers, who see their lakes go down where others are held up; I know this is very unsatisfactory in some of the areas of Haliburton. It was pointed out to us on our select committee that this was a very serious problem.

I would like to turn to page 15 of the Minister's remarks and in that he mentioned that he was setting up a programme for the Ontario performing arts, I would just like to question this. Our good friend who was in the press gallery, I believe, has undertaken somewhat a similar programme through The Department of Education—I am referring to Mr. Carman. Is this an entirely different type of programme to the performing arts?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes. I think the hon. member is referring to the Centennial activities—the Canada festival—the subsidization and promotion of it and the Ontario festival. There is no overlapping in the sense that we are competing. Our purpose is, as I mentioned before, to try to insure that the smaller communities around the province will have an opportunity to enjoy some of the companies, and some of the artists who will be in Canada or who have normally played in the larger centres only. First of all, the Canada festival programme is a method of ticket subsidy where you insure that such a percentage of the house has a block of tickets at popular prices and/or where the travelling expenses of the company are paid to take them further from their normal beaten track. We and the federal people are cooperating to do this.

In the Ontario programme, it is a little broader in that we are assisting companies, not perhaps all major companies, not all symphonies and so on, but companies of many kinds to travel more widely than they normally would, which does not mean that every company will travel all over the province. The Ontario council for the arts, I believe, have made grants to some of the

organizations who are in the Ontario performing arts festival or the Canada festival for their year to year expenses or their production expenses for some specific project, but are not involved in the kind of thing that we are in. There is one occasion where we are involved with the Ontario council for the arts and its Quebec counterpart. That is in the art show which we are sponsoring jointly.

Mr. Paterson: Was this art show the exhibit that was in our lower halls? Is that sponsored under this programme or is this through Expo?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I do not believe that that is part of that programme. I am not an expert on art.

Mr. Paterson: You did not pick that exhibit out personally then?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I heard a comment from one of my hon. friend's colleagues about one piece and he said it was the largest bottle opener he had ever seen. I do not know—

Mr. Paterson: Secondly, on this same vein, I notice the Minister has announced an Ontario sports festival. Here again, is there any chance of overlapping with the Ontario athletics commissioner?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, here again this has, I suppose, two aspects. One is the achievement and award for excellence programme which is a series of individual or team contests. The other has been the assistance to communities to bring some of the major international events here; for instance, the international driving races which are taking place in Toronto, the Canadian badminton finals—a number of contests of this nature. I think the athletic commissioner's activities are confined pretty much to the provision of equipment—sports equipment—to local small teams.

Mr. Paterson: I have always felt the athletics commissioner's jurisdiction was not wide enough in the province and should be expanded and I was somewhat surprised that you had moved into this field where I would assume that he could have. Could I ask the Minister, although this is connected with the Ontario Centennial celebration and possibly does not really fit into this vote, but it is a matter of policy, are these—

Hon. Mr. Auld: This is the correct vote.

Mr. Paterson: I wonder if it is going to be a policy to issue these medallions to all the school children?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, I believe that the federal government has a number of medallions which are to be issued to the school children.

Mr. Paterson: What was the cost of this particular brochure? Could this be looked up under the printing section?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister the status of the tourist reception centre at the bridge in the city of Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid that I cannot give the hon. member a completely up to date answer. The Department of Public Works called for tenders for a new structure in October or November. I believe they received very few tenders and the lowest is considerably in excess of their estimate so they renewed the tender call. They have recalled, but I cannot say whether or not the tenders are closed as yet, but if they have not, they will very shortly. It will be almost any day now and we hope that this time there will be a price that The Department of Public Works can accept and that they then can go ahead with the job.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, what has taken so long, as far as the Minister's department is concerned, in getting that centre? It should have been opened three years ago—talk about foot dragging! There is no reason whatsoever why that centre should not have been opened. A trailer was used for two years and now it is planned to use a trailer for a third year. The city gave permission and the Minister said that it would be up within a year, but he drags on for one year and a second and third year, and we are going to be lucky if we have it up this year. If there was any time it should have been up, it was for Centennial year. One out of every three tourists who come by car into Ontario, come through the port of Windsor. In fact, it is estimated that 9,000,000 cars will be entering—

Mr. Chairman: Should this not be under vote 2103?

Mr. Newman: Nine million vehicles, Mr. Chairman, 9,000,000 will be coming in through the port of Windsor.

Mr. Chairman: I would remind the member for Windsor-Walkerville that this should be under 2103.

Mr. Newman: Under 2103? I will take it up then.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I have one or two other questions here. The Minister

made reference to the heritage foundation which I hope is coming into being, and I would ask him specifically when he intends to introduce the legislation setting up this foundation. I know that the hon. member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) and I are quite interested in preserving some of these historic buildings and sites in the province and I am waiting for the day when it gets into the book in the House.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I hope that the hon. member will not have to hold his breath for too much longer.

Mr. Paterson: I have one further question. I note from an eastern Ontario paper that our friends in Watertown, New York, seem to have erased "Canada" from their signboards. Surely, the Minister is aware of this and as this is the entrance to the Ivy Lea area I wonder what steps our department can take with the New York authorities and the chamber of commerce in that area to get "Ontario" or "Canada" back on the map over there?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will send the hon. member the remainder of the press clipping that cover that incident. I can perhaps sum it up this way, that there appeared to be a new reporter on the Syracuse *Times Herald*, I believe, who wrote a story to the effect that "Canada" was being taken off the signboards on Interstate 81, and he was correct—except that it was done six years ago, and there are different signs now. I can send hon. members all the correspondence. As a matter of fact they are welcome to see the letter I got from the Watertown chamber of commerce, because it happened that they called us and I explained to the chap that there was nothing wrong. There are new signs going up and there is the greatest cooperation between New York state and the Thousand Islands bridge authority and the Thousand Islands international travel council.

One interesting result of this was that the Watertown chamber of commerce made particular amends for the erroneous report which indicated that they, or one of their members, had asked the New York state highway commission to take Canada's name off the signs. They put up a special "Visit Canada" and "Visit Expo" booth with no charge to anybody in the public square in Watertown, but the original story was erroneous and the corrected story has been widely circulated.

Mr. Paterson: I am pleased that the Minister has taken appropriate action on that because I have travelled that route several times and it is a very enjoyable route to get into eastern Ontario.

One further question: We realize that the Centennial celebrations in our province were kicked off New Year's Eve in what we will call the "front yard" of the seat of government of our province, but I note from the Brockville newspaper that the premier concert in the series happened to start down there in the home town of the Minister. I wonder if he has slighted the great capital of the province, or is this an honour that is befitting the Minister—

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will tell the hon. member that it came as a very delightful surprise to me.

Mr. Freeman: I wonder if the Minister would enlighten the House as to the northern Great Lakes area council membership, assessment and expenses, and so on. I am sure that many of the members of this House have no real idea of what this item is.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The northern Great Lakes area council is made up of ourselves, Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota. The aim of the council is to promote—

Mr. Freeman: Did you say Illinois, too?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Ontario. The aim is to promote travel in the area which, in fact, is called the "great circle route" and as you will note from the budget figure of $18,000, it is for joint promotion. It is similar to our membership in the Mississippi River parkway commission which the member referred to a while ago, and to the Thousand Islands international council and to this kind of thing, where we are doing joint promotion with other agencies, sometimes state and sometimes county, or sort of quasi officials.

Mr. Freeman: Does the Minister feel that this is well-spent money? Is it doing an effective job?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think it is.

Vote 2101 agreed to.

On vote 2102:

Mr. Paterson: I would ask, under the Centennial planning branch, if the Minister could inform the members of the House as to what tokens or symbols or advertising materials are available to the members of the House for use in their own locales. I telephoned that office on several occasions and got a few pins and a few flags from them. I understand the federal Minister in charge of this

has sent forth to all the members of the federal House a specified list of certain publications, pins, flags and so on, that federal members can obtain for the numerous groups that are meeting in their own ridings and to make presentations in commemoration of this. Could the Minister—

Hon. Mr. Auld: The only Centennial item which we have in any quantity—and it is quite a limited quantity—is the small, plastic pin. I would be delighted to make perhaps several hundred available to each member. However, we do not have in the budget a sum to cover a very large supply of these and it would be very difficult to attempt to supply everybody with, say, 5,000 or 10,000.

As far as flags are concerned, we have some flags in the Centennial planning branch which we have used for Centennial meetings around the province and on occasion larger ones have been available on loan for a day or two. The small flags are ones which again we provided for Centennial meetings with our Centennial field men and local and regional Centennial committees. The reason we have quite a few of them is that we never seem to get them back after a meeting so we have a continuing supply for our own purposes. We have not any large quantity available, although we can and we do let the members know and those who write in to us where these various items are available commercially.

Mr. Paterson: I would appreciate it if the Minister could have the department send a memo today to the members spelling out just what is available and so on. I know I have been caught in this particular dilemma. As a merchant I sell flags and I also sell pins. I am into the umpteenth thousand that I have had to give away, being such a good fellow in my own riding. I realize that other members in this House have not availed themselves of the generosity of the Minister's department.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Perhaps I could send around to the other members the address and telephone number of the hon. member's business so he could supply them.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I notice in the public accounts, the expenditure for the restoration of historic sites. The amount is shown as $244,800-odd, and you are budgeting for $900,000 in the coming fiscal year. Does this indicate a degree of expenditure in this area on a planned basis or an assumption?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can give the hon. member the details of this. I might say, Mr. Chairman, in this vote 2102, item 4, of the estimates, the wording should be changed from "restoration of historic sites" to "restoration, development and management of historic sites". To give the hon member the details, that many hundred thousand dollars is made up of $230,000 for the interior completion of Ste Marie Among the Hurons; $70,000 for the Ste Marie park, which is just the land immediately around Ste Marie, the compound and the structures; and $200,000 for the interpretive museum, which will be just outside Ste Marie itself. I do not know whether the hon. member has been to Ste Marie, or has seen the model, but there is a compound, a wall, around it. When I refer to Ste Marie Among the Hurons, I refer to that section.

Continuing $200,000 is for the interpretive museum; $285,000 for the work at Fort Penetanguishene, which I mentioned in my opening remarks; $50,000 for the Upper Lakes museum, which is at Wasaga and which is mainly centred on the H.M.S. *Nancy;* $40,000 for Moose Factory at Moosonee; $15,000 for public relations and information; and $10,000 for consultants, making a total of $900,000.

Mr. Gisborn: May I ask the Minister, has there been any expenditure in this regard in Wentworth county in the last fiscal year and if there are any possibilities of the establishment or restoration of historic sites in the Wentworth county area anticipated for the coming year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There are none in my estimates. The only expenditure that I would think of in Wentworth which would be comparable would be the federal and provincial grants for the Dundurn castle restoration.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the original question I was going to ask of the Minister was asked by the previous member speaking. But I would like to ask of the Minister if he is planning any other historic sites. Does he have a long-range plan for the restoration of other historic sites?

Hon. Mr. Auld: At the moment, as the hon. members will see, there are no funds in my estimates for other than the projects mentioned. We have encouraged the formation or creation or restoration of historic sites around the province. I mentioned a few moments ago the Kiwanis club project at Sault Ste. Marie. I think the hon. member may be referring to the plans of the Essex county tourist association and discussions

about a seigniory restoration in the area. But we have no funds for other than this project and the one in the St. Lawrence parks commission at the moment, although we have funds to give technical assistance and research assistance, which we propose to continue.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister were approached by an organization in my community, would he offer them technical assistance for the development of a historic site in the area?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, and we have done so in connection with one proposal which came, I believe, from the Essex county tourist association.

Mr. Newman: But the Minister's department in itself has no plans for any future historic sites or the future restoration of any historic sites other than the ones being worked on right now? Am I right?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, there are no funds here for any other.

Mr. Newman: I am not worrying about the funds, but are there plans? Is there a long-range plan or is the department just waiting until it thinks it is an opportune time to suggest a plan to a community and—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Let me say, I would hope that a number of other projects of this kind will take place in the province. Under what aegis, I am not prepared to say at the moment because I do not know, but there are possibilities in a number of fields—for instance, the proposed legislation referred to earlier in cooperation with the federal government through the national historic sites and monuments board, and a number of other cases. I am aware of proposals that have been put forward from various parts of the province for various kinds of projects.

Mr. Newman: But Mr. Chairman, I bring this up because from not only a tourist point of view but from an economic point of view, it might be better to plan the various restorations in geographic locations around the province. Then, when we get the tourists within our province, we can tell them they have one historic site at the extreme western end of the province, there is another one toward the central part, and they can take a circle tour going from one to the second, to the third, to the fourth, were that individual primarily interested in historic sites only, rather that attempting to develop historic sites all in the one area simply because there happens to be a little more history in there. The long-range plan might be well and good to develop in one area, but from a tourist point of view I think it would be better to scatter them, have one development as you have in the Soo area, one in the St. Lawrence parks, and I think there should be one in the garden gateway to Canada, that is, in Essex county.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word under this vote, Centennial planning. I never cease to be amazed at the lack of knowledge about Canadian history that is demonstrated among our school students of this province, and indeed many of their parents. I think, that this being Centennial year, we could very well take advantage of this opportunity to its utmost. I am thinking particularly now of the CNE. I believe the government has an Ontario pavilion or Ontario building at the CNE and I am just wondering specifically what the department intends to do with that building, in view of the fact that it is Centennial year. It would give the Minister a very logical opportunity to do something of an extraordinary nature in that regard. Does the Minister have any plans to promote Canadian history, if you want to put it that way, at that occasion?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Perhaps I could best answer the hon. member by saying that in many ways I agree with his assessment of the knowledge of Canadian history by Canadians. As far as our own department is concerned—other than what is being done now through the animation of history, which is done at Old Fort Henry and Upper Canada village, and will be done at Ste Marie, and the encouragement of historical pageants and historical activities as part of Centennial celebrations—I believe that the question would probably get more effective and a fuller answer from the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis). I know that there are certain activities in The Department of Education aimed at making the teaching of Canadian history more interesting to school children. I can tell him that there are certain activities with Ste Marie which, in conjunction with the CBC and with films, I think, will help to create a greater awareness of our own history and our heritage.

The film programme of my department has, as I mentioned earlier, an aspect of this. We have done two films on history in relation to certain areas, the Niagara area, the Upper Canada village area, pioneer village, and we are proposing one, as I mentioned this year,

as an historic aspect to encourage tourism. I am afraid that other than that, that is the limit of The Department of Tourism and Information's activities.

Mr. Gaunt: Then specifically, Mr. Chairman, if I may ask my friend, you do not intend to do anything at the CNE? In other words you are not going to make use of that building for this particlular promotion?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, the CNE exhibit is under the jurisdiction of The Department of Public Works, which owns the building. The various government departments have space in it. We will have space in it for the department of public records and archives, which will have again a very interesting exhibit—which is history—important documents relating to the history of our province. The Centennial centre will also have space there.

Vote 2102 agreed to.

One vote 2103.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, is it your intention on vote 2103, to do it by branches, or shall we just have one grand scramble?

Mr. Chairman: I think the best way would be by branches.

Mr. Bryden: So we start with the office of the executive director, is that correct?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, what the function of the executive director is?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, the function of the executive director is to coordinate the activities of the publicity and information sections, and to be in charge of the advertising section.

Mr. Bryden: How does he get that title? It seems to me that a division head is usually called a director, or head, or something. Why do you call him executive director?

Hon. Mr. Auld: This was the title given by the civil service commission after the organization and the branch of Treasury looked at our organization. The hon. member for Woodbine will remember that the department had a major survey of organization methods three and a half or four years ago.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I think that the questions I was going to ask of the Minister may be scattered throughout the vote, and I want to return to the tourist reception centre at the Ambassador bridge. Can the Minister advise us just exactly where he intends to locate that centre?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That, Mr. Chairman, I think is under 2104. I do not know that I can describe the exact location, except that it is immediately adjacent to the bridge itself.

Mr. Chairman: Well if it is under 2104, suppose we delay it, and deal with 2103 at the present time: Under the office of the director, publicity branch.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I have always had a great deal of admiration for the Minister, I have always found him to be a very aggressive fellow, but I have always been confused with some of the publications that he has put out. I recall a few years ago that he had a man in a boat in quite a large lake and I do not think there was any land involved, or any trees—I just forget the background of it. But I came across the *New Yorker* magazine today and he has got a very fine picture by Karsh of a man by the name of Jock Richardson.

This man has got snowshoes on one side and a gun on the other and has his winter outfit on. Then I turn over and it has got "April", which would indicate to me that it is a sign of spring, rather than winter. I would think, sir, that when you are letting out to these advertising agencies, you would switch from this winter picture to something with a little more colour in it that would indicate and be more suggestive of Ontario. Do you not think that a good idea?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would just say very briefly to my hon. friend that the purpose of this campaign is to take a new approach to publicize the northern and northwestern part of our province. It stems from one experimental ad which we did last year in the Chicago *Tribune* magazine. It was a photograph of the late Canon Eiserhoff, a Cree Anglican priest in the north. It was a photograph showing a face with a great deal of character and also an indication of the life of the north and most important of all, it drew a great many inquiries and had a very, very high readership quotient.

This programme is based on the same principles of attracting attention and getting inquiries.

Mr. Worton: I think it is an excellent picture. It is just a question of the time of the year. I think you should have it in keeping with spring. If you have a winter scene, this is excellent, but if it is spring I think you should have something more flowery, that is all.

Mr. Paterson: To follow this same principle, I have this brochure that our friend Mr. Karsh, who is no doubt the world's greatest portrait photographer, and who, I believe, was employed by your department to do this series—I know he was in my particular area doing the famous Jack Miner bird sanctuary and I am looking forward to seeing the results of that. But I would like to comment on this. Being from the far south of the province, if I was in the north, I would be more interested in having the best scenic photographer doing work in my area, because I think people are attracted—at least I personally think that—to beautiful scenery and so forth than as you say, to the expressive face of characters in our Ontario scene.

I would ask of the Minister, just what would a folder like that cost? I assume that this was sent out to the various press media in our province. It is certainly oriented to that and just how much was the contract worth to Mr. Karsh and his back-up men on this particular venture?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can give the hon. member the actual figures, certainly, but as I recall his fee is $1,500 per portrait.

Mr. Paterson: How many would be involved, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There were six.

Mr. Paterson: Six at $1,500.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Just following along the comment about the kind of advertising: In the current issue of *Time*, which is not the issue you see here, but the one seen in the northeastern United States region, there is an ad of Stratford and a sunset and an antique shop.

Mr. Chairman: It appears that the members are dealing with both the publicity and the advertising branches, and there is no objection to this, if you want to deal with them together.

Mr. Paterson: That particular shot was not one of Mr. Karsh's?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No.

Mr. Paterson: Possibly at this time I could get an answer on the cost of this particular folder, and its distribution across the province.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Which do you mean?

Mr. Paterson: This is on the information clip and the Centennial events. It looks like quite an expensive—

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am informed—I do not have the exact cost—but it is about 50 cents. Those are sent to the banks and the various agencies who are now selling these medallions.

Mr. Paterson: Did I get a price per unit?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The cost of that one?

Mr. Paterson: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will get that in a minute.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion to the Minister concerning one of his publications? This happens to be Greater Ontario Winter Vacations. The publication is very nice, the colour photography is good, but I think that when this is sent out it should be made certain that the information contained in it is factual. I happen to have received the publication—it was mailed from Toronto on January 17 and I received it a day or two after that. Yet on January 10 there were certain liquor laws that were changed in the province, and your publication, which I assume was mailed to many in the United States, specifically carries on page 22, "Present regulations do not permit sale of spirits, beer or wine on Sundays." I think if these booklets are going to be passed around, surely a sticker should be placed over that portion of the book so that when our American friends do look at it, they will be aware of the changes that have taken place in the province.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid that some things like that are inevitable. The hon. member will realize, of course, that the publication went to press some months before the change was made and the cost of individually affixing a sticker in each booklet would be rather high. I am happy to say that the folders for the summer and the regional tour folders all have the correct information about the change.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the Minister cannot tell me that the cost to put a sticker on page 22 would be high. Surely there are many employees in his department who could very easily put a sticker over just that one page. It is not that complicated or that difficult or that expensive, either, to up-date the book.

Mr. Whicher: He could do it himself!

Mr. Newman: We would not want the Minister doing that.

May I ask the Minister if he made a suggestion to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) to have a slogan on the 1968 licence plates, just as we have now on 1967 plates, that is, Confederation? Mr. Chairman, here is an opportunity of selling Ontario in 1968 by putting some other slogan on the licence plates. We have broken the ice now by having a slogan on the plates this year and we should continue this. Let us sell Ontario by putting another slogan on them next year. I hope that the Minister has made this suggestion to the Minister of Transport. Has he, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would prefer that the member discuss the Minister of Transport's responsibilities in his estimates.

Mr. Newman: If there is cooperation between the departments, Mr. Chairman, the Minister would suggest that to the Minister of Transport. I should not have to do that; I think it behooves the Minister of Tourism and Information to make that suggestion. This has merit and we all think it has merit, including The Department of Transport or they would not have put a slogan on the 1967 licence plates. It should be on the 1968 licence plates.

May I ask the Minister why in publications put out by the department, we never see anything concerning the city of Windsor? It is the gateway to Ontario—

Mr. Bryden: It is also the gateway out—and we do not want to encourage people to leave!

Mr. Newman: It has the only vehicular tunnel between two jurisdictions in the world. This is something unusual. It is the centre which one-third of the tourists coming into Ontario use as a point of entry. Surely, if that many—I think the actual figure, according to the Minister's book, is 34.18 per cent of all the vehicles coming into Ontario—come through the port of Windsor, surely, that figure alone merits a little attention in the department's publications. Why would a city like Windsor be neglected? Is the Minister taking it out on us for having sent three Liberal members to the Legislature? We can conclude nothing else, if Windsor is not included.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We have done well by you; we have three pictures in this year's book—one for each.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the Minister's last comment. Would he mind repeating it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There are three pictures—in the Heritage Highways there is one, which I have just noticed. I am informed that in this year's book there are three photographs of Windsor and the Windsor area.

Mr. Newman: May I suggest to the Minister that he keep putting in photographs of the area, because of the importance as far as tourists' entries are concerned.

May I ask the Minister if the department is considering promoting the smelt festival in the Point Pelee area? I have here a clipping from a newspaper dated April 18, 1966: Smelt Run Draws 31,471 to Pelee.

Mr. Chairman: Could we leave that until the next section—

Mr. Newman: Well, this would be under advertising and publicity. It would fit under this, Mr. Chairman.

I think a project such as we have here certainly deserves a little encouragement on the part of The Department of Tourism and Information. I should not use the word "little"; I should always use the words "a lot" of information on the part of this Minister.

At last year's smelt festival, traffic backed up three miles—to show you how popular the attraction is—and a large number of the individuals who did come to the smelt festival not only spent money for the normal needs, but for the special fishing licences that were required of them. So as far as a revenue-producing affair is concerned, it certainly ranks among the important ones. It comes at a time when there are very few tourist attractions in the county and I think that the Minister's department should promote the smelt festival. It is something good and something that would really sell that section of Ontario, if not the idea that Ontario is a good fishing spot.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, earlier today I asked a question before the orders of the day, directed to the hon. Minister in relation to the television and radio services downstairs and I assume that this is the correct vote under which to bring up further details? I would like a fuller explanation of the workings of that particular office, if the Minister could give that to me. My impression is that the Cabinet of this province has a free hand to use these facilities, yet other members

of the House cannot, except if they provide the film and the camera operator. I would like verification of this.

Mr. Bryden: It is the propaganda agency for the Tory party.

Mr. Paterson: I did not say that. In the reply that I received from the Minister, he indicated that the chairmen of the select committees who are not of Cabinet status had this privilege in making their report. As most of the members of the House have served on select committees they are, in fact, somewhat separate also and I would ask out of the 17 or 18 television stations in Ontario, say, specifically on the report of the select committee on youth—it would be my interpretation that each of the 17 or 18 TV stations would have to write in requesting that the chairman of this committee make this film clip for them. Is this in fact so?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No. In the case of the two select committee reports these were done mechanically as though they were departmental activities. They were, in effect, all-party committees of the Legislature and this was sent to all the stations in the same way that an announcement by, say, the Minister of Transport would be. But the other four instances which I quoted this afternoon by private members were at the request of the TV stations in the—well, in most cases the member's own area.

Mr. Paterson: Well, would these TV stations then, in fact, replace the film that was used for their purposes, or had this in fact been done in all cases; or do you have the same trouble as with your flags—

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, I am informed that we have no trouble with the film.

An hon. member: Would the Minister have a communication from the television station requesting this, or would this come by telephone?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I cannot say. I do not answer the phone down there or read the mail but I would presume it would probably be by telephone or by wire because if somebody wants something in those fields they generally want it in a hurry.

Mr. Newman: May I suggest to the Minister that by telephone would not be good enough. I think it should come by a direct communication so that we can see that this was a legitimate request and not something done solely by the member convincing the TV station that it would be good to have this on.

May I ask the hon. Minister if he has a request from CKLW TV in the city of Windsor for the telecasting of information from the Parliament buildings? I would like to see the communication.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will be glad to find out if there has been such a request.

Mr. Newman: Thank you.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, has the hon. Minister thought of extending the privilege that is accorded to the members of the Cabinet to the leader of the official Opposition and to the leader of the third party on a similar basis?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think I mentioned in the public acounts committee that the facilities are there and that they would be dealt with in the same way. The Opposition parties have certain public funds to assist in the operation of their offices. The service is available on the same basis.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this subterfuge surely cannot be permitted to continue any longer. The Opposition parties have certain extremely limited funds. I am not sure what the total is for the two parties but I would doubt if it is more than $75,000 a year as out of a budget of over two billion dollars, for all of their purposes—for stenographic assistance, research assistance, stationery, office equipment, everything. This is the total sum of money they have available. The government has practically unlimited funds available for public relations. In every department we see public relations offices, large sums of money for public relations.

This is provided under the guise of promoting government programmes but, of course, a very substantial part of it is used for promoting the government in its capacity as a Tory government and the Ministers in their capacities as leading figures in the Tory party. It is for the promotion of the Tory party. Yet even in this organization downstairs Ministers, chairmen of committees, Tories all, have again unlimited access to public funds, not only for the use of the room after we are admittedly permitted to use it—after all, nobody is paying any rent on it anyway, it is there, so that is not much of a concession. But the government spokesmen, Tory spokesmen, are permitted not only to use the room but to use public funds for the purpose of putting partisan messages across,

and they have all the production costs covered. Now the Tory party, as we all know, is by far the wealthiest of the parties in Ontario. I suppose even with the refurbished sources of funds for the Liberal Party I have no doubt that the Tory party's funds will perhaps be two or three times those of the combined—or maybe five or six times those of the combined Opposition parties. But still they have to dig into the public treasury in order to carry on their political propaganda. I know that the Minister has been trying to carry off this sort of phoney argument for a long time but there is nothing in it. We might as well face it.

This organization has a dual role. It does provide certain facilities whereby local radio stations can get recordings of speeches by the local member, which many of them want. It does that, and then beyond that, and primarily, it serves as a propaganda agency for the Tory party, paid for out of the tax money of the people of Ontario. This is what it is and there is no use our fooling ourselves. If it were the only one, one would say that it is wrong, but not too costly, but it is not the only one by far. Every department is loaded with hangers-on of the Minister who run around taking his picture and rushing to the newspapers to get his picture in the paper as a representative of the Tory party, to write scripts for him, to carry on general public relations campaigns. In fact, it is a good thing there seems to be a substantial supply of press people in this country because the government has really done a job in denuding the press gallery. It often makes one wonder when one sees what happens here as to how independent the press gallery is. Now, of course, one has to say with regard to the present gallery—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): You had better.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am just going to say that we have no way of knowing whether any of them have jobs lined up with the government. We can only assume that they have not. From the work they are doing one can probably assume that they are independent, but the record of the gallery in Ontario is that a great number of them are there for a period and then they end up on the government payroll. One wonders how independent they were when they were there supposedly reporting the news.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Oh, that is cheap—

Mr. Bryden: Well, I do not know what is cheap about it.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): It is a good thing you are not running again, you would not help—

Mr. Bryden: I do not know if any of them ever went out of their way to help me, I do not remember them doing it at all. They have reported me in the press and other media from time to time mainly because I bulled my way into it, but I would not say they went out of their way to give me a break. I am not suggesting they should, far from it. I do not think they go out of their way to give me the reverse of a break either.

Mr. White: You had a better press than you deserved.

Mr. Chairman: Let the member for Woodbine continue. I wish he would stay with the publicity and—

Mr. Bryden: I am right on publicity.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Whose publicity?

Mr. Bryden: I am dealing with your publicity. You fellows are so cheap you have to charge it up to the treasury of the province of Ontario even though, as a party, you are rolling in money. You know, if you were poor I would not condone what you do but I would understand it, but when you are the wealthiest party that this province has ever known or probably will ever know again, it is preposterous that you should be raiding the public treasury for the purposes of your own political propaganda. Yet that is exactly what you do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to—incidentally one of the members over here asked if he could get some certain records, written information, indicating that certain stations had requested certain films. I am afraid I will have to advise him that he is more optimistic than the circumstances merit if he thinks he can get any information out of this branch. I have had a request before the public accounts committee for at least a month, for copies of the vouchers for the last six months for Vidon Productions Limited, Dominion Broadcasting and Pallette Productions, the three organizations which are involved in this Tory gravy train down there. Because of certain unforeseen circumstances over which I had no control, I was not able to be at the committee on public accounts meeting today. It is the first one I have missed, and it is possible that those docu-

ments that I asked for were tabled today. Were they? If they were tabled, it is unfortunate I was not able to see them, but it took me a solid month to get copies of documents that could have been run through a photocopying machine in ten minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would, not having the documents—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, my understanding was that the copies were wanted for the public accounts meeting of this week. They were wanted for the day after they were requested, I believe, and we were unable to supply them then so they were sent down for today's meeting.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, I requested them when the department was before the committee, I do not remember the date, but it was approximately a month ago, the departmental officers were right there when I made the request. How in heaven's name could they conceivably arrive at the conclusion that I was requesting them for a month hence? I was requesting them to be produced at the earliest opportunity, which in my opinion should have been the next meeting. There was absolutely no reason for delay and I do not know why they should have been delayed for a month. However, I will not belabour the point. I would like to ask how much is included in this vote for the coming year for Vidon Productions, Dominion Broadcasting and Pallette Productions?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is $38,000.

Mr. Bryden: Is that $38,000 for the three of them? How much for Vidon Productions?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I could not give any breakdown, it would depend on the volume of work which they did, just as it would depend on the volume of TV for Pallette Productions and the number of tapes Dominion Broadcasting were prepared to supply.

Mr. Bryden: Well, what is the basis of payment to Vidon Productions? I tried to get this information from the Minister at the public accounts committee meeting and he went around it in 25 different circles. I have to give him credit, he is most adept at that, but he never did answer the question.

I would assume, Mr. Chairman, that whenever anybody provides service to the government, there is some basis of payment. It may be on the basis of a salary or wage, it may be on the basis of providing certain services on a sort of fee basis, if we want to put it that way, or it may be on some other basis, but I would assume that there is a basis of payment and I am still interested to know what is the basis of payment for Vidon Productions.

Hon. Mr. Auld: At the present time, Mr. Chairman, it is a fee of $1,200 per month or $300 per week. This is based on the volume of work which they are required to do. Unfortunately, I have no copy of the invoices for them, which indicate the change. I think their weekly fee has increased from the original fee to its present level, but chances are that it will be reduced once the session is over. As I mentioned at the public accounts committee, their fee has been, generally speaking, higher when the House has been sitting than when the House is not sitting.

Mr. Bryden: Well, when are these adjustments made and what are the circumstances under which the fees are adjusted?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I mentioned, there is no long-term contract with any of these, there is no contract with any of these three organizations and the fee is presumably subject to change any time the volume of business either decreases or increases. This is constantly under supervision, under observation.

Mr. Bryden: In addition, I take it from my recollection of what was said at the public accounts committee meeting that you pay their actual expenses incurred in producing whatever they are required to produce, not only for material that they obtain from Dominion Broadcasting and Pallette Productions, but any stationery and any other expenses that they incur in carrying on this work, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is $300 per week plus office expenses.

Mr. Bryden: I am sorry, did the Minister say they are paid $300 plus office expenses?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is correct.

Mr. Bryden: By the office expenses, the Minister means the office downstairs?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, no, postage, stationery, paper clips, this sort of thing. They supply all the staff.

Mr. Bryden: Do they have any office other than the office downstairs?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I presume so, I have never visited it.

Mr. Bryden: Well, the one voucher of theirs that I have seen recently indicated as an address, apart from this building, only a box number and a telephone number in this building. It may have been another telephone number, I am not sure, but it did not show an address of any physical premises.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid I cannot tell the hon. member because as I told the public accounts committee, I have never visited any other office. I do not know who their directors are and so on. I do not know what other work they do for people.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister and his department not make any effort to look into the credentials of people with whom they did business? It would seem to me that, if I were doing business with an organization, I would want to know—

Hon. Mr. Auld: There is quite a difference between looking into their background and their office.

Mr. Bryden: I am sorry?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I said there is quite a difference between looking into somebody's credentials as far as their ability is concerned—

Mr. Bryden. Well, if a firm does not even have an office, it leaves some doubt as to whether it is much of a firm, does it not?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would be glad to reply if the member would let me continue, but he can carry on.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I said, Mr. Chairman, as far as their facilities and their services are concerned, we are satisfied with them. I have no particular intention of finding out where their office is, how many desks they have in it, what their other telephone number may be and who their other customers are. And I would think that if I asked and somebody said they did not want to tell me, I would be correctly informed, it would be none of my business.

Mr. Bryden: In fact, though, the only facilities they have are what the department provides. Is that not true—or what the government provides? I do not know if it is done through the Minister's department or some other department but that is their only facility.

Hon. Mr. Auld. I do not know.

Mr. Bryden: The facilities they use here certainly are all supplied by the government, is that not so, including even films and stationery and paper clips, everything. It is a strange situation where the principal in a contractual arrangement provides even the office supplies for the contract.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is sort of like a hospital and a doctor operating.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am not quite sure if I got the significance of the Minister's analogy, I am not sure who is the hospital and who is the doctor and who is the patient. But I would suggest to the Minister that this is not the kind of arrangement that would normally be carried on by the government with any business firm. I think they would want to know something about the business firm, something about the credit rating, for example.

I know that the Queen's Printer puts great stock in the fact that he wants to know about the credit rating of the firms who bid for his work, about their equipment and their capacity to do the job. But here the Minister does not care to know anything about the firm with which he is doing business—if indeed it is a true firm. He provides them with a fee of $300 per week. He provides them with the premises in which they do their work, he provides them with all the material used to do the work, and yet he still tries to maintain this myth that this is an independent contract.

I am suggesting to him that what it is, in effect, is that he has an employee who is on the payroll of the government, under the guise of a fee for service arrangement and that essentially, although not exclusively, the role of the employee is to provide propaganda for the Conservative Party and government. This is essentially what is here. Unfortunately we have some radio and television stations in Ontario who are so lacking in any sense of their responsibilities to the public in providing news, that they are willing to take canned news handed out by the government. This is what is happening.

Now, of course there are radio stations and television stations that have their own staffs and ferret out their own news and they make their own news judgment as to what will be in a film and what will not be in it. But there are some which are not willing to do that. They are willing simply to be fed by the government, to take hand-outs from the government.

This, you know, is the seed of the destruction of independent news and this is why I am concerned about it. I am concerned when news media make themselves dependent on the government, then we have the seeds of the destruction of independent news gathering. News media ought to be independent of the government and of any other group. They should gather their own news, edit it and present it in their own way. The effect of what these stations do is that only one point of view is ever presented on these films.

The government has it so arranged that Opposition comments are never provided. A Minister makes a statement. In my opinion the statement is news. It merits news coverage, but all that goes out to these stations is one side of the story. There may be many flaws in the statement. It does not necessarily follow, but it is always possible and in a democratic society it used to be believed the truth would most likely emerge from the presentation of various viewpoints. But here only one viewpoint is presented and there are, I regret to say, television stations in this province which appear willing to make themselves into the propaganda mouthpieces of the government in this way.

I realize that not every television or radio station in Ontario could afford to maintain its own staff at Queen's Park. There are a few which do that. They happen to be the biggest and they have greater resources, but there is no reason why they cannot band together just as the newspapers of the province and of the country, indeed, have banded together in the Canadian Press.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forst Hill): Have you ever heard of Broadcast News?

Mr. Bryden: Well, some radio and television stations do band together. I thank the hon. member for Forest Hill for having reminded me of that. Some of them do indeed band together to get their own news independently, but some of them apparently are just willing to take hand-outs from the government, with no criticism, no commentary, no opposing points of view presented. It is a most unfortunate situation.

I know that the Tories smugly chuckle to themselves that they do have this degree of control over the dissemination of news, and they think this is wonderful. They do not care very much about the basic democratic principles involved, just as long as they can get an advantage for themselves. That is all that matters to them, and that is unfortunate too, but I think it should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that this is what is happening within the publicity branch of this department, and specifically through that service that is allegedly provided for everybody, but is actually only available to any significant degree to the government.

Mr. Nixon: I wanted to make some remarks about the responsibility of the office downstairs which does distribute the tapes and information to the members of the Legislature when requested and on other occasions. My own feeling is that the facilities there for press conferences are extremely useful and I think they are appreciated, certainly by the press gallery people, particularly the electronic press who had pretty meagre facilities here up until the opening of the new press conference room.

I certainly think that it is a useful procedure also that people concerned with developing news at the provincial level can make use of that facility as well, whether or not they are members of the Legislature or in the government service. I am very glad that there has not been any bar on the part of the government in these facilities in the months gone by.

I particularly believe that there is going to be a rapid expansion in the responsibility of that particular office—I forget what its official name is—in the years that lie immediately ahead. I can see nothing wrong myself with the tape recorders of the press being plugged into the outlets associated with the system that presently wires this House, and they would be at liberty to use for broadcasts anything that is said in the debates in the chamber here. There would have to be some safeguards, and I suppose they already exist, for prohibiting the reporters who make use of these tapes, from editing them for any purpose other than conveying the full meaning and context of the speaker.

As a matter of fact, we sometimes accuse the press of misquoting us and we have every opportunity to rise in our place and correct any misapprehension that might be a result of that already. I think the prohibition in the House against the taping of the procedure, as long as it does not interfere with the decorum, is one that should no longer apply.

My own feeling as well is that in the near future, certain important debates and perhaps at the question period, or some selected part of the procedure day to day, would be made available to either the facilities of the office

downstairs, which is improved so that we can be assured of its independence, or through the opening of some part of the gallery to the television medium so that it can be made available across the province. The fact that our proceedings would be televised *in toto* is a fairly frightening thing, when you think of the long procedures, I suppose, in the situations we are undergoing at the present time, when it would be very difficult to arouse any great mass audience, particularly in competition with what the television is providing tonight.

But I do think that we should be making plans.

Mr. Bryden: Offer them Quentin Durgens.

Mr. Nixon: Oh yes. Well Quentin Durgens they say is going to run.

But this is something that surely lies in the immediate future and we must be prepared for it. In fact, I have a very high regard for the staff in the office downstairs. As you know, they are very close to our own offices and with all the good mornings and good afternoons you eventually get to know the people, and I believe they are doing a good job.

With this particular exception — I hope I can say it without offence—I believe the staff in that particular office has a tremendous responsibility to see that both sides of the question are presented in the reports that are sent out on tape to the various stations.

Mr. Bryden: Well, they sure do not do that.

Mr. Nixon: Well, this is something that I think the Minister is capable—surely in his position of responsibility—of correcting. I do not think that we on this side would ever have the confidence that in our partisan system we would ever have a Minister with the breadth of view that we would be able to say that he was completely beyond reproach. But this office could be set up in a way that the radio outlets across the country would be provided with a full approach on the issues as they arise, and that there should really be no need at all for the attack on the system that really has come from the official Opposition and the NDP—and with some reason—that there has been a slanted approach going out across the province. Surely we can provide a service down there so that on each individual issue, whether it is on air pollution or any other matter, they can send out a tape on the government position, and the position of the Opposition can be made available. Of course, the radio stations can use their own judgment as to how much or how little of it they choose to use. We know that a good many stations in the local area do not use that service at all. They make their own judgments as to who they want to interview and what use they would make of it.

I think that there is room for criticism of the type that has been levelled at the Minister in the last few minutes, but the introduction of this service is going to expand; it has to expand and I believe that we must make provisions so that it can be expanded with the confidence of all members of the House.

I believe that the taping of the proceedings should not be interfered with by the rules of the House as long as it does not interfere with the decorum. It could be done readily by providing jacks in the present system so that the tape recorders could be plugged in to make use of any part of the debate that they choose. If this is so, then the next step is on to television, and once again we have to be prepared to make some renovations that would allow the television cameras to beam in on our proceedings without intruding themselves.

It would be useless if every time something of interest happened here the lights came on and, of course, the hon. member who would be in process of debate would immediately stop and say, "Mr. Speaker, as I was saying" and we would go over the whole thing again.

It seems to me that there are answers and that the people of the province and the news media themselves have to have access to a more modern approach to the reporting of what goes on in here. I would certainly favour any plan that the Minister might come up with, and I would think that, in the months that lie ahead, whoever has the responsibility would undertake something of that nature.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments here and would make a suggestion to the Minister concerning the publicity end of things. His annual report specifically states that approximately 90 per cent of United States travel in Ontario comes from 10 states in the union—Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Illinois, particularly. The report states that the average United States tourist coming into Canada tends to reside in United States metropolitan areas. In other words, in the big centres.

Several years ago I made a suggestion to the hon. Minister that the use of trailers be adopted by the department in an attempt to sell the province of Ontario to residents to the south of us. I noticed that the federal people are using Centennial trailers this year in an attempt to sell Centennial year and to sell Canada across the length and breadth of Canada. They, in their wisdom, consider it a fairly good approach to the selling of Canada. During this year the Minister should consider a similar approach in an attempt to entice a greater number of tourists from those states adjacent to our borders, and I would like to mention specifically the 10 that are mentioned in the annual report of the Minister's department.

I think that we are missing a golden opportunity in not having one or two, or even half a dozen trailers if necessary, visit these larger centres in the United States—cities such as Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, Indianapolis, St. Louis, and other large centres such as Connecticut and New Jersey and so on—and show in these trailers either by motion pictures or slides or some other electronic means, the advantages of spending their tourist dollar in the province of Ontario, and show them what they are missing by not coming to this province.

I notice that the Minister is using an approach similar to this electronic approach in the use of "arm chair" tourism in the class room. Some branch of his department showed slides and motion pictures, if I am not mistaken, in one of the secondary schools in my community and I think this is a very nice gesture. I think this inculcates into the minds of youngsters that they have a province that they can be proud of. There are a lot of natural attractions and other attractions and they should first consider touring their own province before they go beyond its bounds or even the bounds of Canada.

I would reverse that and go into the United States and encourage its citizens to come here, but I would do the selling job by means of trailers. I think they have merit; the federal people are using them and I think this Minister should adopt such a plan.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I am not too clear as to whether, when the hon. member referred to the federal government selling Centennial by trailer—was he referring to the Confederation train and caravan?

Mr. Newman: I am referring to the Confederation caravan.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Confederation caravan is actually another version of the exhibits on the Confederation train which are related to the history of Canada's first 100 years. As far as selling the province is concerned—selling the attractions of the province by trailer—I can see certain problems in a thing like this because it is not feasible to show one film and one screening to one person. I think that we are doing more and more in the field of telling people and showing films of Ontario to people by our increasing participation in travel and sport shows in the 10-state area that the hon. member referred to. But we have no plans for trailers at the moment. I think it would be a very costly operation, particularly costly in terms of the number of people you met, per dollar or $10 expenditure, the number of people to whom you could make a presentation by trailer, unless you were simply to take the trailer to sports and travel shows and other places where there is a large number of potential tourists gathered in one place at one time.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would take the trailer, say to the city of Cleveland and I would have some advance publicity and information concerning it. I would have a display of motion pictures one evening in one of the city parks. I do not think that there would be any problem making arrangements with the municipality of Cleveland to do this, and I probably would keep that trailer in the city of Cleveland for one or two weeks, going from one area of the city to another. Then I would do that in other large cities in the United States.

I think that although we advertise in United States newspapers, this does not necessarily reach all of the individuals that we would like to reach. I think that a better job can be done by the use of these trailers and I do not think that they would be expensive as the Minister indicates. A trailer could be rented for a tourist reception centre in various parts of the province. Say you are doing it today, all you would have to do is move that trailer around a little more.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2103. Have you anything else under the last section of tourist promotion?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, we still have not left the publicity and the advertising sections. There are a couple of other questions I would like to ask relating to this.

The total expenditure, as I understand the Minister—or the anticipated expenditure in

the coming year for the television and radio room and ancillary services downstairs is $38,000. Now, I understand that some of the costs of operating those facilities are charged up to various departments. For example, if the Minister of a certain department made a statement on a certain subject relating to his department and put it on film, would that be charged to that department, or would that be paid for out of the vote in The Department of Tourism and Information estimates?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, as mentioned at the public accounts committee, the first year the costs were channelled to the various departments using the service. The Treasury board decided that last year and the current year it would be more convenient and make better accounting sense if the entire costs were in one vote. So in 1966-67 the amount involved is the amount in this vote and that is the total amount. Last year, it was $35,000, this year it is $38,000.

Mr. Bryden: Has there ever been any attempt at competitive bidding in providing the services which Vidon Productions now provide?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, there has not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bryden: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is the kind of a service which it would be very difficult—

Mr. Bryden: The Minister means it was just tailored for him?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Would the member like to hear my answer?

Mr. Bryden: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is the kind of service which I would say would be almost impossible to tender for. As I have mentioned before, it is similar to any other, in effect, professional service which one retains. As I mentioned before on three occasions, the reason that the government uses Vidon Productions rather than its own staff is because we want to have an independent and unbiased staff for operations.

Mr. Bryden: Well, how can it be independent and unbiased, Mr. Chairman, when it is entirely dependent upon the government for its existence? The service and organization came into being because the government decided it was going to set up this propaganda agency. It continues to exist only because the government continues to carry it on. Now, there is no independence in that sort of a set-up. It does not necessarily follow that a particular individual may find himself beholden because he is paid, but the basis for lack of independence is financial dependence and I suggest to the Minister that financial dependence in this case is 100 per cent.

Mr. Chairman: Does this cover publicity?

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I wonder, has the Minister ever heard of the Ottawa tulip festival? I wonder, how much money has he in his budget to help the publicizing of that festival? I have asked the question before and it seems to me the answer was that moneys were being provided to some tourist association in the area. If I remember correctly—and perhaps the Minister of Transport will bear me out on this statement—the deficit of the tulip festival has been carried on by the Ottawa board of trade and perhaps business people.

This is one of the biggest tourist attractions in our part of the country and it seems to me that the Minister could easily provide a sum of money sufficient to carry the deficit of that festival. Has the Minister any information on that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, it has never been our policy in effect to subsidize directly, or make grants to individual festivals—the Niagara wine festival, the tulip festival in Ottawa, and a number of others. I just point out to the member that last year through the efforts of the publicity branch, there was a full colour picture in the Buffalo *Courier Express* in one of the week-end editions at the time of the tulip festival. I think one or two weeks ago in a series of suggested press stories which we sent out, the festival was again featured, and, of course, it is shown in some of our brochures in coloured pictures.

We are anxious to publicize and promote any festival, any activity such as this, which certainly has great appeal. But I think the hon. member referred to an answer previously about grants to regional tourist councils and it is, of course, true that the department makes a matching grant, sir, to the lower Ottawa valley travel council. They can use those funds which they receive from the government to promote by brochures or paid radio or TV time, newspaper ads, or a grant to a festival such as this. It was pointed out to me that in the Highways booklet which we referred to earlier, just about at the

centre, there is reference again to the spring tulip festival.

Mr. Racine: Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that a lot of that advertising money that is being spent could be used to publicize this tulip festival. I would like the Minister of Transport, as a past president of the Ottawa board of trade, to give me some information on how they proceeded in financing this festival.

Mr. Chairman: Under this section, under publicity and advertising—this concludes this section. Under the next section, tourist information.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister about the centres to which he sends his travel counsellors and if he was unable to send them last year because of a shortage of staff?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am sorry, I did not catch the first part.

Mr. Newman: Did the Minister send travel counsellors to centres like New York, Chicago, Detroit, Boston, Minneapolis, Cleveland, Cincinnati and so forth? Was he able to fulfil all requests for travel counsellors last year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am informed we were.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, may I read the next sentence from the report on page 21: "Requests for representations at other United States offices were unfulfilled due to lack of staff."

Hon. Mr. Auld: Perhaps I misunderstand the hon. member. I said we were able to staff all the travel shows. I understood the question was: "Were we able to staff all the travel shows and conventions?" This we were able to do. I have forgotten how many travel offices the Canadian government travel bureau has in the United States. This year, we propose to staff, I think, 11. Last year, we staffed six. We would be welcome to staff every one of them as far as the Canadian government travel bureau is concerned, but I think it will be really some time before we would be staffing an office, say, in Los Angeles, where the potential for the summer season is relatively small as compared to Chicago or Minneapolis or Detroit.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the Minister staffs all requests he may get from responsible organizations in 10 states bordering or fairly adjacent to the province of Ontario, the 10 states that the Minister's book suggests that bring 90 per cent of the tourists who visit Ontario. I do not think the Minister should miss this opportunity at all. If we draw 90 per cent of our tourists from these 10 states, I think we should nurture the opportunity and keep encouraging tourists from that area to visit our province.

Vote 2103 agreed to.

On vote 2104:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I think this is the one where I can get at the tourist reception centre. I had asked this of the Minister earlier. May I simply show the Minister the advantage of a proper location of the reception centre, and this happens to come right from his department.

In the month of August, there were 7,754 parties that registered at the tunnel office of the province of Ontario tourist reception centre, yet during that same month 1,531,995 people passed through immigration on the tunnel at the city of Windsor. The reason why so few actually visited the tourist reception centre is that it is sort of out of the way. Some type of sign will either have to be made on some marquee at the tunnel exit or across from the tunnel exit on private property to encourage and to point out to the tourist that the reception centre is just one short block away from the tunnel exit. Too many do not know it is there and as a result do not visit the centre. The figures point this out, and these figures, Mr. Chairman, come from the Detroit-Windsor tunnel reception centre.

Now, in the construction of the centre at the Ambassador bridge. I would suggest to the Minister that he have that centre located —even if he has to locate it on bridge property—so that practically every one of the vehicles passing through customs and immigration would have to pass by that tourist reception centre. The public will not go one block out of its way to find a tourist reception centre as proven by the tunnel reception centre in the city of Windsor. May I ask the Minister when he contemplates actually having the reception centre open at the Ambassador bridge? What is your target date for completion?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid I cannot give you a specific date, but our information is that the centre will be built this summer, so I presume that it will be open some time in the late summer or early fall.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, you say this summer? This was told to us two years ago. It was told again last year.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend should ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) in his estimates. It is his department which calls the tenders, awards the contracts, accepts the building, and pays for it.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Minister, it is all right to say ask the Minister of Public Works. We happen to be discussing your estimates at this time. The tourist centre is going to be operated by your department.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, there are no funds in the estimates for that reception centre.

Mr. Newman: Then may I suggest to the Minister that he get after the Minister of Public Works to apply all the pressure he possibly can so that this centre is opened as soon as possible—and I mean before the fall sets in—and also that the centre be open on a year-round basis because six months of the year for that centre is not good enough today. If we want to encourage tourists to be visiting our province during the 12 months of the year we have to have our facilities open for them for the 12 months.

Vote 2104 agreed to.

On vote 2105:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, on 2105, the public records and archives, I wonder if the Minister can give some indication as to the use of the archives in the building across the street. I have been concerned, for example, that the private papers of former Prime Ministers are there and I was just wondering how these are made available, if they are still more or less under circumscription, or whatever the word is, that I believe applies to some of the papers that have been taken into the archives. I know that there have been theses written on the basis of them and I just wonder how the decision is arrived at to allow certain people access to them.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that the papers from the office of the Prime Minister up to the time of the Hon. Mr. Drury are available. Papers of Prime Ministers since that time are sometimes available, but the archivist informs me that they clear with the Prime Minister's office on specific papers as to whether or not they are available to the public. These are the ones that have come from the Prime Minister's office vaults, not as private correspondence.

Mr. Nixon: From time to time there have been people concerning themselves with the access to those papers. I wonder what is the best means of approach. Is it through the archivist himself?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Through the archivist personally.

Vote 2105 agreed to.

On vote 2106:

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I am interested to know just what is the theatre situation across the province at the present time; how many are left operating in relation to let us say five, four or three years ago, and what records might show.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid that I have not got figures for five years ago. I can say that in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967, there were 393 theatre licences issued, so there are approximately 393 theatres operating. In 1962 there were 459 licensed: 1963, 422; 1964, 410; 1965, 403.

Mr. Gisborn: Have you had any representations from their organizations as to the need for a decrease in the tax or licence?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have had no representations regarding the tax. Those representations I presume would go to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. As far as fees are concerned, after consultation with the industry we reduced the classification fees charged by the department and changed the system slightly because there had been a change in the pattern of the industry. Very briefly what we did was to change the system from the same fee per print—it did not matter if you had one print or 50 prints—to a higher figure for the first print and a lower figure for subsequent prints. There had been a change in the industry and many people were bringing in 10 prints of one film for 10 simultaneous showings rather than one print that would be shown in 10 theatres.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, is this the censorship portion? Have there been any changes over the last few months in the censorship activities? One hears muted rumours that very few films have been censored in the last little while, fewer proportionately than in previous years.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Last year there were 501 feature films examined; 53 were kept classified as restricted, 95 were classified as adult, 353 were classified as general. There were no film deletions in features. There were 16,226 pieces of advertising examined, one piece of advertising was altered, 117 pieces of advertising were rejected.

Mr. S. Lewis: Does that suggest that there was not a single piece of censorship in any feature film in Ontario in the last year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There were no deletions. There may have been films where the distributor decided to make deletions so that instead of having it classified as restricted, it would be classified as adult or general. There were no restricted films distributed in the province from which the board had ordered a deletion.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right. That is a change, is it not, as memory serves me? Are you not normally in a position of rattling off a large number of films in which deletions have been made?

Hon. Mr. Auld: They have varied from, I think, 20 to 40 deletions. I think last year there were some 20 films, or 19.

Mr. S. Lewis: And this year, none. I want to make this point. I have no idea at all whether it has resulted—or any of the discussions, whimsical or otherwise, which we have had in this Legislature—have contributed to that fact, but I consider it for whatever it is worth, a matter of some significance that we are getting to the point of maturity in this province where we no longer delete from reasonable feature films. I suppose this is a very modest milestone that not a single feature film should have had deletions by the censorship board this past year and I congratulate the board on that. There has been a notable progression downward over the past four years and we have now reached the stage which one would like to see perpetuated, given the general framework within which the censorship board operates. I commend the Minister, I commend the board; I hope the pattern will be repeated in the future.

Mr. Bryden: Were any films rejected last year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No.

Votes 2106 and 2107 agreed to.

On vote 2108:

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the member who is the chairman of this commission is going to make a statement? I believe in past years there has been some report, other than the printed report which we all received.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am informed that the chairman feels that what remarks he might have made were adequately covered in his commission's report.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, under 2102 I raised the question of the great increase in the estimate to $900,000 for the restoration of historic sites. I might be incorrect, but did I understand the Minister to tell me at that time that that included operation costs and construction costs and those things that are now mentioned in 2108?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if I was not perfectly clear. The figures in the former vote were for Ste Marie, Penetanguishene, *Nancy* museum, and Moose Factory. They had nothing to do with St. Lawrence parks commission.

These items in this vote have to do only with the St. Lawrence parks commission and they include the campsites, the parkland sites 11 to 14, the historic sites from six to ten, and those two historic sites, Old Fort Henry and Upper Canada village.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate why this particular operation is under his department? It is under the direction of a commission which reports to him and receives its money through him. I do not want in any sense to imply any criticism of the commission. From what I can determine they are doing a good job in developing this area as a recreation area, but why is this park system treated differently from other park systems? We have of course the Niagara system which does not report to anybody, as far as I can see, although there has recently been a blow-up there. Certainly it never reports to this Legislature; it never has and I am sure it never will. No doubt the reason to be given is that it is a self-financing operation. So that if an operation becomes self-financing then it gets out from under public scrutiny almost totally, which is unfortunate.

Then we have this particular operation, which comes under this department, but then there are a number of other park operations in the province, which I believe are directly

under departmental administration. They are under the administration of The Department of Lands and Forests. Why these differing systems of park operations?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, first: Perhaps the hon. member for Woodbine was not here when I read from the annual report of the commission. Article 15 of the Canada-Ontario agreement provided that—and I will quote it again:

> Ontario will establish a commission to supervise the execution of such work as may be appropriate consistently with the execution of the works to safeguard and enhance the scenic beauty of and historic associations with the international rapids section.

That was part of an agreement made between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario at the time of the power development and the seaway construction and it was approved by the Legislature of Ontario on April 10, 1952.

That was the reason for the commission and I can only say that until such time as it was renegotiated with Ottawa, the commission would have to continue. The fact that it reports to my department rather than some other is, I presume because of the historic aspects of the commission, its operations with Old Fort Henry, Upper Canada village, the Adolphustown loyalist cemetery in the Adolphustown park and the White house and the Fairfield house which were given to the commission by the Fairfield family—the properties together with certain art collections, and so on.

Mr. Paterson: I have one question in relation to the St. Lawrence parks commission. This will be the focal point of a great number of our people in the province on the way to Expo and Montreal. I, in fact, plan to spend a week in that area and commute each day.

I just wonder if the Minister could enlighten the House and our populace as to what added facilities have been provided by the commission to take care of the great numbers of campers and trailer people. Just what is going on in the area? I think the public wants this information.

Mr. F. Guindon (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member I would like to say that we have developed a number of camp sites in the St. Lawrence parkway to the extent of almost 800 new camp sites. We have also near the Quebec border, purchased or acquired property to develop a new camp site at Glengarry park. We have also developed the trailer parks opposite Ingleside at the west entrance of the Long Sault parkway.

We have done all this work during late fall or during the winter. We are ready now. We feel that we have done as much as we possibly could do, as a commission, to provide the facilities for the great number of tourists that we are expecting in our area during the coming summer. We have also done many other things. We have extended our souvenir store in the village. We are presently building an addition to it. In other words, with the money we had available, I think we have done a fairly good job.

Vote 2108 agreed to.

On vote 2109:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions on this vote. The Minister indicated a few minutes ago that he was prepared to adjourn at 11 o'clock, but I see the Prime Minister is back and he may have some other ideas.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I think, in view of the fact that there will probably be some discussion on the last vote, I would rather complete it at one session. I would therefore move that the committee rise and report it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, when these estimates are complete, the next department to be dealt with will be Energy and Resources Management, and the next three will be Health, Mines and Social and Family Services.

This will put the House on notice for four departments after the completion of the estimates of this present department.

Tomorrow I would like to deal with the order paper, House in committee of the whole, to deal with some of the bills that are ready to be dealt with in committee of the whole House. When we have completed that, we will return to these estimates.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is the intention of the Prime Minister, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, to have any Budget Debate in the foreseeable future?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: As soon as the Whips notify me that there are debaters ready, we will make times available to them. The last time I asked, there were no debaters ready.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:15 o'clock, p.m.

No. 64

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, April 14, 1967

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 14, 1967

Presenting reports, Mr. Wishart 2195

Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 2195

Statement re Royal commission to investigate allegations by Dr. Morton Shulman, Mr. Robarts 2196

Questions to Mr. Gomme re transportation systems, Mr. Sargent 2199

Questions to Mr. Simonett re contracts in the city of Cornwall, Mr. MacDonald 2200

Question to Mr. Robarts re Prudential Finance Corporation Ltd., Mr. MacDonald 2201

Question to Mr. Robarts re rezoning referrals, Mr. Young 2201

Statement re volume 1, "Ontario Advisory Committee on Confederation," Mr. Robarts 2201

Insurance Act, bill to amend, reported 2205

Whirlpool Rapids bridge, bill respecting, reported 2211

Lewiston-Queenston bridge, bill respecting, reported 2211

Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported 2211

Energy Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported 2211

Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, reported 2212

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 2219

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 14, 1967

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, Fisherville junior high school, Willowdale; and in the west gallery, Sloan Avenue public school, Don Mills.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I should like to present the report of the Ontario police commission for the year 1966, and also the report of the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police.

More copies of the report of the police commissioner are available and may be obtained from the chairman of the commission. Additional copies of the report of the Ontario Provincial Police can be obtained from the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE MUNICIPAL UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I might say that the purpose of this amendment is to increase the amount of the unconditional grants payable to local municipalities by $1.50 per capita in order to assist municipalities to meet their additional financial requirements.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister answer a question with reference to this bill?

Mr. Speaker: If the Minister will answer a question, I will permit one.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will this give every municipality a like treatment?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I said that the amount involved in this amendment was $1.50 per capita to assist all local municipalities. Therefore that means that each and every local municipality, and each and every type of local municipality, will receive an additional $1.50 per capita over and above the amounts that have been contained in the Act up to this time.

Mr. Sargent: That is not what I asked; I asked if they would all get like treatment—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member—

Mr. Sargent: Let him answer the question!

Mr. Speaker: The member is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: That is not the truth!

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, let us get this straight. Is the hon. member suggesting that I have not spoken the truth here this morning?

Mr. Sargent: I certainly am! I said "like treatment" across the province. Toronto is getting $5 per capita and Owen Sound $3.50 per capita—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The member asked a question and the Minister has answered it. I rule the matter to be closed.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, he also said that I did not tell the truth. I object to that and he should withdraw that statement.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister had answered my question properly—

Mr. Speaker: Did the member say that the Minister did not tell the truth?

Mr. Sargent: He always tells the truth, but he did not answer my question. I withdraw that part about his not telling the truth.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Absolutely disgraceful!

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, what is the hon. House leader talking about—"absolutely disgraceful"? Obviously it was a misunderstanding and based on that the hon. member withdrew—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I will not have any more interjections, please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps we can get back to the business of the province.

On Monday last I gave this Legislature notice that the government would appoint a Royal commission to investigate and report upon the allegations made by Dr. Morton Shulman, of wrongdoing by this government and various senior civil servants in The Department of the Attorney General. I am pleased to be able to tell the Legislature that Mr. Justice W. D. Parker, one of Her Majesty's judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario, has undertaken to perform this task.

May I take this opportunity of saying, Mr. Speaker, that I consider that we are fortunate that we have a group of men such as our judges who will undertake tasks of this sort on behalf of the general public of the province. The allegations which have been made are most serious, in my view. They can have no other effect than to create apprehension and doubts among our people as to the probity of those who are charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of these same people. Such apprehension and doubt cannot be allowed to exist, nor can such serious accusations go uninvestigated and unproven. I am confident that Mr. Justice Parker will conduct his investigations with the complete impartiality that his position demands, and that he will bring to the examination the skills and knowledge which he exercises in his day-to-day duties as a justice of the Supreme Court of Ontario.

I have asked Mr. Justice Parker to proceed with all despatch to commence and complete the commission. He has been provided with office accommodation and is presently gathering together such staff as he may deem adequate for the task in hand. I would hope that this matter may be dealt with as quickly as possible in order that we may all know the truth of these allegations. It is perhaps needless to say that all facilities of this government have been placed at Mr. Justice Parker's disposal, as it is my purpose and intent that full and complete disclosure should be made of all facts and circumstances surrounding the matters to be examined.

Mr. Sargent: When will that be?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I wish that some members of this House would read the rules and have some understanding of the procedures as they should be followed here. I think this is a very serious matter with which we are dealing—it is as far as this government is concerned—and we propose to deal with it in the way which I have set forth and which is in the most expeditious manner we could devise.

The order-in-council appointing Mr. Justice Parker is dated April 13, 1967, and reads as follows:

> The committee of council have had under consideration the report of the Prime Minister, dated April 13, 1967, wherein he states that:
>
> Whereas it is deemed desirable to cause inquiry to be made forthwith into certain allegations concerning the administration of public affairs in the province of Ontario, connected with and affecting the conduct of investigations and inquests and the appointment of coroners and the expenditure of public funds under The Coroners Act;
>
> The Prime Minister therefore recommends that pursuant to the provisions of The Public Inquiries Act, RSO 1960, chapter 323, a commission be issued appointing the Hon. William Dickens Parker, a justice of the Supreme Court of Ontario, a commissioner to inquire into the report upon allegations made by Dr. Morton P. Shulman, of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, that the government of Ontario and certain senior civil servants of The Department of the Attorney General for Ontario, or any of them:
>
> (a) unlawfully or improperly
>
> i. suppressed investigations or inquests,
>
> ii. interfered with investigations or inquests,
>
> iii. suppressed evidence relating to investigations or inquests conducted in the office of the chief coroner for Metropolitan Toronto during the period when Dr. Shulman served as the chief coroner;
>
> (b) discriminated against persons in relation to their appointment as coroners on

the basis of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin; and

(c) wasted public funds by improper administration under the amendments in relation to the schedule of fees and the provisions of section 21 of The Coroners Act, RSO 1960, chapter 69.

The Prime Minister further recommends that pursuant to The Public Inquiries Act, RSO 1960, chapter 323, the commissioner shall have the power of summoning any person and requiring him to give evidence on oath and to produce such documents and things as the commissioner deems requisite to the full examination of the matters into which he is appointed to examine.

And the Prime Minister further recommends that all government departments, boards, agencies and committees shall assist the commissioner to the fullest extent possible in order that he may carry out his duties and functions, and that he shall have the authority to engage such counsel, and other staff, as he deems proper at rate of remuneration and reimbursement to be approved by Treasury board.

The committee of council concur in the recommendations of the Prime Minister and advise that the same be acted on.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister a question? Has Mr. Justice Parker given any indication to the government as to when he will be able to commence his duties?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have stated here, Mr. Speaker, that we have already provided him with accommodation. These arrangements have been made through The Department of Public Works and in conversation with him, I would say he proposes to commence forthwith, that is now, as of now. I told him, as I said in this statement, that it was the wish of the government that this be proceeded with as quickly as possible and he knows our feeling in the matter. I think we can assume that he will proceed immediately.

Mr. Singer: Well, will the chief justice of the high court be able to release him from his duties, recognizing that presently there are at least two judges who are not performing any duties in court and there are a couple of other judges who are not too well? The agenda for the judges of the high court until the end of June when their long vacation commences, is a very intense one. Does the Prime Minister have any assurance that Mr. Justice Parker will be able to be released from his present judicial duties to commence this hearing?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think these questions are completely out of order. However, I am prepared to tell the House that I would not consider, of course, approaching Mr. Justice Parker in a matter of this kind without first consulting the chief justice of the high court, which I did. I told him what I had in mind and what I would like to do and he conferred with—I would say to the House that the judges consider that this is part of their duty. I do not think it is a duty they seek or that they necessarily want, but they feel it is part of their duty and responsibility to the public, to undertake investigations when asked to do so by the government. They will make whatever arrangements are necessary. Undoubtedly this will mean that the other judges will have to work a little harder. The effect of this will be felt through the whole bench, because the work Mr. Justice Parker would have done in the normal administration of justice will have to be absorbed by other judges of the Supreme Court, but they are prepared to do this.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, we are placed under very severe difficulties in discussing—

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the member has already placed two questions—

Mr. Singer: No, it was the same question.

Mr. Speaker: I do not want the statement to develop into a complete question and answer period; it is rather out of order.

Mr. Singer: This is a very brief question but it is a matter—

Mr. Speaker: Would the member ask the Prime Minister if he would care to answer another question?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, I will.

Mr. Singer: Will there be any opportunity to discuss the terms of reference, because as they were read, I do not think they are broad enough. I recognize that to attempt to discuss them this morning would be out of order, but the terms of reference, I think, are limited, and I think we should have an opportunity to express our views on this.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the matter, I would ask the Prime Minister if he would

consider two comments which I will place in the nature of questions to him.

I noticed in his terms of reference, and because we want to have a final solution to the problem which occasioned this inquiry, would it be possible that the Prime Minister would consider enlarging the terms of reference to include a consideration by the commissioner of the status historically and at the present time of coroners in the province of Ontario? And would he consider extending the terms of reference to include, in addition, consideration of the delimitation or the boundary line between the functions of the supervisory coroner in his supervisory and advisory capacity in relation to a chief coroner who has control over the coroners in a city or municipality such as that of Metropolitan Toronto? It would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that these two areas are so important that we should have them finally settled for the benefit of the people in the province so that we will not have a recurrence of this problem.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that both the matters that were mentioned will fall within these terms of reference as they are presently drawn. I have discussed these terms of reference, of course, with the commissioner, because I would not bring them here until I had discussed them with him, and I am quite certain that the points which the member raised will be covered here. I think what the member is speaking about is absolutely basic to the commissioner's approach to the problem that we have asked him to solve; he is going to have to look at these things. I have assured the commissioner that if he finds his activities limited technically because of the terms of reference, I would be quite happy to look at them again, as he goes ahead in performing his duties, but I think the points the member raised are covered and will be dealt with by the commissoner in the commission as it stands.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, may I ask one more question? It is very difficult to absorb the full significance of a statement such as the order-in-council the Prime Minister just read, but do the terms of reference as set forth there permit inquiries into matters that may have occurred prior to Dr. Shulman's term of office, prior to the start of it?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The terminology used here is "during the period when Dr. Shulman served as chief coroner". These are the allegations that he has made and there must be some limitation on it. It will be, I think, in the discretion of the commissioner as to whether there are certain affairs that may have taken place some time in the past that had an effect during Dr. Shulman's term. We want to investigate the allegations that Dr. Shulman has made. This is what we are after. We are not in any way trying to limit the generality of the investigation; on the other hand, we are not either authorizing an examination of all the functions of the coroner's office for the last indefinite period of years.

There is a problem, of course, in drafting terms of reference for any Royal commission or, indeed, any commission of investigation, be it a select committee or not, and we think that these terms of reference are broad enough to encompass the allegations that have been made by Dr. Shulman, but are sufficiently restrictive that the commissioner can find a position from which he will commence, a position where his investigation can start from. I have checked these matters that the member raised because they are of as much concern to me as they are to him; I have checked these matters as the member has raised them here, with the commissioner himself.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact though that at least one of—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, you cut me off a moment ago—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member ask the Prime Minister if he would care to answer any further questions?

Mr. Bryden: I was assuming that if the Prime Minister was unwilling he would say so.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, you put me in this position. I, of course, am not unwilling to answer any questions, but I rather doubt the propriety of us getting into a full-scale debate on this, should it be that this is what it is going to turn into. I will answer any questions.

Mr. Bryden: This is a very important matter.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not think I have ever refused to answer a question on any subject at any time in this House.

Mr. Bryden: I have one more question and I do not know if—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: All right. Go ahead, certainly.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, all I would like to ask the Prime Minister is this: Is it not true, as I think it is, that part of the allegation or allegations of Dr. Shulman relate to occurrences previous to his appointment as chief coroner? It would seem to me that the way in which the thing is now limited could really destroy the whole basis of his allegations and make it impossible for him to support them.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would not subscribe to that. Certainly the terms are not designed to do that. There may have been events in the past that have had an effect during his period in office, but what we are looking at are the allegations that this man has made and this is what we are attempting to get at. There is a high degree of discretion, I think, in the commissioner himself. I would think it would be completely impossible to draw terms of reference that will precisely state exactly each nuance. Frankly, as far as Dr. Shulman is concerned, I feel constrained to say that he makes more allegations every day, so I do not know what he said on Friday, April 14—if this is the 14th—because each day he adds something else. But someplace we have to say, "These are the allegations we are going to investigate."

Mr. Bryden: The Prime Minister consults nobody about them, allows nobody to—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would say this, Mr. Speaker, I realize eventually that probably we will get into this type of criticism. I can only say that the government takes responsibility for what it does and the terms of reference, as I have laid them before this House, are the terms of reference drawn up by the government in consultation with the commissioner who is going to undertake the task and we simply will take responsibility for them. I repeat what I told the House and what I told the commissioner, if he finds that his investigation, or his power to investigate, is limited because of any undue restriction in the terms of reference, I am quite prepared to look at them again and it would not be the first time that the terms of reference have been altered.

But you simply have to have some degree of finality in this matter, otherwise those who are advocating it be dealt with very quickly, it might very well drag on for the next two or three years with a constant, never ending spate of future allegations.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification.

Mr. Speaker: I think we have now had a pretty full discussion on the matter.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of clarification, if you will permit, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if in the terms of reference I was right in assuming that this would be restricted to the allegations that are associated to the metropolitan area of Toronto. I wonder if this might not be an area—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now just a second. I do not know that necessarily such interpretation could be put on it, but the only phrase that could be interpreted as limitation, and I can read it again:

> Whether certain of the government, or certain senior civil servants of The Department of the Attorney General for Ontario, or any of them, unlawfully or improperly suppressed investigations, or inquests, interfered with investigations or inquests, or suppressed evidence relating to investigations or inquests conducted in the office of the chief coroner for Metropolitan Toronto during the period when Dr. Shulman served as chief coroner.

This means that we are not going to proceed now to investigate an allegation about something that happened in a coroner's investigation, we will say, in North Bay. This is an investigation of the allegations made by Dr. Shulman in his own office, the matters about which I presume he has personal knowledge when he makes such allegations.

Mr. Nixon: Specifically to other provincial cases I know.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member for Grey North give the Minister of Highways his question please?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Grey North asked a question of me yesterday: How much money has been paid out for the GO-transit system? The answer is $8,238,445.

Second part: How much money has been paid to other cities in the province for transportation systems? Answer: The total amount of money paid to municipalities which include cities, towns, villages, counties and townships for the construction and maintenance of their transportation facilities totalled $157,649,000 for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967.

The third part: How much has the province of Ontario paid to Metropolitan Toronto over the past five years in subsidies on subway construction? Answer: $15,094,585.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept a question on this? I do not understand this. The motivation for this question, Mr. Speaker, was that the Prime Minister told the House that he would give money—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! The member is completely out of order.

Mr. Sargent: All right. What does he mean by transportation to $1,000,000 across the province? I never heard of this before. We do not get it up our way. Will he answer the question please? I want to know the answer to this.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I want to know the answer to this question. I stand here—

Mr. Speaker: I said the member was out of order, and I would ask him to take his seat.

Mr. Sargent: He said he would answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: I told the member to take his seat.

Mr. Sargent: He said he would answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister does not have to answer any further questions.

Mr. Sargent: He said he would.

Mr. Speaker: I am asking the member to take his seat.

Mr. Sargent: How do you win? I asked him a simple question and he cannot answer it.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has answered the question you asked.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to questions from the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) yesterday regarding certain contracts in the city of Cornwall.

Question 1. What was the closing date for tenders on a major sewage project in Cornwall being handled by the OWRC? Question 2. When were the first awards of contracts made, to whom, and for what amounts?

Contract 1, project No. 64-S-172, closing date was September 17, 1964. The date of award was December 14, 1964, to Matthews Construction Company for $609,187,000. Contract 2, the same project, and this is in three sections: (a) Sansome Construction Company for $484,487. (b) Was awarded December 14, 1964, to Keystone Contractors Limited for $352,694; (c) Awarded August 12, 1966, Beaver Underground Structures Limited for $123,746.

Contract 3—same project number—closing date September 22, 1965. Date of award December 8, 1965; Beaver Underground Structures Limited for $647,566.

Contract 4—same project number—closing date March 4, 1965. Date of award May 20, 1965 to Louisberg Construction Company for $278,160.

Contract 10—project No. 66-S-214—closing date November 22, 1966. Date of award January 18, 1967—Beaver Underground Structures Limited for $395,740.

Contract 5—project No. SP-66-1—part 1—rejected by Beaver Underground Structures Limited. January 5, 1967 was closing date. Part 2, Spino Construction Company Limited for $2,179,882.

Contract 5, a recall, Spino Construction Company Limited and Beaver Underground Structures Limited (by open cut method). This contract has not yet been awarded and the bids will be considered later.

Question 3: Was a portion of the project called for tender a second time?

The answer is yes, in contracts three and part one of contract five.

Question 4: If so, how many tenders came in on the recall and for what amounts?

Contract 3, two tenders—Beaver Underground Structures Limited for $647,566. Matthews Construction Company Limited for $724,472.

Contract 5, part 1, six tenders—Beaver Underground Structures Limited for $655,047, Spino Construction Company Limited, $676,820, Mastercraft Bridge and Engineering Construction, $694,630, Taggart Construction Company Limited, $779,059, Border City Excavators Limited, $841,362, Keystone Contractors Limited, $1,029,850.46.

Question 5: How much of an increase do these recalled tenders represent over the cost in the original tenders?

Contract 3, $52,388 increase. The contract award was for $647,566. The original tender was $595,178.

Contract 5, part 1—$109,618 decrease. Original tender was $764,665, and the contract award was for $655,047.

Beaver Construction, low tenderer on part 1 of contract 5 at $489,145 on the first tender called refused the contract.

The price of the second low tenderer was $764,665 and Beaver Construction's price on the recall was $655,047.

When contract 3 was originally called only two tenders were submitted and the low tender was considerably higher than the engineer's estimate. The consulting engineers recommended, and the city concurred on June 10, 1965, that the tenders be rejected and be recalled at a later date when it was expected competition would be improved.

Tenders were recalled some seven months later in the fall of 1965, with the low tender $52,388 higher than the previous low tender. Due to indications of a general trend of higher prices and the fact that the contract could now be constructed under the winter works incentive programme, it was recommended that a contract be awarded on the basis of the low tender. The lack of competition in this type of work during 1965 in the Cornwall area may have been due to the increased activity in preparation of the Expo site in Montreal.

Contract 5, parts 1, 2, 3: the tenders for the works were received and opened on January 5, 1967. The tender documents were arranged so as to give the contractors choice of bidding one, two or three parts separately or in any combination, altogether seven options. The commission would have the authority to select the most economical price from the seven options. From seven tenders submitted the lowest price was available by selecting Spino Construction Limited for parts 2 and 3 at a cost of $2,179,882 and Beaver Underground Structures Limited for part 1 at a cost of $524,145, making a total cost of $2,704,027.

Beaver withdrew his tender on part 1, claiming he misunderstood the tender documents which made him low bidder on all three parts—option seven—in the amount of $2,846,185.

It was felt unfair to let Beaver withdraw his tender on part 1 and then award the works on all three parts to him since if an error was made it was made by Beaver and not Spino. It was recommended to award parts 2 and 3 to Spino and recall tenders on part 1. The commission concurred with the above recommendation.

On the recall of tenders on part 1 of the six tenders submitted, the lowest two were submitted by Beaver in the amount of $655,047 and Spino in the amount of $676,820.

Considering the contingencies in the tenders, the difference amounts to approximately $12,000. Since Spino will construct the sewer in tunnel and Beaver by open cut method, it is felt that the advantages gained may outweigh the extra money. The decision has not yet been made.

By recalling the tenders on part 1, the commission will benefit by approximately $43,000 as compared to the price on all parts submitted originally by Beaver.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister whether he has a copy of that simple document?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: I would appreciate one.

Mr. Speaker: The member has a question before the orders of the day?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. As the government has had over three weeks to study the report of Clarkson, Gordon and Co. on the collapse of Prudential Finance Corporation Ltd., does the government now intend to make some compensation on an equitable basis to the noteholders of the company?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the investigations are still going on and I cannot answer that question. No decision has been taken.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was drawn to my attention that there was a question some time ago that I had undertaken to answer and I had not done so. I have the answer here. How many applications have been made to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council during the past ten years to have decisions with respect to rezoning referred back to the Ontario municipal board? The answer is four.

Before the orders of the day, I want to just make a few comments about the volume that appears on everybody's desk, entitled "Ontario Advisory Committee on Confederation", background papers and reports, volume 1.

This has been a matter of some discussion in the House over a period of time and I am happy to be able to make these reports public. This is volume 1, as it says, of the background papers and reports of the committee. These papers which are contained in here at best only represent a sampling of the work undertaken by the committee.

It is not possible to illustrate in a publication such as this the wide range of problems that the committee has discussed nor to portray really in a volume such as this the spirit and atmosphere of the meetings of the committee. The papers here are rather technical

in nature, dealing with specific problems of our federal system but this should not obscure the fact that the committee has also spent a good deal of time treating the broader questions of Canada's aims and goals as we enter our second century.

The members of the advisory committee hold a wide variety of opinions about these problems, and it was only on the condition that they would remain free to express these views publicly as individuals that they agreed to join the committee in the first place. Mr. Speaker, each of the papers expresses only the point of view of its author, with the exception of the report of the economic and fiscal subcommittee, which is a report of all members of that subcommittee.

I would like to make it very clear that these papers do not necessarily represent the views of the government. The committee is composed of men of widely varying personal opinions and the research which they have done no doubt will reflect the varying views of these matters which are held by the general public. These papers have been and will be of great value to the government in formulating policy; but once again, I want to make it clear that they are the opinions of the authors and do not necessarily represent official government policy.

In volume I, the following papers have been published: The Legislature and Executives of the Federation, by Dr. E. Forsey, dated October, 1966.

The paper discusses in Dr. Forsey's own distinctive style the effect of the following problem areas on representation in the federal and Quebec Legislatures and on the Constitution:

(1) Quebec's opting out of federal-provincial shared-cost programmes,

(2) the possibility of Quebec's opting out of the dominion family allowance plan,

(3) the official demand of the Quebec government that the dominion should, in Quebec, withdraw from the payment of flat-rate old age security,

(4) coexistence of the Canada and Quebec pension plans,

(5) the endowment of the Senate with large new independent powers,

(6) the proposal from various quarters in Quebec to transfer large fields of jurisdiction, in Quebec, from the dominion Parliament to the Quebec Legislature.

There is another paper by Dr. Forsey entitled: Constitutional Monarchy and the Provinces, dated October, 1965.

Some Canadians have an "amiable but fuzzy" desire to help the French Canadians by recommending that Canada become a republic. Dr. Forsey contends that a factual look at Canada's political and constitutional history indicates that this theory is a misconception. Moreover, he also disposes in this particular paper of six other arguments for a republic in Canada.

Dr. W. R. Lederman, dean of law at Queens University, has a paper in this volume entitled: The Process of Constitutional Amendment for Canada.

> In June 1966, the Lesage government was defeated by the National Union Party of Daniel Johnson, which had been explicitly opposing the Fulton-Favreau formula which you recall, was debated in this House and accepted.
>
> With the Johnson government in power in Quebec, it is now clear that the Canadian Constitution is open for review once more.

In other words, the Fulton-Favreau formula went so far and then was pretty well discarded—at least for the present—and as Dean Lederman says, "the Canadian Constitution is open for review . . ." Dean Lederman discusses the methods of constitutional change as they now confront us, the question of whether the federal Constitution should be repatriated and the terms on which the repatriated Constitution could then be amended and these are matters, I think, of very great interest.

The next paper is by a man by the name of Alex Mesbur of Queens University, and this was done under the aegis, I believe, of Professor Maza. It is entitled: The Making of Federal Constitutions: A Study of Constitution Making in the United States, Australia, India, Pakistan, Malaysia and the West Indies.

Any attempt to draft a new constitution or even to make serious amendments could involve an important shift in our entire approach to federalism. How are federal constitutions created? What has been the experience of other federal states? Mr. Mesbur's paper is a study of six aspects of the constitution-making process in the United States, Australia, India, Pakistan, Malaysia and the West Indies. These aspects are:

(a) The political and constitutional background to federal constitution-making.

(b) Constitution-making as an amendment process.

(c) The use of committees of inquiry, commissions and conferences in the period before final constitution-making.

(d) Creation of constitutions by legislation and order-in-council.

(e) The constituent assembly as a constitution-making device.

(f) The use of referenda and the ratification of constitutions.

Mr. Justice Bora Laskin, contributes a paper entitled: The Provinces and International Agreements.

The renewed interest on the part of certain provinces, particularly Quebec, to play a greater role in international affairs that led the committee to investigate more deeply provincial responsibility in this field, and I think the currency of this particular topic is indicated in the story that is on the front page of the morning paper. Sustained public interest in this topic occasioned two subsequent papers on the same general topic.

The purpose of Mr. Justice Laskin's paper in this volume is to establish on a legal basis the answers to three important questions:

(1) Do the provincial governments have any right to make agreements, treaties and conventions with foreign powers?

(2) In what way, if any, is the federal government restricted in making agreements with foreign powers in areas of exclusively provincial legislative jurisdiction?

(3) Are provincial agents-general and provincial discussions and arrangements with foreign governments, in fact, illegal?

Mr. MacDonald: That would be illuminating—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The reason I am making these comments on these papers is to indicate the breadth of the studies and the basis that these studies will provide for individuals to make up their own minds. These are background papers in the truest sense of the word. By the time hon. members wade through this material, they will have a basis upon which they can make some decision themselves. The currency of the paper, I think, is immediately evident because a knowledge of what is contained in this volume will make one's reading of the paper every day a good deal more intelligent and will give one a greater grasp of events. This, of course, is the basic reason why the committee was established.

Bora Laskin lectured me in constitutional law when I was a student at Osgoode Hall. That is how far back his involvement in matters of constitutional law are concerned.

Mr. Singer: You were all young together.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, there was a group of us who were there together. I suppose in making that remark about me, the hon. member is in some way satisfying himself that he is not growing too old too fast.

Professor E. McWhinney who, I think, is known to most of the members of the legal profession in the House, has written a paper on The Constitutional Competence with Federal Systems as to International Agreements, and from examinations of a number of examples, cited on behalf of the province of Quebec, Professor McWhinney concludes that "on a practical level, a lot of the apparent problems raised by Quebec's tentative ventures into trans-national governmental and commercial operations are seen not really to exist at all," and I think that is a very intriguing statement in itself.

Treaty-Making Power in Canada, another paper prepared by the federal-provincial affairs secretariat of this government, dated July, 1966, by Mr. R. J. Delisle, deals with whether a province, as a constituent member of a federation, can enter into international agreements intended to create legal rights and obligations, or to establish relationships governed by international law. The report attempts to answer this question by looking first at what the writers "on international law have said, then to examine the evolution of treaty-making power in Canada as seen in the custom and practice of the past century—at times formulated at colonial and imperial conferences—and finally a review of judicial pronouncements on the subject".

Professor McWhinney contributed another paper entitled, "A Supreme Court in a Bicultural Society, the Future Role of the Canadian Supreme Court", and this, again, is a very intriguing and very interesting area of speculation as far as the future of our country is concerned, from a constitutional point of view.

The function of our Supreme Court, a body appointed by the federal government, has come in for attack as to its impartial role in disputes between the provinces and the federal government. Mr. Lesage once said that if the Supreme Court found against him, he would not accept its decision, which will give you some idea of the topicality of these studies.

What kind of role should the Supreme Court play in a federal country? Professor McWhinney sets out to suggest an outline for

restructuring the Supreme Court of Canada based on an analysis of the functioning of continental European final appellate tribunals and mainly on the experience of the Canadian Supreme Court in the 1950s and early 1960s.

Finally, Dr. Forsey contributes a paper entitled, Memorandum on the Associate States, completed and dated November, 1966.

Various proposals have been suggested to cure Canada's constitutional ills. One of these is the associate state concept put forth by the Saint Jean-Baptiste society of Montreal to the Quebec Legislature's committee on the Constitution, May 16, 1964. Although the idea of associated states had been discussed before this date, the society's presentation was one of the first popular expressions of support for it. Dr. Forsey's brief memorandum is mainly concerned with an analysis of this report.

Mr. Speaker, that covers the material embodied in this particular volume. I have had a good many copies of this prepared for distribution to the public. I would say it is the hope of the government that we will with this stimulate some public discussions among our people of the issues that lie before us and that are going to have to be faced in the immediate years that lie ahead of us in this country. There will be another volume similar to this which is in process of preparation at the moment and I hope to have it available next week. It will cover some cultural aspects of the problem and some other areas. Then there will be a third volume which will be mainly statistical—

Mr. Sargent: It is all window-dressing.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there is the exact, precise appreciation of the hon. member of the problems facing Canada. I can say no more. But here we have the result of some of the finest brains that we have in Canada and it is the desire of this government to make this—certainly I know one member in this House who will never read it, and that is the member who made that last statement. But here we are trying to put into the hands of the people of our province the most complete background material we can find in order that they may be competent to analyze and judge the statements that are made by public figures in our country and we think this will have the effect. The third volume will contain a compilation of statistics which have been developed and which also will serve as background material, as some of us face the problems that lie ahead of our country in the immediate future.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, this has arisen three times in the last couple of days. In the normal course of events, Mr. Speaker, the official Opposition has first priority.

Mr. Speaker: No, I am sorry; not on questions.

Mr. Singer: Yes, it does, Mr. Speaker, that is traditional in this House.

Mr. Speaker: The chair recognizes the first person who catches his eye.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, the chair is wrong.

Mr. Speaker: That may be the member's view. In this case, I recognized the member for York South and I am giving him the floor.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, the chair is wrong and is traversing an important tradition established in this Parliament, in the Parliament of the United Kingdom and in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: That may be the member's point of view.

Mr. Singer: Well, you are wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on occasion I have sympathy with both you and the Prime Minister, at least fleetingly.

I have two questions, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to ask the Prime Minister. First, can he indicate when the subsequent volumes are going to be available, and secondly, earlier he said these papers would be tabled some time in advance so that we could read them in preparation for the debate on the resolution standing in his name on the order paper. Can he indicate when that resolution is likely to be called?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes. I do not want to press you too much, but I have had a certain amount of difficulty, I have had to make arrangements to get these published. The next volume will be out next week. The third volume, as I say, is statistical primarily. I would like to call that debate possibly for a week from next Tuesday or Wednesday. I will arrange this in light of the business of the House, but I think we could assume it will be one or other of those days.

Mr. Bryden: We now know the election date.

Mr. Singer: That was the information I wanted, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Prime Minister a question in clarification. It may be that his researchers brought up the wrong answer to the right question or vice versa. I did ask a question some time ago as to how many cases of application for rezoning actually have been referred back, and the answer at that time was "four." Then I asked the question, how many had been applied for to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and I got the answer "four" again. I wonder if this is the fact.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Perhaps I misunderstood the question of the member. I had better check this again. I see the problem. I think probably the answer "four" that I have given refers to the four referred back.

Mr. Young: That is right, I had that.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: But the member wants to know really how many were in fact appealed, how many were disposed of in any way?

Mr. Young: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will get that information.

Mr. Young: I thank the Prime Minister very much.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The fifth order, committee of the whole House; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

THE INSURANCE ACT

House in committee on Bill 60, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

On section 1:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on section 1 of this bill, I wish to propose an amendment because of the similar problem which we raised here last year when this provision was passed relating to automobile insurance contracts.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that this clause of the bill provides for the termination of a contract of fire insurance by the insurer. A year ago, we dealt with the identical clause which dealt with the termination of an automobile insurance policy by an insurer, and at that time we proposed an amendment to require the insurer to give the insured person a reason for the cancellation and to give notice to the superintendent of insurance of the reason for the cancellation as well.

Now, in fire insurance it is equally as important that in some way there be an arrangement by which the insured person and the superintendent of insurance be advised of the reasons for the cancellation of insurance policies. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister (Mr. Rowntree) will recognize that, as part of this whole problem of the urban renewal of any area, we are faced with situations where it is almost impossible to find out whether or not some areas are in fact blacklisted. It is almost impossible to find out when a policy of insurance is cancelled what the reason for the cancellation is.

If I had the time to draft the necessary amendment it would also cover the provision of a failure to renew a fire insurance policy. My amendment is directed solely to the question of cancellation, because that is the only provision that is in here. But my remarks relate as well to a failure by an insurer to renew an insurance policy for a further period of time.

For example, there is a Mr. Pinchut, who lives at 439 Shuter Street in Toronto. I am advised that his fire insurance policy is not going to be renewed. He has lived there for many years, his property has been insured under a fire insurance policy. Now he is advised that it is not going to be renewed and he is going to have considerable difficulty getting it renewed.

I am advised that it has nothing to do with any change in the state of his property as such. Nobody knows the reasons, the only assumption that one can make is that it has something to do with the immediately surrounding area. I, therefore, begin to wonder whether or not the superintendent of insurance should not know about this so that he can find out whether or not areas of the city, be they large or small, are in substance being blacklisted by the insurance companies.

I am not fighting the proposition that an insurer must at some point decide whether the risk can be insured or not, but I think it is also equally important that the government should know when this situation develops so that the proper authorities, be it the municipal authority, if this is the proper authority, would have a place where they can get this information and where the area could be improved so that a home owner is not seriously damaged by being unable to get

fire insurance because of, say, the surrounding circumstances.

As I say, my amendment is directed solely to this question of the actual termination of the contract by an insurer during the course of its term. At the same time, I would like the Minister to comment upon and give us some assurance that both in automobile accident cases on the one hand, and in these fire insurance policies, that he will give immediate consideration to dealing with this problem as it relates also to renewals.

I have only one other comment on this clause of the bill and I do not propose any amendment on it, but it is something which I have never clearly been able to understand. If an insurer cancels a policy then the insured person gets a rebate of the premium on a pro-rated basis. If, however, the insured person cancels the policy then he only gets a rebate on what is referred to as "the short rate premium" basis. Therefore, he gets less money back than he would if it had been on a pro-rated basis. I believe my understanding is correct.

It is a rather technical point, but I have the sensation that an insured person, particularly under a fire insurance policy, where in many cases the fire insurance policy has been renewed every three years as is traditional, on that property, that if it is then cancelled at any time by the insured person, that he still only gets the rebate of the premium on the short rate basis and therefore gets less money than if the insurer had cancelled the policy. This, I suppose, in the insurance business would be somewhat similar so what happens in the mutual funds to something called sort of a "front end load". It is in theory a more limited return, where the insured cancels the policy for the purpose of allowing the insurance company to recoup, I suppose, what it would refer to as its acquisition costs of that business by retaining a larger portion of the premium than it would if the insurer opted to cancel the policy.

Again, I am not suggesting that that is a matter that can be dealt with in this particular bill, but I draw the point to the Minister's attention because so many of us renew our insurance policies every year such as automobile insurance policies, and many of us renew a fire insurance policy regularly with the same company. There may be some validity for the first writing of the first policy, but where they are renewed policies it seems to me that this short rate premium cancellation should not apply and that it should be on a straight pro-rated basis. I do not know the number of dollars that are involved but there are always some dollars, and it is certainly sufficient that it has been traditional that the insurance companies feel that they have had the right to retain this additional amount of money. My main point for this morning, Mr. Chairman, on this clause of the bill is this question of notice of termination to the superintendent of insurance as well as to the insured person and is also the reason that I therefore move that clause (a) of subclause (1) of clause (1) of this bill be amended so that subsection 1 of statutory condition 5 read as follows:

> This contract may be terminated
>
> (a) by the insurer giving to the insured and to the superintendent of insurance 15 days' notice of termination by registered mail, or five days' written notice of termination personally delivered, which notice shall state the reason for the termination.

I am not at all satisfied with the 15 days and the five-day period but in order to get the principal point across I have not tampered with those time limits, and I so move, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, further to what my hon. friend the member for Riverdale has said, I can see no justification for clause (a) of subsection 2 of the proposed section 5, giving the insurers the right to set any minimum retain premium. After all, under this section it is the insurer who is cancelling the contract and he could very well use this to his benefit by cancelling under such circumstances that he does receive benefit from the minimum retain premium specified. There is no limit on what the minimum retain premium specified is. Accordingly, I move, Mr. Chairman, that section 1 of An Act to amend The Insurance Act be amended by striking out all the words after the word "time" in the second line of paragraph (a) of subsection 2 of the proposed section 5.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak to the amendment proposed by the member for Riverdale. I think there is some merit in suggesting that reasons be given but that really does not explore the point and I do not know that in this context we can properly explore the point. The concern is that insurance companies on occasion act arbitrarily and they cancel insurance in certain areas where it seems by common consent they have decided that there is a great risk. There are other things that they have been doing as well. I have seen letters, and I am sure the Minister has seen letters as well, where it has been

suggested, "We will only write fire insurance if we write all your other insurance. We will only write automobile insurance if we write your fire insurance," and so on. My big concern, and I think probably both these amendments get at this, is that there really has not been in the province of Ontario for as far back as I know, any real control exerted by the responsible Minister over these insurance companies, and on many occasions the individuals who want insurance are placed under a very severe handicap and on occasion can end up without insurance.

I know that in my own practice I have on several occasions recently discovered that in downtown properties in areas that apparently might be facing redevelopment in the near future, or in the foreseeable future, a wall is put up by insurance companies which prevents insuring ordinary properties and an unfair risk is put on the people who can be supported. I am sure this is what both these amendments are directed at and it seems to me that merely amending the statutory provisions that have to be included in a contract in the way that it is being done now, only nibbles at the fringes of a much more serious problem. In the past I suppose it would be suggested that a series of Attorney Generals have been too busy to spend a great deal of time on these aspects, but now that we have a new department and a Minister with substantially less responsibility in volume I would have hoped, Mr. Chairman, that we would have had brought before us something new in the method of dealing with these very serious problems.

This is perhaps not directly to the point on this, but I had occasion a few days ago to speak to the registrar of insurance companies about a very arbitrary manner. He agreed with me, he went to the insurance company concerned, and its original decision was reversed. It is fortunate that the person who came to me had gotten into the right pipeline. But how many times that sort of thing happens when there is no ability to get these things changed, is what concerns me, and there is nothing in this Act and there is nothing in this section that remedies these very serious defects. I think it is fine that the government has meaningful controls over the arbitrary actions of insurance companies.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that the purpose of this amendment is two-fold—firstly to make the statutory conditions with respect to fire insurance uniform with those in automobile insurance, and secondly to achieve greater uniformity with the other provinces. That, I tell you quite frankly, is the intent of the amendment.

I agree with the member for Riverdale and the member for Downsview and the third member who spoke, with respect to the point that they raised. I agree that these matters are really the substance of, and the matters that go to the depth of, the things we are trying to get at. I am endeavouring to inform myself as quickly as possible about these matters and I have initiated conversations and discussions and the gathering of certain information to deal directly with the matters that have been raised—and I think quite properly—here this morning.

I would just like to identify the areas. The items raised by the hon. member for Riverrale had to do with the blocking out of an area for risk purposes, I assume, and the deprivation of the right to acquire insurance coverage by someone who has a property within that area. That, of course, raises the question of the incidence of this matter, just how far the problem exists and the extent of it—but more than that, what remedy is going to be made available to that man to whom you made reference.

The second point that the member for Riverdale raised had to do with the matter of cancellation and I would just like to speak to that point and the question of the entitlement and the degree of entitlement, or degree of refund he might be entitled to. He did not lay great stress on this, but it is still an interesting proposition and one to which I would like to get the answer. I would simply say to him that I suppose, to add to the remarks he has made, it might also be stated that a greater penalty has been imposed on the insurer if he cancels than the insured. I do not say that is right, I do not say it is wrong, I just point out the fact.

Now, let me then refer to the member for Downsview, the question of the incidence of cancellation and what would amount to the arbitrary nature—I think he used that word—the arbitrary steps which—I take it and I think I am right, that the inference that was intended was an arbitrary step at the expense of the public, which is—

Mr. Singer: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Now I can only restate what I indicated before, I recognize the validity of the subject matter which has been raised. I am not in a position to come up with the answer today. I have initiated discussions, I have had discussions on the subject, but I am not in a position at this point

to come in with a proposed amendment along these lines. I might state the fact that my assurance must therefore be contained in my declared interest and recognition of the validity of the points that he raised. I would like to have the matters completely studied so that I understand them and give them the amount of attention which I think these matters are entitled to.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to speak on second reading, because I thought the points had all been made, but on this particular—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This is House in committee.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, in committee, my apologies.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine, my inhibitions are removed completely. Every member in the House is thoroughly aware of the importance of this. Just last night I got a call from the wife of a constituent of mine who had suddenly received a notice that his insurance will be cancelled two weeks from now; they had three or four alleged claims. The only valid claim was in 1963 and there had been nothing in the interval. The other one or two were rear-end collisions for which the person was not responsible, but out his insurance goes and the pathetic plea over the telephone is: What can we do?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: May I just comment about that? This is another excellent point as to what constitutes a claim within the technical ambit of this industry. Is this an alleged claim or is it a question where money has been paid out on behalf of the insured, or where liability has existed; or is the very fact that he was innocently in an accident, if I might put it that way—we are talking about an automobile?

Mr. MacDonald: An automobile in this instance.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: In the spirit of the discussion—does the fact that he has been innocently involved in a situation put a black mark against him? This has been one of the matters that I started out with in my discussions with a certain industry, and I lay great stress on this point.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the point I was going to make is that it seems to me that enough study has been done, that I am just a little unhappy that the Minister has not moved with the speed that he has sometimes revealed himself capable of.

For example, if we may broaden the spirit of this debate to include a report on car insurance in Alberta, and I repeat—although perhaps it is not necessarily within this Legislature—that the Alberta government is perhaps the most militant free enterprise government in this country. If the government wants to contest that and say they are more militant, I will concede their point, but I note there was silence.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I would like to agree with you.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps Mr. Thatcher exceeds them. They had an investigation and their committee came up with a recommendation that there should be amendments to require written notices of cancellation. Whether or not it involves, as my colleague has suggested written notices to the superintendent and to the individual, I am not certain. But there has been a great deal of thinking and there have been many alternatives considered, and those who normally are very sympathetic to the insurance companies have recognized that action must be taken now. Therefore it seems to me that the Minister has not got very much ground to stand on in a lengthy delay.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well now, I will just take a minor point of issue with you. I am not suggesting any further research. My point is simply that I want to inform myself of all of the kind of information to which you make reference, so that I may be completely knowledgeable. As far as the long delay goes, all I can say to you is that I have endeavoured to be, and believe I am being, diligent and faithful in the discharge of my duties. No one would like to move faster than I would, but I think any other comment would be obvious. I must ask you to give me that time and that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am just going to speak very briefly. A year ago, when the insurance amendments were referred to the committee relating to automobile insurance, to the standing committee on legal bills, and then back to this committee of the whole House, we moved the amendment in committee. I was led to understand at that time by the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), who was then responsible for this, that he was going to give very serious consideration

to it. Indeed, I came away with the impression that he was going to introduce an amendment himself when we got into committee of the whole House, on the automobile insurance part of the identical provision. It went through the House without any amendment whatsoever and I think the record will disclose that it was only because of the pressure of business that he had not been able to direct his attention to it.

This year, we introduced the same amendment with respect to the fire insurance statuory condition. The automobile insurance to my knowledge is not in effect yet, incorporating these changes. I do not know at what point it is intended to bring these conditions into operation, but surely the starting point is so simple that it does not really require any further consideration to say that an amendment such as this—which would mean that the superintendent of insurance would get notice of the cancellation and the reason for the cancellation—at least would be a starting point. He would at least have the information available to him so that he could begin to make some assessment. I doubt if he has any knowledge of it.

It is such a simple amendment that I do not think it requires any further study. It puts in the control of the government as to when it comes into force in the first place. Secondly, it does not impose on the government any obligation to do anything about it. All it does is provide the government with the basic information starting as of the date that they proclaim the statute, so that the superintendent of insurance will know the reason for the cancellation of a fire insurance policy. I will be quite happy to eliminate from the amendment that the reason be given even to the insured, if it would get it going. The only obligation on the insurer is to give the reason to the superintendent, so that we begin to get to some department of government the basic information on which they can make an assessment of the extent of the problem.

It is such a simple amendment. It does not impose any obligation on the government other than to receive the information and to make sure that they do get the information. On the other hand, it is within their control as to when they bring it into effect. It is so simple, surely in this instance the government could accept this amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I have the amendment by the member for Riverdale and I also have an amendment by the member for Bracondale. It is by agreement in this House that only one amendment is accepted unless you are willing to combine them.

Mr. Renwick: That is fine, it is quite satisfactory to combine them.

Mr. Chairman: All right.

The House divided on the combined amendment which was negated on the following division:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "yeas" are 19, the "nays" 42.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Section 1 agreed to.

Sections 2 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 60 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

there shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund to the corporation of the city of Niagara Falls, Ontario, the sum of $144,000 in respect of the period of 1964 to 1967, both inclusive, and the sum of $36,000 in the year 1968 and in each year thereafter to and including the year 1980,

as provided in Bill 61, An Act respecting the Whirlpool Rapids bridge.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before the resolution is concurred in, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) was good enough to give me privately an explanation of the substitution of the grants for the municipal taxes which could, or should be levied on the property occupied by this bridge and the succeeding bridge.

Mr. Chairman: Could we not discuss this in the bill rather than in the resolution?

Mr. Renwick: I think it is a matter that relates generally to the vote of this money. I am concerned now about a further matter, and that is how the commutation is made to fix the amount for such an extended period of time, 1980 is some 12 or 13 years away and yet this resolution and the bills will fix for that lengthy period of time a fixed amount rather than to provide for some adjustment of it, depending on the increase in taxation, should that be necessary in those municipalities.

I recognize the specific problem that the Treasurer raised with me about the requirement for securing the bonds and the covenant that was made, so I am not directing

my attention to that. I am directing my attention to the fixing of the amount for such a lengthy period of time, and why this matter would not be subject to adjustment from time to time.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): I think the simple answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is that it was arrived at by negotiation with the municipalities involved. Two meetings were held with the mayor and members of the council of the city of Niagara Falls. I attended both of them and so did my predecessor. There was one meeting held with the township of Niagara. These amounts were concurred in by mutual agreement.

I might say with respect to the length of the tenure of the arrangement set out in the statute, it was the wish, as I recall it, of the municipalities to have it over a more extended period. They would have been happy if we could have seen our way to extend it for a substantially longer period of time. So I think the point can be answered when I say that we felt that 1980 was substantially long enough, and at that time the statute should be considered for amendment against the very point that the hon. member has made.

But I do say that agreement has been reached with both municipalities after several discussions.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased about the point that was brought up by the hon. member of the New Democratic Party. I was very pleased to hear that the Minister had meetings with representatives from the city of Niagara Falls, and this leads me to say that since I have been in this House—since 1958, 1959, 1960—we get the impression that the good guys are on one side of the House and the bad guys on the other. I have never determined which is which.

But municipalities sometimes get the impression that through their members they cannot get the concessions they are entitled to. They cannot get fair treatment, because the representative from that riding happens to be opposite in politics.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: That is not true. I agree with my friends to the left—

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): You are with us, really.

Mr. Bukator: Right. When the thing is right, I agree that you have done a good job. Or I say you have not treated us properly.

I did not know naturally, that councils come to the Ministers of this government with their problems and often forget that they have a member there. They are busy men too, I suppose. Maybe they feel that politics enter this particular field.

Now I have an impression that politics could have entered very easily into this particular issue. They could have said: "You have a Liberal member. We will not consider this grant until you get rid of that individual from Niagara Falls and bring us a Conservative member here and then we will consider your problem."

I have found on many occasions in the past arguments that were brought before the House by members on both sides of the House —and, in the lobbies, if you will. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in this particular matter, since the amounts were negotiated by the council of Niagara Falls with the Minister, and since they are in complete agreement, I find no fault with this bill. I say this most sincerely to the Provincial Treasurer that on other occasions he has treated the problems squarely and fairly, not considering political boundaries. This is a good indication of the fair play that municipalities do get regardless of the politician that represents them and his political stripe.

When this particular grant was cut off some four years ago—not cut off, I should not say that—this particular bridge was privately owned; it was the Niagara Falls Whirlpool bridge owned by a private company. The Niagara Falls bridge commission apparently agreed to purchase this particular structure and after buying it, they continued the contract that was binding on the former owners and the city of Niagara Falls. Two or three years of that contract were in effect until the day came, some four years ago, when the contract was not renewed. I do not condemn the government and I do not point my finger at the Niagara Falls council, but someone forgot to come to this government with the proposal such as they have today. I do not have the dates of these meetings, but if the Minister would be good enough to enlighten me with the dates of those two meetings, I would appreciate it very much.

I brought this to the attention of this House in 1965 and in 1966 and again this year before I knew that this bill was coming into existence. But I say this: There are men trying to establish their practices in this province, regardless of their politics, who have come to one conclusion: This is the proper approach. I feel that I have done my

bit by bringing it to your attention. You are better acquainted, I believe, with the problem through my effort here when you met with these men. And because you knew the other side of the story, I want to say this to you, that since you have done this for them, I do appreciate it, and I am sure that everybody in the city of Niagara Falls does, but there are other areas to look at. There are other bridges and there are other commissions, and when the day comes when you do get through the commission where you have come to on this particular issue, and you have given a substantial grant by agreement with that council, I again will say that I had a part in it.

I want no one to think—and I have a competitor who condemned me not too long ago in the newspaper; he said I was playing politics. I thought that a member who heard the good news here, had a right to walk up to the telephone and say, "Now you are going to receive." Like the seven blind men and the elephant, they all looked at it from a different angle. I knew something of it on the other side of the table. People approach you on this very issue. I want to make my position clear.

I think that by cooperation, Mr. Chairman, and by common sense and reasoning, these things become a fact and I must say—and I have no other choice—if you want to be a politician you should find some fault. I had something to do with this. The fact is, I found a fair Minister who was good enough to consider this point, and for this the people of Niagara Falls thank him.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship): Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member for Niagara Falls in paying tribute to the Provincial Treasurer and to his predecessor in the way these particular matters have been negotiated. The municipality of the township of Niagara will benefit—I hope within a minute or two—from a resolution which is soon to pass. I know that the reeve and councillors and the people of the township of Niagara would want me to join with the member for Niagara Falls in saying "thank you" for the satisfactory settlement of this very important matter.

Resolution concurred in.

WHIRLPOOL RAPIDS BRIDGE

House in committee on Bill 61, An Act respecting the Whirlpool Rapids bridge.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 61 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

there shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund to the corporation of the township of Niagara the sum of $80,000 in respect of the period of 1964 to 1967, both inclusive, and the sum of $20,000 in the year 1968 and in each year thereafter to and including the year 1980,

as provided in Bill 62, An Act respecting the Lewiston-Queenston bridge.

Resolution concurred in.

LEWISTON-QUEENSTON BRIDGE

House in committee on Bill 62, An Act respecting the Lewiston-Queenston bridge.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 62 reported.

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill 63, An Act to amend the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on section 4, I assume from the explanatory note—which says that this amendment will permit relocation or reconstruction of a transmission line without leave of the board, if there is no change in size and no need to acquire additional land or authority to use land—I assume that this simply means that if you happen to have trouble develop and it has to be coped with in a hurry, you do not want to waste time going to the board and obtaining permission to deal with it. You will have the right to proceed immediately.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): That is right.

Sections 4 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 63 reported.

THE ENERGY ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill 64, An Act to amend The Energy Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 64 reported.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill 68, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

On section 1:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, it is our feeling in this party that we simply must do something to correct what is obviously an impossible situation given to repetition as the bill now stands. It would seem to us that an amendment would therefore be justified and desirable to prevent any unilateral action on the part of the medical association from being imposed subsequently on this Legislature.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) has indicated to the House that he has entered into behind-the-scenes negotiations and indeed has involved the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) himself, and hopes that the unhappy repetition can be avoided. But the medical profession has not acted in good faith in respect to OMSIP and one has no guarantee that it will act in good faith in the future. That being the case one must reconsider this clause, I suggest, to incorporate adequate amendments.

Another aspect of the clause is to remove our indebtedness to the Ontario medical association's schedule of fees and to recognize that this trade association of the profession, to use the Minister's phrase—and he was not happy about the phase—is not the body with which we should be negotiating, but rather the professional representatives of the medical group, and if not, the professional association itself. If no agreement can be entered into, then it is the responsibility of government to make sure that exorbitant fee schedules are not imposed on the people of Ontario with the eventual result of scuttling a medical care insurance plan.

With those observations in mind, Mr. Chairman, I would move that clause (1) be amended by deleting the words "two years" and substituting therefor the words "one year" and adding thereto the following words:

> And during each period of any two years thereafter, shall be based upon 90 per cent of the schedule of fees established by the Ontario college of physicians and surgeons after consultation with the Minister of Health, and failing such schedule upon 90 per cent of the schedule of fees established by the Minister of Health.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I would have to oppose this amendment. First of all, I do not think, as I said when the bill was discussed in principle, that this is the way to approach it. We cannot direct by legislation that a professional shall charge a certain fee, or shall charge a fee imposed upon him. I can say to you now with assurance that the college of physicians and surgeons does not believe that this is its responsibility. It believes it would be putting itself in an impossible situation in seeking to administer the Act of this Legislature, responsibility for which has been delegated to the college by this Legislature.

It has been a very happy arrangement over the years that matters pertaining to such things as fee schedules and the day-to-day operation and business of the profession is best handled by the professional association. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we will come to an arrangement whereby all matters of mutual concern and mutual interest will be resolved around the table and not call for an amendment or for legislation of this kind in the future.

In that regard, sir, and because of the pressing urgency to get this amendment into our legislation in order that we may begin to pay the fees which this permits us to do I would suggest that the House should oppose the proposed amendment.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, when I came into this honourable House a year ago one of the first occasions I had to rise was, I believe, with reference to this bill—not the bill before us but its predecessor. It had to do with the schedule of fees. I was raked over the coals by the press and everybody else because on that occasion I was supposed to have bolted the party. What I pointed out on that occasion was that this section was not going to work, that it was iniquitous; that if this Legislature insisted on restricting the amount paid to doctors to 90 per cent, the doctors were going to circumvent this and they were going to increase their fees to get at that 10 per cent.

An amendment had been moved by one of my colleagues and I suggested that the proper amendment should be that anyone who has his fees subsidized should, in fact, also have the 10 per cent subsidized. That is, if a person covered by OMSIP does not pay any premiums then the full 100 per cent of the

fees charged by the doctor ought to be paid by The Medical Services Insurance Act. Anyone else who has his fees subsidized should also have that remaining 10 per cent subsidized because it was iniquitous to have a doctor ask a patient, "Well, are you a 90 per center or are you a 100 per center? Can you afford to pay that other 10 per cent?" If people cannot afford to pay the premium for medical care then they cannot afford to pay the 10 per cent. As a matter of fact, I would think that the 10 per cent is quite a lot to most of them, especially those who have had their total premiums subsidized by this government.

The hon. member for Scarborough West has pointed out what is going to happen in the future—it is going to go up again. The Medical Services Insurance Act was designed specifically to look after those who cannot look after themselves and I suggest that to a great extent it is not doing that. Some of us here may think lightly of a dollar but there are many people for whom that dollar just cannot be gotten to pay for the doctor representing that 10 per cent. They do not go to the doctor when they very well should. Once again I ask that this government give consideration to paying the total charges with reference to those whose premiums are subsidized completely, and at least prorating those who have their premiums prorated and partly paid by this government.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am not too happy with the suggestion from the Minister that these can hopefully in the future be ironed out around the table, particularly when they do not fit in with what has happened in the past and when he prefaced that statement by saying that really he does not think the Legislature has any business stepping into this in the first place. Now that series of statements just does not hang together.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. This hon. member is putting words in my mouth. I said I do not believe that the Legislature has any business stepping in to dictate to a professional body, or any kind of body, how they shall run their own business affairs. Now there is very great difference—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The amendment does not propose that.

Mr. MacDonald: What he said is relevant.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: My hon. friend, just remember that your own profession would be one of the first to rise in high dudgeon and would be supported by us and all other professions, and I believe trade unions as well, if any government sought to tell you how you should run your internal affairs. That is all I said was the business of the Legislature.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with that statement at all. In the legal aid programme the government has told the profession what exactly they can do. Now why are you afraid of telling the medical profession? The fact is that you got yourselves into a jam—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We came to a mutual agreement.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but it was—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not to intervene.

Mr. Singer: You came to a mutual agreement, whatever it was, something was given the force of it, was it not? That is all that is being suggested here. Why are you afraid to? Is the medical profession holier than everybody else? I do not think so.

The Minister beats his breast and tears out his hair and says "this is a terrible thing, it should not have happened" but do not let us, as legislators, impose our will on the medical profession; that would be very unprofessional; that would be very unethical. All right we are not going to do that, says the Minister, we are not going to do that at all. Next year we will all sit around a table and next year the Minister apparently is going to be more appealing to his professional colleagues than he was this year, because next year they will listen. The only thing that the Minister misses, he will not be sitting around the table in the capacity of Minister of Health with anybody next year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Do you want to bet?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Make the bets outside the House.

Mr. Singer: Just tell me who the local bookie is and we will make our arrangements.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied, nor are my colleagues, with the Minister's suggestions in this. They are only pious hopes. He thinks he can have the best of both worlds and obviously in the public interest this cannot be done. They are avoiding the issue and I think the amendment

should be supported and something should be done along this line. I would support the amendment.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, now that I am in order, what I was trying to say when I was out of order, namely that the defence that the Minister has made of the section as it stands is totally irrelevant to what we are discussing. There is no suggestion in the amendment that the Legislature or the government or any agency thereof should dictate to the medical profession or any individual member of that profession, how they shall carry on their business.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Why should they?

Mr. Bryden: No, it is not proposed. But that is the straw man that the Minister knocked down. Now let us get down to the real issue that is at stake.

The basic issue that is at stake as I see it, is whether the laws of this province are to be made by the Legislature or by the medical politicians within the Ontario medical association. This is basically the problem. What has happened here is that we passed a section last year. Most of us on this side of the House raised grave doubts about it. The Minister suggested that we should let it stand as it was and he felt he could work things out.

Well, the medical profession decided that they wanted to up their schedule of fees. So here we are, willy-nilly, without exercising any discretion at all, changing the laws that we enacted because they say we must change them. That is what it boils down to.

I believe that we must try to work out some sort of cooperative arrangement with the medical profession on matters of this kind. It seems very difficult to come to any sort of understanding with that group. It seems to be about the only group in the province that it is impossible to sit down and discuss things with. But I believe it is necessary to try to work out arrangements and understandings with them. Nevertheless, I certainly do not think we can put ourselves in the position where in this area, they make the laws of the province.

I think we have to have it stated in the legislation that the public, as represented by the Minister, has an interest in this matter, and it should have an opportunity to express its interest. If the worst comes to the worst, the law has to be made by the people who are entrusted with the authority to make laws.

The Minister himself indicated that the new schedule of fees that has been put through by the medical association without reference to anyone, without discussion with anybody, actually is a schedule which is mainly for the benefit of the high-priced specialists. This is one of our difficulties, Mr. Chairman. The high-priced specialists dominate the medical association. This is true not only in this province, but in almost every province. The general practitioners are so busy that I suspect they do not really have much time to consider a great many of these matters. They leave them to the discretion of the executive of the association. But the dominant interest in that executive consists of the high-priced people.

On the Minister's own figures, the general practitioner, the overworked general practitioner, I think most of us would agree, probably may be entitled to some reconsideration of his remuneration.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): I do not agree with that.

Mr. Bryden: Well, at any rate maybe we could agree that there is a possibility of an argument in that case. The general practitioners under this new schedule of fees get only eight per cent, but the high-priced fellows, the fellows who are already making $50,000 or $100,000 a year, get a 30 per cent increase on their fee schedule. I do not see why we should have to accept that sort of dictation. It is true they have got a gun to our heads at the present time. The existing plan, such as it is, can be disrupted unless we go along with this arbitrary decision on the part of the medical politicians in the association, and so we have no option this time. But I believe that we should now take steps to make sure that the public interest is considered in such matters in the future.

The amendment proposed by the member for Scarborough West sets forth the principle that there is a public interest as represented by the Minister of Health and that it should be recognized. Without something like that, I can foresee the possibility, Mr. Chairman, of another year and a Minister of Health, whoever he may be, coming in and saying: "Well, now we have to change the date again."

You see, this section is precisely the same as the section we enacted last year, except the section enacted last year referred to the date of April 1, 1966. Now we change it to April 1, 1967, and if the medical profession, the highest paid group in the entire commu-

nity, should arbitrarily decide in December they are going to jack these fees up again, then is the Minister going to come back in again and say: "Well, now we will have to change it to April 1, 1968"?

If that sort of thing happens—and this seems to be the pattern that is being established—then we can just say that in this area the medical profession, or that select group which runs the medical association, is making the laws of this province. The Legislature of the province, and indeed the government, are just rubber stamps for the medical profession. I think it is most important, Mr. Chairman, that we assert at this time the fundamental principle that there should be discussion and negotiation on these matters. This should be put right in the section. There is nothing in the amendment that gives anybody any power to dictate to the medical profession, but it does assert the principle of the necessity of negotiation.

The Minister of Health raised the question of the legal profession and I am not suggesting that the member for Downsview did not answer his allusion quite satisfactorily. However, I want to make a reference to it myself, because I think the contrast between the behaviour of these two professional groups should be held up for all to see.

On the one hand we have the medical profession, which arbitrarily raises it fee schedule without discussion with anybody. When the Minister of Health, himself a member of the medical association and the spokesman for the public, goes to see them, they say we cannot talk to you. They do not rudely refuse. They just say: "We cannot discuss anything with you because we cannot commit our profession." Well if they can put through this fee schedule, surely they can discuss that with us. That is the medical profession. Arbitrary, dictatorial, unwilling to negotiate or discuss anything with anybody.

On the other hand, the legal profession agreed that in the legal aid scheme they would accept 75 per cent of the schedule of fees. There are some lawyers in this House, such as the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), who is not here this morning, who think that the fees they will get under that arrangement are too high. Well, I will leave that one for the lawyers to argue among themselves. I have no way of knowing.

But what I do know is that the profession responsibly sat down and worked out an arrangement with the government which made an urgently needed piece of social legislation operative, and placed the government, the Legislature and the public in the position where they knew exactly what was required in order to make the legislation operative.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is high time that the medical profession should have been satisfied with that. But if they were not satisfied, then at least they should have been prepared to discuss their dissatisfaction with public representatives and have the whole matter threshed out.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for London South (Mr. White) says their income is up to $35,000 and I presume that is an authoritative figure.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: I will accept the hon. member as an authority on this matter because it is quite obvious that he has given it a great deal of study, but whether we accept the precise figure or not, which after all, is still only and estimate, even if an expert estimate, it is quite clear that there has been a substantial increase in income without any corresponding addition in work for the medical profession under OMSIP. Yet they now come along and want to gouge a still larger amount out of the public treasury. I think that is an unsupportable proposition, Mr. Chairman.

I would point out that the medical profession, as far as I know, is just about the only group in the whole community which has arbitrary unilateral powers to increase its own remuneration. Most people who want an increase in pay, have to negotiate with somebody.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Nonsense!

Mr. Bryden: That is not nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification—

Mr. Bryden: What kind of a point is that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: An hon. member about to launch on a doctoral course of study, is better informed than that. Everybody who is self-employed has the right unilaterally to increase his—

Mr. Bryden: Well, it shows what a sheltered life the medical profession leads, if the hon. Minister actually thinks that. Take a farmer, he has no discretion at all. In fact he has not even got the advantages of a wage earner, who can enter into some part of collective negotiation. He just has to take the price that is determined by vast market

forces far beyond his control. He has no control over his situation at all and the situation is essentially the same with regard to the small storekeeper and that sort of person. He is caught in a competitive market which leaves him very little freedom of action, he has no freedom of action at all in his pricing policy. But this sort of competition does not operate in the medical profession at all.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): This is completely out of order.

Mr. Bryden: I do not know what the hon. Prime Minister is nattering about, Mr. Chairman, but if he would please be silent, I could just finish up what I am saying.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would just rise on a point of order for the benefit of the Chairman to express an opinion. I think that this is completely out of order. We have heard it all before and it is completely—

Mr. MacDonald: You mean the interjection of the Minister of Health?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, it is the principle of the bill that you are arguing.

Mr. Bryden: It is the amendment that I am arguing. There should be some legislative basis for negotiation. Now, I have no objection to the Prime Minister absenting himself from the House from time to time. I am sure he has important matters to attend to. But when he absents himself, I do not think he should come back in and intervene on the basis of no knowledge of what is going on. What we are discussing is the principle of negotiation and that is what I have been talking about.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that this is the only group that can arbitrarily raise its income without discussion with anybody at all, and I think it is a most unfortunate principle. It is time we started to lay down the basis for a new principle. That is incorporated in the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Scarborough West. I would urge all members of the House to support this very sensible and necessary amendment.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, of course. I support the medical profession. I have never heard such nonsense in all my life. Well, of course we hear nothing but nonsense from the hon. member, anyway.

Mr. MacDonald: You are doing a good job of matching.

Mr. Cowling: He does not seem to realize the important role that the medical profession plays in the community.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure we do.

Mr. Cowling: Now, are you supposed to put them on the same basis as trade unions? Are they supposed to negotiate the way they do?

Mr. Bryden: No, the same basis as the lawyers.

Mr. Cowling: You do not know what you are talking about. I think the important thing for you to do is to see what the doctors do for people first before you start to condemn them.

Mr. Bryden: Now, we get the thing on—

Mr. Cowling: As far as I am concerned, they serve the most important role in the community, and I am delighted to say things that probably the Minister of Health would not say, because he happens to be a member of the profession.

I think that if you are going to enhance your NDP position—and I do not think you ever will—you are certainly not going to do it by condemning—

Mr. Bryden: I will not go to you for advice for one thing.

Mr. Cowling: Because most of our citizens realize the important role they play. Now as far as the amendment is concerned—

Mr. MacDonald: Have you read what the member for London South said when the Minister—

Mr. Cowling: I do not care what the member for London South said, I am only interested in what the member for Woodbine just said, which amounted to practically nothing. The medical profession in our country has an important role to play and they have fees to receive. After all, they do not do their work just because they think it is a great thing in the community. They are entitled to be paid the same as anybody else, and I fail to see when I talk to many people in my riding—

Mr. MacDonald: You fail to see, period.

Mr. Cowling: I think it might be a good idea for the hon. members to get around a bit and find out what is going on. I talk to people in my riding who have occasion to call at a medical doctor's office and they are

delighted with what they get. They are quite prepared to pay his fee, any reasonable fee, to get the service they desire. I have never heard such silly talk in my life, and it will be a great day when you stop talking, my friend, about the medical profession, and other people and—

Mr. MacDonald: It will be a great day when—

Mr. Cowling: I urge all members not to support this amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: Just do not bet on it.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be provocative, but I would say to my hon. friend from Woodbine in many ways I admire his type and his efforts for working conditions and higher salaries in many facets of industry. That has been my background in earlier years, and for this I commend him. But after all, to say that the medical profession is now the highest paid profession as we know it—

Mr. MacDonald: It is.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Just a minute. I can tell you that in the newspaper profession and the plumbers, they get $5.50 an hour. Other organized unions get $2.20 an hour.

Mr. S. Lewis: They negotiate.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: It is not just incidental that the medical profession happens to be in the higher bracket. They have earned this. Now, we agree that HCL today is rising and if you must fight for unions, which I agree. then how can you except the medical profession on a percentage basis from raising their fees also?

Mr. Bryden: I just want them to negotiate, that is all.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Negotiate with whom?

Mr. Bryden: With the Minister of Health. This is costing us $10 million and I think there should be some discussion about it before we—

Mr. W. B. Lewis: At least they do not parade out in front of the door and I say—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word or two here. I have a suggestion to the hon. Minister of Health.

One of the reasons why these fees have been raised substantially—whether they have a good reason or not—is because there simply are not enough doctors in the province of Ontario. I have two suggestions. When he has time he should go down to the Minister of Immigration and say to him that 1,000 extra doctors are needed in the province of Ontario and: "Let us go over to Europe and bring them here—qualified doctors." Failing that, we need more medical schools, not only in Ontario, but in Canada, and after these medical students graduate they should be kept here. If they are going to be educated at the expense of the taxpayers of the province of Ontario, they should find a place and stay here after they graduate.

I am sick and tired—

Mr. Chairman: This is most interesting but it has nothing to do with the bill.

Mr. Whicher: I am speaking to the amendment. I am sick and tired of what are known as "pressure groups" running this government, or any other government, and believe me, Mr. Chairman, the doctors are really at the top of the world as far as being called a "pressure group" is concerned.

No one will deny that they should get a decent salary for their duties. But we simply do not have enough doctors here and, as a result, they can go to the Minister of Health—probably it is not true that they put a knife at his throat, but they give him no alternative. He is caught, and there is nothing that we can do about it as far as I can see. We have to pay and we are lucky that instead of putting up their fee 15 per cent or whatever it is, they have not asked for a 50 per cent raise, because that is probably what it will be next year.

So I humbly suggest to the Minister of Health that his only answer is to get more doctors into this province, and then we will have a satisfactory solution.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Whicher: They can give suggestions, at least.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Yes, but what?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, supporting the amendment, I concur 100 per cent with my colleague, the hon. member for Bruce. In our part of the province, we have a serious shortage of doctors.

Mr. Chairman: This is entirely out of order!

Mr. Sargent: On this 90 per cent deal, Mr. Chairman, it is unheard of to give to any select group the right to write their own ticket. This is compounding an economic imbalance in what we pay people for services. These doctors now are getting to be specialists; there are no general practitioners around any more who want to perform for people. They are so necessary to us in our life in Ontario; we must have them and they know that—they have a gun to our heads and they say, "It is this—or else." I think that if the government is going to allow this kind of giving in to this pressure group—as the hon. member for Bruce put it—so that they can have anything they want, then the government should say, on behalf of the people of Ontario, that the doctors must then perform certain things. They must have enough doctors around to do the job, but now we do not have them and so the Minister is taking the easy way out. He is saying, "You can have what you want and the field is wide open to charge what you want," and this is wrong.

I think if you are going to do this thing that you should say, "You must perform too. Give us general practitioners who can answer the needs of our people."

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, there has been some comment about the parallel between the legal aid bill and this particular method of fixing the fees for doctors. I simply want to put it clearly on the record as to what the legal aid bill did and the principle that was accepted by this government, the law society of Upper Canada and by the legal profession. Under the legal aid bill no fee schedule can be established without the express approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. It is not even a question of having to consult about it. The total right to approve of the schedule of fees that members of the legal profession receive under the legal aid plan is subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

The other point which I think is utterly essential that it be made in this debate is that there is nothing in this bill, nothing in the proposed amendment, which refers to the importance of the role of the doctor, on which I am sure we can all reach substantial agreement. There is nothing in this amendment which requires any dictation of any kind. All that this amendment does is three things.

The first thing is to restore the original expiry date of the fee schedule of the Ontario medical association to the original two-year period so that the 90 per cent of that fee schedule will end on April 1, 1968, instead of 1969.

The second thing which this does is to transfer the responsibility to the governing body of the medical profession and away from—even though the Minister of Health dislikes the term, Mr. Chairman—the trade association, or the pressure group, as the member for Bruce said. To transfer to the professional body where we can anticipate, and I know we will receive, the recognition by that body of the public interest which is not a prime aim of the Ontario medical association.

The third thing it does is simply to say that they will establish that schedule of fees after consulting with the Minister of Health. Even at that point the amendment does not suggest for one moment that the Minister of Health has any veto at all or that the college of physicians and surgeons could not establish one with which the Minister of Health would disagree, and they would still be protected under this bill. What it simply says is the professional body charged with the responsibility for that profession by the statutes of this Legislature will consult with the Minister of Health. That is all, to consult with the Minister of Health. Then there is the closing-off provision that if they do not do it, well, the Minister of Health establishes the schedule. There is no effort whatsoever to dictate, to threaten, to coerce, in any way, shape, or form. It is an endeavour to reach a permanent solution to this problem. It is an endeavour to transfer the responsibility to the professional body charged with this profession by this Legislature. It is an endeavour to avoid in the future some confrontation between the government and that profession in the implementation of the medicare scheme on the basis of OMSIP now and undoubtedly, in due course, on the basis of a universal scheme. The amendment is so essentially reasonable, so essentially proper, and so essential to the public interest, that there is no question that the government should here and now accept that amendment.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, obviously we are going to finish this amendment and there will not be more than a few minutes of the House's time all round. More than that the amendment expresses the feeling of an all-party committee of the Legislature when it met with the Ontario medical association. One of the reasons this amendment was proposed is that we on this side of the House

do not understand what it is about the medical profession that so intimidates this government. We do not understand why the Prime Minister trembles in his boots before the medical profession; we do not understand why the Minister of Health bows and scrapes before the medical profession; we do not understand why the Minister of Family and Social Services genuflects before—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order or privilege—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a question of personal privilege—

Mr. MacDonald: There is no question of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is a question of privilege.

Mr. S. Lewis: What I am saying is—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On a point of personal privilege—

Mr. Bryden: There is no such point.

Mr. Chairman: Just a moment, the Minister stood in his place on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I speak on a point of personal privilege, sir. I have never bowed and scraped to the profession or to anybody else nor will I bow or scrape to any man.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister is right, no one has a right to make a personal attack on a member.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am not making a personal attack. I am saying that the interpretation of this bill as it stands is that a group of reasonable men have been turned into cringing sycophants because of the pressures of the medical profession. There is no other explanation for it.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, our amendment in that context is eminently reasonable. It embodies the intentions that the government pretends to. I remember very vividly, that committee meeting. The Minister's voice was controlled but underneath the control was a very powerful tone of anger as he said to the Ontario medical association that they had not been honest with him, that in fact they had never indicated to him at the time of the previous negotiation that they would unilaterally increase the schedule of fees. Mr. Chairman, they will do it again, they will do it time and time again, and it is obvious that the government wants them to do it, it is obvious that this is an open invitation on the part of government because they refuse to accept the amendment which they themselves pretend to.

The House divided on the amendment proposed by Mr. S. Lewis, which was negated on the following division:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 17, the "nays" 32.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Sections 1 to 3 agreed to.

Bill 68 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the committee of the whole House rise and report two reslutions and certain bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed: Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report two resolutions and certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information to be followed by the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

There will be a private members' hour on Monday afternoon, between five and six.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.15 o'clock p.m.

No. 65

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, April 17, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 17, 1967

Presenting report, Mr. Welch 2223

Township of Cornwall, bill respecting, Mr. Spooner, first reading 2223

Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Renwick, first reading 2223

Coroners Act, bill to amend, Mr. Renwick, first reading 2223

Question to Mr. Spooner re land sales, Mr. Young 2223

Questions to Mr. Davis re Humber College, Mr. MacDonald 2223

Questions to Mr. Davis and Mr. Bales re collective bargaining rights for professional employees, Mr. S. Lewis 2224

Question to Mr. Wishart re Ontario police commission report, Mr. Renwick 2224

Questions to Mr. Rowntree re casualty insurance companies, Mr. Renwick 2224

Statement re federal-provincial meeting of the Ministers of Health, Mr. Rowntree 2225

Third readings 2226

Borough of East York, bill respecting, Mr. White, second reading 2227

City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading 2228

City of Niagara Falls, bill respecting, Mr. Oliver, second reading 2228

City of Hamilton, bill respecting, Mrs. Pritchard, second reading 2228

Borough of York, bill respecting, Mr. Dunlop, second reading 2228

Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported 2228

Peterborough Racing Association Limited, bill to incorporate, reported 2230

Estimates, Department of Tourism and Information, Mr. Auld, continued 2231

On notice of motion No. 9, Mr. Reuter, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Freeman, Mr. Bernier 2247

Recess, 6 o'clock 2256

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1967

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests in the east gallery, students from St. Joseph's separate school, Toronto; in the west gallery, Upper Canada preparatory school, Toronto and West preparatory school, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the annual report of the inspector of legal offices for the year ended December 31, 1966.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

TOWNSHIP OF CORNWALL

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Cornwall.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE, 1961-1962

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical to one I introduced last year. The purpose of it is to prohibit bodies governing admission to professions or callings from refusing or suspending membership because of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin, and ensures that these bodies are removed from present exclusions.

THE CORONERS ACT

Mr. Renwick moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Coroners Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, this bill is to protect a coroner in his judicial office by making the same provisions for the removal of coroners from office as apply to magistrates.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a six-part question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs:

1. Did the township of Sandwich West sell parcels of land to a trust between the time of the Ontario municipal board amalgamation order and its effective date?

2. Were these parcels scattered throughout the whole land assembly project?

3. What effect did this land sale have on the development of the land assembly project?

4. There is a typographical omission here, Mr. Speaker. Were independent evaluators obtained for this land?

5. If so, was the sale price consistent with this evaluation?

6. Who was the agent for the trust and who are its principals?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: As the department offices to some extent are decentralized throughout the province, the files in respect to this particular matter are located in our office in London, Ontario. The best that I can do at the moment is to say to the hon. member in answer that I have already asked that the files dealing with this matter be sent to our office here in Toronto, where they may be examined and I shall report to him in due course.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Minister of Education.

What justification is there for the government appointing seven persons from the borough of Etobicoke to the board of governors of the proposed Metro west end college of applied arts and technology and only one from the borough of York?

Secondly, who is the person appointed from the borough of York and what are his qualifications for such an appointment?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I should point out that there is no longer a proposed college. It is in fact

a college; Humber College. Eight appointees are made by the Minister on recommendation from the council of regents, and the council of revents relates its recommendations to the occupations or the interests of the people whom it recommends. At the same time, two appointees were made by each of the two municipalities, Etobicoke and York, and as I understand it, Father Bartholomew De Simone and Dr. Norman Gunn are the two appointees on the board from that part of the borough of York.

Mr. MacDonald: My question, I submit, has not been answered, Mr. Speaker. Which one of those was appointed by the government from the borough of York, one of the eight—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the two appointees, Father Bartholomew De Simone and Dr. Norman Gunn, were recommended by the municipality of York, and were then appointed by the Minister, so there are two from York.

The eight appointees who are not from the municipalities, or direct recommendations from the municipalities, are people whom the council of regents recommends to the Minister and are representative primarily of say, the business community, the commercial community, or those that have a general interest in the college development. They are not related to, shall we say, geographic representation.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my next question is to the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall). It is a three-part question:

(1) Has the Ontario housing corporation decided to proceed with the construction of 100 homes in Ear Falls for the employees of the Griffiths Mine at Bruce Lake?

(2) When will the houses be built?

(3) Under what arrangement is it proposed that they will be made available to the employees?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for two different Ministers that are interrelated. The first is perhaps to the Minister of Education, re this morning's letter to all members from the chairman of the steering committee on negotiation rights for professional staffs:

What exactly did the Minister mean by the phrase "recent developments", which managed to convey that certain programmes would now have to be reassessed before the government could bring them before the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the letter. I gather that this came from a discussion with one of the members. I am not sure whether he is chairman of the steering committee—who is a constituent and resident in the town of Brampton, some three weeks ago. Then last week a group of engineers where I was speaking had some informal discussion with me and they were wondering just what was the timing or the possibility of legislation relating to this. At that time I indicated to them that while I had no more knowledge than anyone else, I was not in a position to say to just what extent the government's complete legislative programme would or would not be available at this session. I think this accounts for what has been suggested in the letter.

Mr. S. Lewis: How then would you define a complete legislative programme if it is not ready in this session?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say if this is in the form of a question, Mr. Speaker, anything this government does is complete in itself as part of the legislative programme.

Mr. S. Lewis: Could I ask the Minister of Labour—this is virtually the supplementary—will the government be introducing a bill this session on the matter of collective bargaining rights for professional employees?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question I am just advised that this whole matter is under very careful consideration at the present time and that government policy will become known in due course. It is being given careful consideration.

Mr. S. Lewis: Is he taking lessons from the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko)?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions. The first question is to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General:

On what date did the Minister of Justice and Attorney General receive the report for 1966 of the Ontario police commission and on what date did he sign the letter transmitting the report to the Lieutenant-Governor?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I signed the letter of transmittal to the Lieutenant-Governor on March 16 and the report as printed was delivered to my office on Monday, April 3 of this year.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs:

Is the superintendent of insurance participating in any discussions with the casualty insurance companies or with officers of the assigned risk plan about any changes in its operations, and if not, does he intend to have the superintendent of insurance raise the questions arising from the operation of this plan with the casualty insurance companies?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the superintendent of insurance is active in negotiations with those representing the underwriters.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would permit a supplementary question:

The press reported that there is going to be a change to a pooling system. Does the Minister know anything about this matter?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I have heard about it but I do not have the specifics before me.

Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I should like to inform the House of the federal-provincial meeting of Ministers of Health which is now in session at Ottawa. The Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) is attending on behalf of the people of Ontario. This is a most important conference since it deals with issues which affect all of the people of this province and I feel it is important that all members of the House should be aware of the position being taken by the government of Ontario. In an opening statement to the conference, the Minister of Health has stated, and I quote:

> Mr. Chairman, I would request your permission before dealing with the formal agenda to make a statement to the conference which represents Ontario's basic philosophy and attitude on the relationship between the two levels of government on health matters and other related areas which fit into a similar jurisdictional interpretation.
>
> In making this statement, Ontario has not taken a fixed position, but it seems desirable at this time to represent our views in a positive way in order to facilitate discussion. We thought that such an expression of policy and attitude might be helpful to the attainment of our common objective, which is the development of the best possible health services for the people in this country and in our individual provinces. The purpose of these remarks is to indicate the attitude Ontario is adopting, so that there will be a clear understanding of our willingness to cooperate with the federal government in a manner which I propose to outline. I would again emphasize that, while I intend to state policy and attitudes in fairly definite terms, we are quite prepared to modify these principles if changes are desirable for the common good.
>
> Under the heading of Need to Establish Ground Rules, one of the features of concern to us is that the ground rules have not been clearly established. This has led to unilateral action which makes long-range planning impossible, or at best, ineffective. We acknowledge the role of the federal government in health matters as we believe that this level of government must be involved in nationwide concepts and in meeting our international obligations. The federal government has a significant role in medical (health) research, but research is interwoven into the fabric of education and service. Therefore, the provinces must have a complementary interest. Water and air pollution has no respect for boundaries and is local, provincial, national and international. My province also accepts the thesis that this role can be effective in a governmental structure which places the primary responsibility for health matters with the provinces.
>
> However, a fragmentation in approach—particularly in a weighting of emphasis which results from financial assistance to certain programmes with the exclusion of others—has led to a warping of health programmes to fit into arrangements where a favourable financial situation exists. In this regard, I might mention the imbalance created in the field of mental health brought about by the exclusion of mental hospitals from the hospital insurance programme. Therefore, Ontario proposes that terms of reference, priorities and techniques to ensure action should be worked out to ensure that the respective roles of the two levels of government are defined in general, but fairly specific terms, to facilitate our common objective of effective, comprehensive health services of high quality.
>
> We also believe that both levels of government should work closely together in determining future developments and emphasis. To accomplish this, we would like to propose that this meeting of Ministers of Health be an annual event and that a continuing committee of officials be established to provide each meeting with working papers which relate to subjects of mutual concern. Provincial Ministers could meet at

the location of the conference at an appropriate time to discuss matters which are of concern only to the provinces.

The province of Ontario also accepts the fact that if these new arrangements are acceptable, there must be a cut-in procedure. Certain programmes such as hospital insurance, health grants and the health resources fund are established, and medical services insurance is proposed. We would suggest that this represents the starting point and should be accepted as such. However, Ontario will propose changes consistent with long-range planning and the need to mould these arrangements into a form which is more conducive to a fully cooperative approach in the future. For example, with regard to medical services insurance, I am able to say that Ontario supports the principle of universal public medicare and is in sympathy with the objectives of the federal government's medicare bill. Nevertheless, when this item is discussed, we wish to point out that the federal fiscal formula is likely to result in a return to the people of Ontario of only about 40 per cent of the cost of these services. In fairness to everyone regardless of domicile, we suggest a floor arrangement so that no province will receive less than 50 per cent of cost. In addition, the exclusion of provincial administrative costs is another matter which seems unwarranted. These costs are recognized in many federal programmes, notably the Canada assistance plan. Why discriminate in this circumstance?

In the matter of programme, the Prime Minister of Canada and the Ministers of National Health and Welfare have often and consistently emphasized that, "The operation of the programme is provincial responsibility." In the light of this, Ontario believes such an attitude, which is quite acceptable to us, should be literally interpreted.

We believe, in Ontario, we can meet the basic principles laid down in Bill C-227 by developing a programme which best suits the needs of our province. We can have the numbers enrolled as recognized necessary for universality. We can provide more than the basic services mentioned. We can readily arrange for portability. We can satisfy ourselves on a provincial administration that, insofar as control by public audit is concerned, meets the requirement of C-227. It is our view, therefore, that, having met these requirements, according to our interpretation of clause 4 of C-227, we qualify for the federal support laid down in the Act.

The health grants have been most valuable, but they have been set up on a "closed end" principle which has not kept pace with increasing cost. Categorical grants are preferred for new programmes but in our view a block grant tied into a formula which would allow for escalation in costs would fit into a pattern of cooperative development. This would protect federal interest in a nationwide approach. Similarly, the health resources fund should be increased substantially to permit the payment of a fiscal contribution of 50 per cent of cost as the proportion of assistance which would be provided by the federal government for individual projects. This level has been accepted but the total amount in the fund has been demonstrated to be grossly inadequate. The health resources fund should avoid becoming even further enmeshed in "paper" tape which appears to be the trend at present.

Mr. Chairman, I put forward our views at this time on the broad issues related to effective cooperation between the federal government and the provinces as an indication of the willingness of my province to establish a much better and firmer relationship with your government on health matters.

Mr. Speaker, that is the statement which the Minister of Health made at the beginning of the conference in Ottawa today.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 60, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Bill 61, An Act respecting the Whirlpool Rapids bridge.

Bill 62, An Act respecting the Lewiston-Queenston bridge.

Bill 63, An Act to amend The Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964.

Bill 64, An Act to amend The Energy Act, 1964.

Bill 68, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, before this motion passes, I would like to make some comment on behalf of this group.

Despite the statement which has just been made by the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs in place of the statement to be made by the Minister of Health—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Would hon. members like this bill held until the Minister's return from Ottawa?

Mr. Renwick: I just want to make one point about the bill and that is that the amendment which we proposed last week and which was defeated in this House is a matter which this government is going to have to deal with urgently, that is, the question of the method of consultation and the bodies that do the consulting between the government and the medical profession with respect to the fee schedule which is to be established under the OMSIP plan. If this province is going to move into a universal medicare plan, then it is essential that we avoid at all costs any confrontation without any adequate machinery to deal with the problem between the medical profession and the government representing the public interest.

Motion agreed to; third reading of Bill 68.

BOROUGH OF EAST YORK

Mr. J. H. White (London South), in the absence of Mr. H. E. Beckett (York East), moves second reading of Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the borough of East York.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on second reading of Bill Pr10, I would simply like to draw to the attention of the House that this bill, designed to relieve persons who qualify as old-age pensioners, and subject to certain other conditions from the incidence of the education tax up to an amount of $100 in each year, is in itself a very wise statute. It is the only one of the numerous private bills which have come before the assembly containing a provision which, instead of remitting that tax or that obligation completely, pyramids each year that rebate of $100 or that amelioration of tax to the point where the person either dies or his property passes to someone else; at that point, tax which has been remitted becomes collectible.

I simply want to say on that particular matter that we in this party disagree entirely with that proposition. The burden of that tax up to the amount of $100 per year should be completely removed. We disagree with the provision in the bill for the borough of East York which is before us and we approve of the principle which was established in other bills, namely, that if a person qualified for the remission of that tax, that person would be free of that tax for all time and it would not be collected from him at any time thereafter or from his estate. We believe that this bill should not pass in the form in which it is presently before us.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the press a day or two ago that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) had had an interview with certain persons. The press report indicated that the government was going to seriously consider relief for older people, insofar as municipal taxes are concerned. As the member for Riverdale has pointed out, there is in this bill a substantial departure from similar provisions in other bills. The city of Hamilton bill comes to mind particularly.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Municipal Affairs was correctly quoted or not, or if he, as a typical Tory Cabinet Minister, was getting rid of a delegation and mumbling nice things. Well, he has got a good point; we will take it under consideration.

But it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there could not be a more appropriate time than right now, if the government has any policy insofar as providing tax relief for older people who are finding it a very severe burden to maintain their homes. This is going to be part of government policy, to apply not just to one, two or four municipalities, but to all 975 of them.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when we should have one policy for relief for older people from municipal taxation. By any interpretation at all of what the Minister is quoted in the press as having said, I think he agrees with this. I have watched the Minister, over the years, come before the private bills committee; he has at least paid lip service to having uniform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the purport of my remarks is this: Are we, at long last, going to have one policy in this very important field from government, and is it going to apply to all 975 municipalities instead of letting the more adventurous ones—East York, Hamilton, Ottawa and what have you—come in and evolve their own formula? I do not think it is good that a municipality should have its own formula. I think there should be a system of relief written into our Municipal Act and I think it is up to the Minister of Municipal Affairs,

particularly at this time, when it seems as if we are on the eve of an election, to say what the government's intentions are in this very important field.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I might say in answer to the hon. member's speech that the Minister of Municipal Affairs in this one instance was correctly quoted in the newspaper, and as, if and when government policy develops, you shall hear about this.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves second reading of Bill Pr24, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South) in the absence of Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls) moves second reading of Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre) moves second reading of Bill Pr28, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

BOROUGH OF YORK

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill) moves second reading of Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the borough of York.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE, 1961-1962

Hon. D. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves second reading of Bill 73, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, does the Minister—

Mr. Speaker: It was carried.

Mr. S. Lewis: He was rising and I wondered.

Clerk of the House: The eleventh order; committee of the whole House, Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

House in committee on Bill 72, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 6:

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, in connection with section 6, the move here is a good one, that cars shall be inspected and certificates issued. But I am concerned that those cars then can run from that point until they are junked without any further mandated inspection. I would point out to the Minister that this bill really should carry with it an amendment which calls for regular inspection of cars on the highway so that these cars that do have certificates at this point will be re-inspected time after time on a regular basis so that we are always certain that cars on the road will in fact be as safe as we can make them. I call this to the Minister's attention and wonder if he is willing that this clause be amended to provide for regular inspection of motor cars, year by year.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Chairman, I think the matter of periodic annual or semi-annual inspections goes rather beyond what this section is intended to accomplish. This section is an amendment to or a replacement for previous section 49, with respect to the sale of used cars, to require that they then be, as of now, provided with a certificate showing that they be safe or that they be not safe. This eliminates the latter case and prevents the sale of a used car that is not certified in safe conditions. It is to be sold only on removal of the plates, which must be returned to the department.

Sections 6 and 7 agreed to.

On section 8:

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, some of us have been very much concerned with the matter of motorcycles on the highway and I would like to offer an amendment to this

section dealing with the wearing of safety helmets as far as the driver and rider of motorcycles are concerned. I would like to point out to the House that during 1966, motorcycles were involved in about 4,000 accidents in Ontario, of which there were about 60 fatalities and 3,400 injuries. The British safety council has said that motorcyclists are 50 times as vulnerable to serious injury as are car drivers, and Australian studies have recently concluded that the risk of fatalities of motorcyclists in an accident is reduced by wearing a helmet to about one third.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, what section is the member speaking to?

Mr. Chairman: Section 8.

Mr. Young: Section 8. I want to offer an amendment to section 8.

Already British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia mandate safety helmets, as do several states south of the border. We do know that many of these jurisdictions have standards set up. One of the problems that the Minister spoke of some time ago was the lack of adequate standards, but standards are now available and it would seem reasonable that this House at this point, in view of the fatalities in recent days and the very great record of accidents in connection with motorcycles, should mandate the wearing of helmets.

Mr. Chairman: The member is speaking under section 8, dealing with the trailers and vehicles? I am wondering if the member's amendment is under the right section?

Mr. Young: It is Bill 72 and I have an amendment. Can I offer it under another section?

Mr. Chairman: It does not appear to be under this section, that is all.

Mr. Young: It may be that it could come better under clause 1, Mr. Chairman, but I think it also could come under section 8.

Mr. Chairman: We are past clause 1. It does not seem to fit into this particular section but if the member wants to put forward an amendment I will accept it.

Mr. Young: It may be that I have—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: May I just offer this: Section 8 of the bill deals with an amendment to subsection 1 of section 54 of The Highway Traffic Act that has to do with vehicle loads.

Mr. Young: Vehicle loads only? Perhaps I could offer the amendment at the end of the bill then, or a more appropriate place if the Chairman will tell me where it might stand.

Mr. Chairman: There would not be any amendment except to a section.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The amendment could be made by adding a new subsection 3 to section 15 of the bill if it is—

Mr. Chairman: It would depend on the nature of the amendment. If it was introducing something new—

Mr. Young: Supposing we try it there.

Mr. S. Lewis: We will fight your decision, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Young: I will offer it at that point and see what you say, Mr. Chairman.

Sections 8 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that subsection 2 of clause 14 be added to Bill 72 in the following addition:

> Every person while operating a motorcycle upon a highway shall wear a protective helmet of the type of specifications prescribed by the regulations:

If this can be changed to fit into the proper number.

Mr. Chairman: I was wondering if the Minister would indicate whether he felt that this had anything to do with section 14 or if it is a new principle that is being added at this time?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that section 14 of the bill deals with section 148 of The Highway Traffic Act and that section of The Highway Traffic Act relates to motor-vehicle owners' and drivers' responsibilities respectively. I do not think that the wearing of a helmet is germane to this section of the Act at all.

Mr. Chairman: If, under the circumstances, it is not germane to the Act I would then rule it out of order and suggest to the member that he introduce it as a separate bill.

Mr. Young: I have already done so.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): How many more have to be killed?

Section 14 agreed to.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the government should be allowed to get

away without discussing this particular proposition simply because—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, this entire debate is out of order. There are some rules for the guidance of the House and we, on the government side, must conform to them as must all of the members of the House. If the principle of an amendment is not the same principle as the legislation or any section of it contained in the bill which is before the House, there is a way of bringing that matter in; that is by way of a bill.

Mr. S. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I understand full well what the House leader says, but I say to him that the debate in this Legislature is to facilitate an exchange of views. If a member inadvertently missed a section and his amendment is, in fact, germane to that subsection, I think the members of the House should re-open the section or we have to find an alternative. I would say that that alternative could be found in section 15 by adding a new subsection (1) which says:

> This Act except section (1) comes into force on the day it receives Royal assent with the following amended procedure.

And then add the words that were given by the hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on the part of the official Opposition, we are prepared to join in unanimous consent to revert back to subsection 3 if that will expedite the matter.

Mr. Chairman: On which subsection?

Mr. Singer: Subsection 3 for the purpose of allowing this amendment. It would seem to me that is where it would be appropriate; we would give our consent to that.

Mr. Chairman: My understanding is that the subject matter that he is attempting to introduce is not in the bill anywhere.

Mr. Singer: But it would have been most appropriate under subsection 3 which deals with safety devices for motorcycles and motorcycle operators.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the Minister if the amendment as suggested would properly come under subsection 3.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, subsection 3 deals with equipment. I see nothing in the Act by way of precedence to include wearing apparel under vehicle equipment *per se*. I would think it would be odd to consider inserting into section 35 of The Highway Traffic Act under the section "vehicle equipment" such an extraneous matter as a helmet that would be worn by the operator. I think it is a separate matter. The member who has raised the question has a bill dealing with it that he can use as a vehicle to put his views before the House when that bill is called.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Under the circumstances, I would rule it out of order.

Sections 15 and 16 agreed to.

Bill 72 reported.

PETERBOROUGH RACING ASSOCIATION LIMITED

House in committee on Bill Pr18, An Act to incorporate Peterborough Racing Association Limited.

Sections 1 to 15, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 16:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one brief comment. This bill opens a new era. For years the procedure in this province had been to get—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): On section 16?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, it is on the name of the bill—general comment. You are in an obstructionist mood today.

Mr. White: You are dealing with the principle of the bill and you are out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the Chairman in the chair or has he been deposed? Is it his ghost that I view in front of me or is he still there?

Mr. Chairman: I am tuning in on the member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. I was going to say that this bill opens a new era. The procedure for some years had been to revive old charters and to get racing rights in that fashion—a back-door procedure. I welcome the fact that now we are going to do it openly and aboveboard. If you want racing rights in an area, you come and get a bill passed in the Legislature. There is no subterfuge about it.

Section 16 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill Pr18 reported.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 20th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION

(Continued)

On vote 2109:

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Centennial centre of science and technology, we have already heard on several occasions in this House about the problems this centre has been faced with; it has been dealt with at some length.

But I do want to ask a few questions this afternoon of the Minister. As a background to those questions, I want to recall some of the events of last summer very briefly. I quote from the Toronto *Daily Star* of August 27, when:

> John Crean, chairman of the centre's board of directors, confirmed yesterday that director Dr. George MacBeath, 42, had quit because he could not accept the policies of the board. Later, it was revealed that six other officials had either resigned or asked for transfer away from the centre, planned for a 180-acre site at Eglinton Avenue East at Don Mills Road.
>
> Donald Crowdis, associate director and Robert Hume, assistant director, both Oxford transfers, Eric Lawson, project supervisor and L. G. Johnson, acting chief curator, Stewart Harwood, supervisor of construction, and Miss Elizabeth West, registrar, resigned.

In this list, Mr. Chairman, are some of the top people in the museum field in Canada. We have a group here of four senior men who, I understand, have had combined experience of about 65 years, and one of them is the chairman or president of the museum association in Canada.

These men, I would think, would have a great deal of experience and a great deal to offer to this project. These people also came to the project, I understand, at the invitation of this government and of its agencies. They were invited to come because they felt it was one of the great challenges of this day and age; it was presented to them as such, and they responded. They felt they could build here something of very great significance to display the past and to show what the future might be.

Mr. Chairman, one would think that because of this experience, because of the quality of these men, that there should be no great trouble—because they knew the terms of reference, which had been laid down, and because the whole matter had been explained to them very, very carefully. I can see no reason why these men should not have been happy to continue to carry on under the terms of reference under which they came here.

I understand that some time last year there was a problem created by certain events that transpired. Those problems seemed to hinge upon a change of policy on the part of the Minister. I think all of us in this House would like the Minister to explain to us what that change of policy could be.

February 22 of this year, 1967, the *Star* again says that:

> Dr. George MacBeath resigned as director of Ontario Centennial centre of science and technology in August because he and the centre's board of directors had a different concept of its role, the Minister of Tourism and Information, James Auld, said last night.

This "different concept" is a strange term, because, I reiterate, these men came, they gave up good jobs, they moved their families into Toronto, because they clearly understood what that concept was.

If there was a new concept, I think the Minister owes it to this House to explain what it was and what the problem amounted to, because this is a serious situation—not only a matter of dollars and cents, because all of us are aware of the great escalation of costs in connection with this project—and it is not just a matter of delay as the Centennial project will eventually be completed.

Whether it is completed this year or next year or the year after, I suppose, in the long range of history, is not that important, although I think all of us would very much

have liked to have seen it completed for the Centennial year, as was intended.

But, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I think we should know at this stage what the fundamental problem was, what this change of policy was and what it meant. Perhaps if the Minister can answer that question, then I would like to go on with a further observation.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Chairman, first of all I do not think there has been any basic change in the concept of the centre, as indicated by the government to the board of trustees, and the board of trustees to the directorate of the centre.

I think perhaps there was a different concept as between the then director and the board, or a different understanding of that concept, and I think that over the months, this difference, which was obscured in the beginning, became clear.

I think basically the difference in concept was: of the kind of centre that was to be established; and of the direction of emphasis on the present, as opposed to the past.

I think the feeling of Dr. MacBeath and some of the staff was that there should be more emphasis on the past than the board of trustees wished, and that there should be an expanded role for the centre, a role which would include a great deal of—perhaps research for want of a better word—rather than the emphasis on the explanation of what is happening today to us in terms of technology to the people. I think that is perhaps the basic difference.

In connection with those members of the staff who resigned at the time Dr. MacBeath resigned, I simply point out to the hon. member that Dr. MacBeath recruited the staff. It may well be that the concept which he gave them, and which he apparently proposed to follow, was his own concept rather than that of the board of trustees. I might just say, though, that of the names which the hon. member mentioned, Miss West is still at the centre.

Mr. Young: I was quoting from the newspaper report. Mr. Chairman, it does seem a very strange thing, though, that if Dr. MacBeath was recruited by the Minister, or his people, that he should have had such a fundamental misunderstanding of what this centre was all about and then have hired other people with this same misapprehension.

This seems a strange thing to have happened. Was there no discussion with the director during this process when the trouble was building up? I notice in the annual report, the first one of which has come out—and it seems a rather hurried job, perhaps after it was asked for by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon)—but in this it said:

> Since disagreement could not be resolved after numerous meetings with the board of trustees the director proffered his resignation, which was accepted.

Numerous meetings would indicate that there must have been a whole series of meetings where these matters were aired and discussed. Reports I have would indicate that those meetings were almost non-existent.

Were, in fact, several meetings held, or many meetings held, or numerous meetings the way the report gives us here—between the director and the board?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I know there were a number of meetings with Dr. MacBeath and myself and members of the committee of the board. Of course, Dr. MacBeath was meeting with the board at its monthly meetings and also with the executive committee of the board at weekly meetings, so I would say there had been a great many meetings held.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, again I notice in the report, these words:

> During the year, by rearrangement of the interior of the building, we have been able to provide over 150,000 square feet of display space. This has been largely achieved by re-allocating the storage area and the library, neither of which will be required on such scale in the phases now under construction.

Originally, a library was included in the plan. Certain other items were included that, I think, called for space for the curators, the chance for some research work to be done there and a fairly large section for reserve collections, and yet these were cut out and the 150,000 square feet of display space was included. Was this display space added, was there a much bigger display space put in when the others were cut out?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, first of all, to take the points raised in order, the centre's role had a great deal to do in the concept of the centre, with the use of space within the physical structure which is now being built.

Out of a total of something over 400,000 square feet, I think the hon. member would agree that 75,000 square feet of display space seems disproportionately small, or disproportionately low.

At the time of concern last spring, on the part of the board as to the concept of the centre, a scientific advisory committee was appointed consisting of three eminent gentlemen, whose names are in the report. It was considered by them that the use of space within the centre was too heavily oriented towards non-display use, rather than display use.

When the new director-general was appointed and arrived at the centre, one of his first tasks was to study the allocation of space. As a result of his study, a report made to the board, and on the acceptance of that report by the board, a number of other functions of the centre, non-display functions, were not cut out, but reduced to what was considered to be a better proportion and a more usual proportion.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, was this one of the points of conflict between the original staff and the Minister, this allocation of display space, the 75,000 versus 150,000? Was this one of the points in dispute?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I could not answer that specifically, Mr. Chairman. I would say that it flowed from the differences over concept which had arisen.

Mr. Young: Was the difference in concept based on the necessity for more display space for industry? I notice that the industrial committee is made up of pretty top-flight industrialists. Did they feel very strongly that the original concept of the centre was not adequate and that more attention should be paid to the industrial aspects of the centre?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No. To take the library as a case in point, the purpose of the library at the Centennial centre is for ready reference for the staff. It has never been the centre's intention to have a complete industrial or technological or scientific library. This is available very handily at the University of Toronto or the University of Western Ontario, or Queens or McMaster and so on. The original director apparently decided that he needed a very large space for a library. Subsequent examination by others technically qualified indicated that there was not the need for the kind of space that had originally been allocated and consequently the space for the library was scaled down and this made available more display space.

Mr. Young: What space will be available now for the library?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am informed, about 2,000 square feet.

Mr. Young: Two thousand square feet. And does the Minister consider that this is adequate for the kind of services which a library like this ought to give?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, and I might point out to the member that he may have noticed in the press the other day that the University of Toronto is proposing a new library, a reference library, at a cost of $43 million. We do not propose to have that.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I notice that the first explorations for the librarian and for staff for the library took place some years ago. Has any progress been made in building staff for the library?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We are not attempting at this time to gather the size of staff which was originally considered necessary for the much larger library, which the previous director had planned, so that—

Mr. Young: So that there is no move yet, as far as staff is concerned?

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the other matters that were cut out, such as the space for reserve collections, is there no thought that there ought to be space for this kind of activity within a centre of this nature?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Oh yes. There will be space, but there is not to be as much space as was originally thought, for several reasons. One of these is that we expect to have sufficient workshop space for updating exhibits and for producing new exhibits each year, as there are changes to be demonstrated by the centre to the public. Because of the now proper emphasis on the present and the future, there will not be the space required for large collections of artifacts illustrating the past.

Mr. Young: Then the past is gone and you are going to leave this to the Royal Ontario museum? Is this to be done?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, I perhaps should put it this way in very general terms: I would not want to state at this moment that at every time in the future you could divide the space up with a ruler and it will always come out this way, but by the rule of thumb, the emphasis and the use of space will be roughly 20 per cent past and 60 per cent present and 20 per cent future. For that reason, there will not be as much space required for reserve

collections. I might say that the space which has been saved here, or has been turned into display space here, will be where the junior museum will now be.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, this evidently was the point of contention then—this matter of the amount of emphasis, as you call it, on the future rather than the past. Did that have something to do with the elimination of research space for the curator?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would think very generally that is correct, Mr. Chairman. As I have said there is a question of emphasis and there is a question of staff work, other than display. By that I mean it had never been intended that we would be doing research as the Royal Ontario museum and other museums of its type do research. We would not be sending out archaeological expeditions and this sort of thing, and consequently we will not require staff for those functions which are being carried out by other agencies, the ROM, universities and so on. We will not require the staff for that purpose, we will not require space in the structure for the staff.

Mr. Young: Then if this was not a fundamental change in outlook, Mr. Chairman, why was it that the curators of museums, outstanding people in this field, were brought in at the beginning to administer this whole concept? This seems to me to be completely out of line, that you should choose these top-flight men of this kind to direct the centre, when the concept you claim was somewhat different, or was misunderstood. Why would you go after men of this type when in effect you were thinking 80 per cent of the present and future rather than the past?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, a curator is a curator, whether he "curates" a collection of designs or exhibits displaying technology of today or, I presume, ancient Greece. The term itself is still curator. I do not think the term itself is germane to this discussion, but I can only tell the hon. member that presumably the then director felt that the concept should have more emphasis on the past and more emphasis on research. But I do not think that the board of trustees ever had that conception. It may well be that there was a misunderstanding among the directors, myself, the staff, and the board. Certainly if there was, every attempt was made to clarify the matter.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the Minister a question in respect to the study which was undertaken—the organization and methods study, done by The Department of the Provincial Treasurer. This was completed, I understand, in mid-1966. Has that ever been tabled or made public?

Hon. Mr. Auld: In the normal course of events, Mr. Chairman, O-and-M reports on organization in departments are not tabled. This is for the information of the department itself. The final report was completed September 18. I think there was an interim report in June or July.

Mr. Young: The final report was completed in September? Then could the Minister give us some indication of what those reports might have contained?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Basically, the O-and-M report indicated that the centre had now reached a point in its growth, administratively and physically, that it should have its own complete administrative setup and that it should be in effect an agency of the government, rather than a part of a department. So it was at that time when the new director-general was appointed that it became self-contained administratively, rather than having some of its administrative functions carried out by branches of The Department of Tourism and Information.

Mr. Young: Then did this report play any part in the friction between the staff and the government?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Young: So that the report had nothing to do with that particular division of opinion?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I do not know why it would, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, another line of inquiry I would like to pursue for a moment has to do with this new concept, or what the Minister chooses to call, I think, the original concept which was misunderstood. This I find very, very difficult to swallow because men of this calibre who came here are not the kind of men who could easily misunderstand a concept. However, this the Minister has said and I suppose we have to take his word for it at this point.

About the extra space which was added for displays: What kind of displays will go into that space? What is the general idea of this industrial space?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There will be displays indicating the relation of pure science with life today, the application of science, which is generally referred to as technology. I could perhaps give the hon. member a list of some of the things which will be exemplified in the centre. I can give it to him in the breakdown of the space in general terms.

First of all, the junior museum, which will be a section of the centre oriented particularly towards children and the school curriculum, will be 27,000 square feet. In the general field of transportation, 7,000 square feet: engineering 30,000; communications 20,000; health 15,000; the Canadian resources 11,000 and pure science 40,000 square feet.

Mr. Young: In these sections, is it intended for the government itself to take certain space and then to rent other space to private industry? Will private industry have any space inside the centre at all?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There is no intention of renting space to anyone. The centre will be in complete control of all its space. As I have said before and am delighted to say again, we are hoping and expecting that there will be participation by industry, but that participation will be as a result of either their contributing funds for our staff to build an exhibit or a display, or their provision to us of the entire display after our agreement as to its content, making sure there is no great commercial aspect or anything like that.

This will not be operated in a fashion similar, for instance, to the Chicago science museum, where they do, in effect, rent space under certain circumstances.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, that was one of the fears that I had—that this would become another Chicago museum, that it would become a trade mart, simply a place where the emphasis might be on advertising certain of our products or certain of our corporations. Do I understand correctly, then, that in the telephone section, a certain corporation will not be represented by name, and that it will not in effect under its own name point out the advantages in the telephone technology?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No.

Mr. Young: I see. Then those commercial names will not be there. We will not have the names of our corporations within the—

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would not say that you will see no commercial names whatsoever because I would expect that in certain fields, if we are going to have examples of what is being done, we must acknowledge that somebody makes them. We are not going to grind names off castings, or something like that. But the centre will be in complete control of what is displayed here and it will be, the director-general points out, done as it is in the science museum in London, England. If the hon. member visits it, he will be aware that there is no great commercial pitch or sell on the part of manufacturers of certain things.

Mr. Young: So that no space is to be rented to commercial interests at all?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Other than the possibility of having a catering service operate the food situation, which would be done on a tender basis.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, the pressure for the new emphasis or the old emphasis, as the Minister chooses to call it, did not come from industrialists who desire to display their wares? We are not going to have this turned into any sort of a trade market? There is not going to be a trade fair of any kind, and the reins are going to be held tightly by the government itself and its servants? The displays will, I suppose, be designed in some measure by industry, but the approval must come from the committee or the directors, or their servants?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is correct. Mr. Chairman, industry has great interest in this project, which is basically unique. If we are not the first, we are one of the first to start from scratch and to progress, if I may say so, Mr. Chairman, very, very rapidly in a field which is a new one. Industry's interest is to show, for its own self-interest in attracting people to the sciences, what is happening to our lives because of the advances in science, and how this advance is translated into what affects our daily lives.

I give the hon. member one example which sticks in my mind, the advance in chemistry which has made it possible, by spraying or adding to the fertilizer or some other way, to influence the growing of grapes so they grow hanging in a different way. Consequently, you can now build a machine which will pick them instead of having to pick them by hand. The fact is that the old division between the disciplines, between engineering and medicine, for instance, no longer applies and all these things are interrelated. This is one of the purposes of the centre.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I am very interested to get the answers from the Minister and everything seems to be coming up roses in this connection, but I wonder whether the situation is as rosy as he presents it.

I cannot quite get through my thick skull—if I can put it that way—this difference, this thing which brought about this explosion last summer, because, certainly, there must have been very basic disagreements here for a staff as qualified and as eminent as this staff was, to pick up and leave the way they did, because of disagreements. They made no bones about saying that they disagreed fundamentally with the new policy of the government. These are two different stories and I say to the Minister today that he has a very grave responsibility—because if he gave the wrong impression to Dr. MacBeath and he came in under the wrong impression, then that is leaving Dr. MacBeath out on a limb someplace, and it brands him as a person of a little less intelligence than I think he has.

Again, the Minister has a grave responsibility because these men who came here, in some measure, at least, have been lost, perhaps permanently, to this whole field of the museum. They are, I understand, taking other jobs in other services and this is a very great shame because some of them are well qualified to continue here. They have pulled up stakes where they were, they cannot go back. They came in here to do a job. The Minister has had some disagreement with them, so they are removed from that job, and now they must seek employment where they can. These men, no doubt, will make a good contribution no matter where they go, but the fact is that they are lost to this field and to me that is an extremely serious situation.

I cannot see where two groups of men can see things so differently as we have had demonstrated last summer and here this afternoon. Again, I reiterate what the leader of the Opposition said here in this House not long ago, where he said that there should be, in the public interest, an inquiry into this whole matter and I think that inquiry should go forward—I think these men should be allowed to testify. I think that the report which the Minister has put before us here this afternoon should be tabled in this House. More than that, the letters of resignation of these men, when they separated themselves from employment, should be tabled so that they are a matter of public record to enable us to see exactly what their problems were. Then the whole matter should be subject to a public inquiry so that testimony could be given and the Minister could present his case, and his directors could present their case, and we would be in a position to judge exactly who was right. There is no question that the two opinions presented are at opposite poles. I find it hard to understand, since I must take the word of the Minister, how he can say that he brought in a man of the stature of Dr. MacBeath under misapprehension on his part—Dr. MacBeath's part. I just find it difficult to understand this could be so and that he could build up a staff and bring men in to the centre from all over the country—eminent, qualified, outstanding men—with the same misapprehension.

I think a public inquiry is certainly called for and I reiterate this afternoon, that that public inquiry should be undertaken and the testimony placed before this province, so that a judgment can be rendered as to which group is correct. I am not going to stress, this afternoon, the delay, as I said before, or the escalation of cost. Part of that cost no doubt came from the fact that we are going to provide much more display space than was originally called for. Whether that pressure from the industrial world overcame the ideas of the academic world, I do not know. I am in no position to judge and only an inquiry could bring that out. But it certainly has all the marks of industrial pressure—which could change the concept of this centre—and I think we ought to know, I think we ought to find out. The Minister can clear this whole matter up by having this public inquiry set up so that we know the facts in the whole situation.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate and it is just beyond my comprehension as to what has happened, so far as Ontario's Centennial project is concerned. I have a statement here and I think I am going to read it in full because it is going to really heighten the import of the rest of my remarks. It starts off this way:

> ONTARIO CENTENNIAL PROJECT
>
> Ontario's Centennial project will be a centre of science and technology, Premier John Robarts announced today. It will be the first of its kind in Canada. The project, to be located within a 180-acre site in the Don valley in Metropolitan Toronto, will be known as the Centennial centre of science and technology. Mr. Robarts said: "The first phase will be ready for opening July 1, 1967."

Let me pause there, Mr. Chairman, before I read the rest of this fascinating document. I note that the Minister said just a few moments ago that we were proceeding with all possible dispatch. Let me draw to his

attention the Prime Minister's remarks, and I will give you the date when I am through:

"The first phase will be ready for opening July 1, 1967. We will create a Centennial project which will be a living symbol not only of the hundredth anniversary but Canadianism in the best patriotic and national sense," the Premier declared. "Of equal, if not greater importance, it will be a means of looking into our bright and dynamic future—"

A very good PR man who phrased this one—

"The project will be an inventory of the achievements of our people where they can see and feel and touch the results of those achievements; where we can say this was done by a Canadian, this was invented by a Canadian, so we can say this development was conceived and created by Canadians; so we can say this is the future of Canada."

Mr. White: Are you against that?

Mr. Singer: Very moving. Very moving. I quote:

"The time has come for us to begin to clothe ourselves with pride in the accomplishments of our Canadian forefathers."

Mr. Robarts said that the offer of the federal government to make a financial contribution to provincial Centennial projects required that they should be built in provincial capitals and the provincial governments must give an understanding that, after the projects are completed they will be operated by the provinces or designated agencies as a living symbol of the Centennial.

"The project selected by the Ontario government meets these conditions in every respect and in particular it will be a living symbol of the Centennial which will not only live, but will grow vigorously from the starting point we now plan for 1967," Mr. Robarts declared.

The Premier said that the construction of the Centennial phase of the project will start in July of 1965 and be completed in September, 1966, so that the centre can be opened on July 1, 1967. A board of directors with John G. Crean, of Toronto, as chairman, will be responsible for construction and maintenance of the centre, Mr. Robarts said.

Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Robarts said it, and Mr. Robarts said it with such regularity and with such repetition in this press release dated August 31, 1964, what has happened to what Mr. Robarts said? Why has the Minister not been able to stand before us and tell us what happened to these empty words that were so boldly and proudly announced in 1964? What has gone wrong? Why have we not got a Centennial centre that is opening in the capital city of this province on July 1, 1967? What are the explanations for the delay? What are the explanations for the mounting cost? What are the explanations for the resignation of the staff? What are the explanations for mismanagement, for lack of planning, for sloppiness, for carelessness? Why does the Minister not tell us what is wrong with this Centennial centre? How can the government be so wrong in this project and not come forward with one real word of explanation as to why it is so long?

Mr. Chairman, it just escapes any reasonable comprehension as to why we have this project so badly mismanaged, so badly underpriced, so badly organized and why this Minister is unable to bring before us, when his estimates are here, any reasonable explanation of what in fact has happened.

What went wrong? Is it the Minister who is totally inefficient? Is it his advisors who are totally inefficient? Is his department unable to cope with this? Who is to blame?

Surely, Mr. Chairman, at this time, somebody with the knowledge of what goes on in capital council, and somebody with the knowledge of what goes on in this mysterious department, should be able to come before us and say, clearly and simply, why they made such a horrible series of errors, why they were so careless, why they were so inefficient and why the people of the province of Ontario are going to be stuck with this apparently outlandish cost for something that was never envisaged at the time the original announcement was made. And we have not heard a word in explanation, in real explanation from the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how the Minister can suggest, as he told a luncheon meeting in February of this year, that he hopes that the province's Centennial project will not be used as a plaything for political opportunities. I suppose this is the usual government dodge when they have made a mistake that they try to remove it from the atmosphere of public discussion.

This is a point that has to be discussed publicly, otherwise the government is neglecting its duty to the people of the province of Ontario. The Minister, with absolutely nothing to say, hopes this will not be a plaything for political discussion. This is the Minister's job. The Minister is here to explain to the people of Ontario why he bungled so badly.

And I say this advisedly, Mr. Chairman, because he is the man responsible to the members of this House for an explanation. If something in his department went wrong, we are not going to attack an individual civil servant. The responsible Minister is the man who takes the burden of the praise or the opprobrium in matters such as this. In this case, certainly there is no praise, Mr. Chairman. Why, then, did the Minister bungle so badly? Why, then, is he not able to do something that carries out the proud words of his leader, uttered so boldly and in such vulgar language, less than three short years ago?

What are those explanations, and when is the Minister going to come forward and explain to the people of Ontario what went wrong? If the Minister is as inept as it appears through this long and sordid history, then, Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Minister has any right to continue to sit in that portfolio. This is a history of fumbling, mismanagement, perhaps even worse, but we cannot get at the facts. We have been denied a public inquiry. The hon. member for Yorkview referred to the repeated demands of my leader for public inquiry. This has been denied us in true government and Tory style. The last thing remaining for us, Mr. Chairman, is to have the Minister rise in his place before this debate is over and tell us why, from 1964 up until now, there is not a better history of what has happened in connection with this important project for the people of Ontario.

The government's record, as I have said, has already had several goings-over by my present leader and by Mr. Thompson, the gentleman who preceded him. Frankly, there has been no answer despite all the speeches made in regard to this matter. From the beginning, the whole project has been surrounded with uncertainty—from the original announcement which I just read, coupled with the announcement that the cost of the project was going to be $5 million. The cost has steadily mounted. I have been told that the present estimate runs around $50 million. Can the Minister tell us exactly how many dollars today he imagines are going to have to be spent? Certainly it is far and above the $5 million that was bruited about in 1964.

Do not come forward with the figure of $21 million. Come forward with your present estimates. Include the dam that is going to be necessary to stop the waters from flooding out the site. Include everything that is going to be necessary and tell us, in realistic figures, how many dollars this project is going to cost before it is finally finished in 1970, 1971 or 1972 or whatever year you think would be appropriate to celebrate Canada's Centennial —because obviously it is not going to be 1967. I suppose we can call 1970 or 1971 the Auld Centennial year. He is going to invent his own, because 1967 is not good enough for him as it is for the rest of 20 million Canadians.

Mr. Chairman, some answer has to be forthcoming and it has not been as yet. During recent press conferences, the information about figures has been delightfully vague, and we cannot understand them; I am going to come back to the figures here in a few moments. As to the exact nature of the project, the hon. member for Yorkview is trying to get at that. The answers that are forthcoming are vague, illusive. I do not think the Minister knows. I tell you quite frankly as I listen to the questions and the so-called answers, I do not think the Minister really knows. I do not think the Minister is deliberately trying to hide anything; I do not think anybody has bothered to tell him anything—if there is anything to tell. I do not think the planning has been completed to the stage where the Minister can intelligently get up in this House and say what is going on with this project.

The project will be an inventory, again quoting Prime Minister Robarts, of the achievements of our people where we can see and feel—I read these words a few moments ago—and touch the results of those achievements.

Well, to what extent is this fond boast of the Prime Minister going to be carried out? Some of the highlights of the erratic progress have been in April, 1965, when this Minister told the Legislature that the estimated cost was now $14 million; in August 1965, a month after construction was supposed to have started, The Department of Public Works said the probable cost would be $17 million; the next year, when the first stage of the project was supposed to be nearing completion the works department estimated the cost would be $20.3 million. Subsequently a contract was let for $21.7 million. That is only the beginning. As we look at some of these figures tabled before the public accounts committee and look at the figures in the report and at some other things, it is almost impossible to figure out who is keeping the books, what are the true books and what are the true estimates of cost and how they fit in in any way whatsoever.

I would like the Minister to spend some considerable time trying to enlighten us as

to what the cost of this project is going to be—and not to leave out anything. Include the dam, include the money that you paid to Ontario Hydro, include the surveying costs, include your architectural costs, include all your salaries. What is the cost going to be for everything, from the time you start it until the time you think you will be finished in Auld Centennial year?

Last summer, quite unexpectedly, it was announced that Dr. MacBeath, the original director, had quit and several senior officials were also leaving. Since then, the new director, William O'Dea, has been brought in from England and the buildings of the project are beginning to take shape on the ground, to some extent. The intriguing question is just what could have brought about such an incredibly upward growth. One thought would be that the government has dawdled in making up its mind on what it should do for the Centennial and then rushed off before it was ready. A second is that in its original cost estimate it was looking for a lot of help from industry. It hinted so in its first statement and then appointed a board of trustees heavily weighted with men from business—obviously expecting them to shell out. This, in fact, has not happened. And if that is in reality the situation, I think it is about time the Minister was frank enough with the people of Ontario to say this is so and this is why they have got themselves in such a terrible hole.

These men, it appears, have been more interested in shelling out advice than money. The result is that the shape of the project has developed according to their ideas, rather than those of the professionals. As ideas have developed, so have the costs—and that is pretty obvious, too. One diverting, incidental note in this affair that the Minister himself is in a poor position to try and rebut, if so inclined, is the original Canadian Press story which questioned the lack of certainty about the programme at the start. The Minister will remember making those remarks, I am sure. The man who wrote the story is now the executive assistant to the Minister. I think the executive assistant to the Minister and the Minister should perhaps get together; perhaps the Minister could pick his executive assistant's brains and find out really what the executive assistant had in mind when he wrote the story prior to being taken on the staff. Or maybe the two events were not just as haphazard as they seem. Maybe the appointment of the new executive assistant was to stop CP from writing inquiring stories into what was going on in the centre. These are some of the answers we should get.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal for a moment or two with what is laughingly called the annual report. The Minister produced a document called the annual report of the centre of science and technology, year 1966. If this is an annual report of anything, Mr. Chairman, I am just embarrassed and ashamed that a responsible Minister could bring forward four or five paltry pages like this and purport to have them be something of a record of achievement of this important body during the year 1966. Signed by Mr. Creary, dated March 9, 1967, we have this so-called annual report. It has a couple of paragraphs here from Dr. Solandt, a quote from Dr. Thode—

Mr. Young: Very good quotes, too.

Mr. Singer: Oh, yes, excellent quotes, if they meant anything. They were good enough to be included in the Prime Minister's original statement in 1964. It would have been equally inspiring to Tories over there and I am sure that had the Prime Minister seen those in 1964, or his PR man, they would have been included. But what kind of an annual report is there on page 1?

Well, page 2: The whole length of page 2 is taken up with the names of the various members of the board of trustees, with two little paragraphs at the bottom saying the board of trustees held 13 meetings with an average attendance of 13 out of 20. And then they had a standing committee and there were 11 meetings with an average attendance of four, and then they received some resignations which were all accepted with regret. That takes care of page 2 of this report.

It is a great report, certainly brimming with information—it tells us all we want to know about the Ontario Centennial centre. Page 3 is taken up entirely with the names of the senior staff—the most elucidating information, particularly since about half the names on page 3 have now gone, so they are no longer a part of the senior staff.

Then we have one page, two pages, three pages of writing and if you read through those very carefully—they are written in the same tone with the same boastfulness, with the same imagination as the Prime Minister's press release in 1964—again they convey absolutely no information as to what happened in this organization during the year.

Then the final page, Mr. Chairman—and the final page is really something that is absolutely a conundrum in figures.

I wonder if anybody in the Minister's department ever bothers to speak to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) and have a word or two with him about what should go in financial statements. But the financial statement here, contained on the last page of the report, really conveys absolutely no information at all.

It is a masterpiece of saying nothing by writing down a few figures. Some of my colleagues have been attempting to find out about costs; in fact, there is a question on the order paper in the name of my leader about the estimated costs and so on. I do not think that question has been answered yet—and small wonder that it has not been answered—I wonder if the Minister, in fact, knows the answer.

But let us see what some of these statements have to say. I have a statement here that was tabled by The Department of Public Works, Mr. Chairman, in front of the public accounts committee, and I would accept this, I think, highly preferably to the statement on the last page of this annual statement. And so I am going to refer to that and ask the Minister if he can justify the figures on the last page of this report, in comparison with the figures tabled by The Department of Public Works in relation to these costs.

The Department of Public Works advised the public accounts committee first of all that Raymond Moryama, in the fiscal year of 1965-66, was paid $1,139,424. I would presume, Mr. Chairman, that Raymond Moryama is the architect who was engaged on this project.

As hard as I may look in this so-called statement of expenditures on the last page of the annual report, I cannot see a Raymond Moryama's salary or payment to Raymond Moryama, included in the series of figures that total only $686,849.47.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I can—

Mr. Singer: Well, can the Minister explain that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: —clarify my friend's thinking. As perhaps he will recall, The Department of Public Works has the funds for the construction of the centre, the architects and the site and what-not in their estimates. The figures shown in my estimates, and in this report, are only those funds which are voted in the estimates of this department.

Mr. Singer: Then, I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is a deception and a designed deception—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I would just point out—

Mr. Singer: —because this document that I have here is supposed to be the annual report of the Centennial centre of science and technology and you have one page in the back of it that says "Expenditures." One would be led to conclude—and, I suggest, deliberately led to conclude—that the figure under "Expenditures" is the figure you have expended to date. And it gainsays absolutely nothing to say, "Well, really, the complete story is that this group, the group that is charged with the responsibility of building this post-Centennial centre, only spent $686,000, but my colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) spent a lot more money and that was in his estimates."

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the time has come when one should be able to expect a Minister of the Crown, when he tables a report of a commission, or a centre, or whatever you call this group, to be completely frank with the people of Ontario. I suggest he is less, far less than completely frank. I suggest that it is only because the public accounts committee is sitting, that we are only beginning to get the story and we are only beginning to get bits and pieces of it. I would think that the people of Ontario not only are interested, but have a right to be interested, and have a right to know how much this white elephant has cost to date; how much it is anticipated it is going to cost; and when it is going to be finished. Look as I may, and look as any member may, through this document, that conveys no information, we cannot find even one inkling of an idea from the documents the Minister has tabled or from his remarks in the House.

Let us go back to Raymond Moryama. Raymond Moryama is the architect, who apparently is being paid in the accounts of the Minister of Public Works. Will the Minister tell us, will he tell us today while this debate goes on, the basis on which Raymond Moryama has been hired? Is Raymond Moryama a government employee or is he an outside architect, who has been hired for this purpose? If the Minister wants to interrupt me on these things, I would be very happy to get the explanations as we go by. First of all, is Raymond Moryama a government employee or is he an outside architect retained just for this project?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, the architect, Mr. Moryama, and whatever associates he has, are retained by The Department of

Public Works. They are not public servants, it is an architectural firm. I simply tell the hon. member, as I am sure he well knows, that The Department of Public Works builds the buildings for all departments of government, and is, in effect, the contractor.

He can ask me questions until he is blue in the face, but I think he knows the place to ask those questions is in the estimates of the Minister of Public Works. I think he also knows from his experience around this House, because he has been here some years, that it is a normal policy for the amounts required for governmnt buildings to be placed in the estimates of The Department of Public Works. They are never shown in the estimates of the department for which they are built.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, that is a good slick piece of footwork but it does not fool anybody.

Hon. Mr. Auld: But it is true.

Mr. Singer: I am not talking about his estimates. I am talking, Mr. Chairman, about this document that is called the annual report of the Centennial centre of science and technology. If the Minister wanted to make the distinction that he now makes, then surely somewhere in this multi-page document—it runs to five pages—he could have put it in a footnote, that the figures we table here on the last page have no relationship whatsoever to the cost of the building, that that is not what this report was designed to do. This report was designed to draw a curtain of delusion in front of the eyes of the people of Ontario. I am just telling the Minister that he is not going to get away with this, because it is not a true statement, it is not a true picture at all.

Now we are into another thing. I suppose the Minister is indicating to us that he is not going to be able to tell us anything about the terms of hiring Raymond Moryama. This is entirely the responsibility of his colleague, the Minister of Public Works. So it would be quite useless for me to ask the Minister the basis on which Raymond Moryama was hired. I would think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be quite useless for me to ask if he was hired on the same percentage as architects are usually hired on, six per cent of cost, because if that was in fact the case, then—but the Minister is not going to be able to answer—I would inquire how they got to the total amount of money.

What is the six per cent going to be and on what basis would it be that they have already apparently paid Raymond Moryama a total of $1,139,424 for a building that hardly has the foundations in the ground? But that is a useless inquiry, Mr. Chairman, because apparently now when we a trying to deal with the centre of science and technology we are dealing, unfortunately, with the wrong Minister.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): One hand does not know what the other hand is doing.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, this is a ludicrous position in which we find ourselves. I have been in this House a few years, and we know that the Minister of Public Works has certain responsibilities. The Minister knows as I do, Mr. Chairman, that when we direct this type of inquiry to the Minister of Public Works, he stands up and says—he believes quite properly, too—that he is only the errand boy for all these other Ministers. They put their estimates through and if he has to build a centre of science and technology, he builds it. If he has to put up a building over there for The Department of Education, he just does what he is told and builds it.

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member asked me any questions in my departmental estimates, about the contracts or architects, I do not make excuses for any other department. I will answer the questions and I always have. If he wants to get around to asking me these questions during my estimates, I will give him the answers as straight as I have always given them.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, might I make a suggestion, and for the better carrying-out of public business, could the two Ministers jointly explain to us and to the people of Ontario just how these costs are made up without taking shelter behind the fact that the one who presently presents these estimates is not able to answer all the questions? Would the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Chairman, be good enough to answer the questions that I am posing to the Minister of Tourism and Information, that he is unable to answer?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, I am not anxious to take the floor away from my colleague, but I notice he agrees. I am not sure that I can answer all the questions that he has given. Raymond Moryama was hired, as many architects are, when we cannot possibly handle the work ourselves. I know he is being paid the regular percentage. Originally, three architects were commissioned to handle this project together, but as

has been intimated by the member for Downsview, it was difficult for three architects to work together, so Raymond Moryama was commissioned to do this work himself. Raymond Moryama did the impossible, in my opinion, on this project, because he did not have too much time; Moryama came up with the plan in an impossible length of time.

I have not worked out the figures. I will have them worked out, but when the plans of any building reach a certain percentage where tenders are ready to be called, the architect is immediately eligible for 60 per cent of his commission. That, very briefly, answers those questions the member asked. I have not checked the figures. One of the things you were mentioning a while ago was that my colleague has been hiding things. It has been public knowledge for two and a half years, or two years at least, that the contract is worth $21,700,000 for the project. There was a public tender opening. Everybody could have known it; to intimate that my colleague is covering up these figures is completely untrue.

Mr. Singer: I presume, then, from what the Minister of Public Works has said, that if the contract is $21 million and Raymond Moryama was hired on the usual six per cent basis—the Minister is not sure of that, so I would not want to put words in his mouth—

Hon. Mr. Connell: I cannot check it out today. Occasionally, on a very complicated building, such as labs, or those buildings that are much more complicated than the usual four-walls type of building, they are paid seven per cent. But I will have to check with my officials to find out whether it is seven or six.

Mr. Singer: All right. Fair enough. I am sure the Minister will be anxious to do that because my leader's question has been on the order paper for well over two and a half months. I thought that question would have been answered prior to these estimates coming here. But I am sorry that the Minister has not had enough time in two and a half months to table answers to these questions. The two Ministers have not been able to get together and bring these answers here so we could debate these matters much more intelligently. But the Minister of Public Works tells us he has not time; the Minister of Public Works is an honourable man and we accept his view. Hopefully, he will get at it right away and hopefully he will give us these figures.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: He said he would.

Mr. Singer: But if the cost is $21 million and the fee is, say, six per cent, my rough arithmetic is that he would be entitled to $1,200,000. Is that about right? Six per cent of $21 million?

Now if that is in fact the case, and he has rushed along these plans and done a miraculous job, it seems to me he has already received about 95 per cent of his fees instead of 60 per cent, because you have already paid him $1,139,424. Could you tell us how that works out? Maybe it is just my bad arithmetic.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would need a pencil to work this out, but I think your figures are a little bit out. I think it was seven per cent.

Mr. Singer: A little bit out?

Hon. Mr. Connell: He was eligible when those plans were approved, for 60 per cent, and he would get other payments as it went along. That building, in spite of all you say, is advancing very quickly.

Mr. Singer: If it was seven per cent, that would be roughly $1,400,000, and 60 per cent of $1,400,000 certainly is far less than $1,139,424. So even according to the Minister's own ground rules, accepting them at their best, it would seem to me that there has been an unusual treatment of the payment of these fees, and I would like an explanation. I point again to this question of my leader's. It has been on this order paper for over two and a half months and it has not been answered. Why not?

Let us move on on this schedule of fees statement of expenditures that was tabled before the public accounts committee. "Master plan, $740,000." Could one of the Ministers tell us what the master plan is and why that would not have been a part of the architect's commission? Or why the architect was not commissioned to draw the master plan, or who did draw the master plan, and whether or not that is part of the seven per cent of the $21 million as well?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I would presume that the master plan to which the hon. member refers is one which was done as part of the construction. What was the amount?

Mr. Singer: $740,000. Was that done by an architect? By Mr. Moryama or somebody else?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I wonder if the hon. member would tell me from whence he got that fee? Is this from the auditor's report tabled?

Mr. Singer: No, no. This is a document that was asked for by the committee on public works and is published; I have a photostat of it. It bears the seal of the province. I am sure the Minister of Public Works could make it available to you, because his department made it available to the public accounts committee.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, this is the whole point. We are discussing the amounts in my estimates for the Centennial centre. If the hon. member wants to discuss those aspects of the centre which relate to The Department of Public Works, it would seem to me that it would be proper in the public works estimates. The Minister of Public Works is here without his statistical information. I have no reason to have that information, and do not have it. I think we are simply delaying the business of the House in pursuing the matter which is not under these estimates.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, we—

Mr. Chairman: I think I must agree with what the Minister has said. The matter cannot really be gone into fully today without the information that the Minister of Public Works would need. Therefore, I would recommend to the member that we proceed with the items under vote 2109 which we might very well discuss at this time.

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. I cannot accept that, because this is the occasion, the estimate, where we are to debate the cost of the Centennial centre.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! The cost of the building, which has already been explained, can be discussed under the estimates for The Department of Public Works. You have already had quite a bit of information on this subject.

Mr. Singer: I have had no information.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2109 is before the House for discussion.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the list of the departments given to us by the House leader does not as yet include the estimates for The Department of Public Works. Now it is no secret that this House is about to dissolve very shortly. It is no secret that if we are denied the opportunity of discussing these items here, we will never get the opportunity—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to discuss these matters in this appropriate vote.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): You will never be back to discuss it. May I say this. The question of future debates in this House is out of order at the moment. We must consider that the regular routine of this House will be continued and that you will have opportunity under The Department of Public Works to discuss the actual cost of construction.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is fascinating that we only get into this when it becomes embarrassing for the government to answer the questions. A few minutes ago the Minister of Public Works was quite happy to give me the information as far as he knew, and to get the official information. Now I think we should have it as we are discussing this very important item. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the government has bungled and fumbled and made a mess of this project; it is so obvious that we are entitled to these facts and figures. I just cannot understand how you can purport to make a ruling like this unless you are trying to muzzle the Opposition in its legitimate pursuit of information which it is entitled to. If that is your will, Mr. Charman, there are enough votes over there that will support your ruling. But I think we are entitled to find out where this money was spent and why it was spent and how much in addition is going to be spent.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to the member that those remarks are very unfair. There is no intention of muzzling debate in this House.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I said—

Mr. Chairman: But there is an intention of directing the discussion in the House. At the moment we have only one thing before us—vote 2109—and only those things which are listed under vote 2109.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I have just been looking through The Department of Public Works. I cannot see particularly where we have that item. Where is it, tell us? Surely when you see—

Mr. Chairman: Under construction, 1901.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): What difference would it make?

Mr. Singer: If it makes no difference, why will you not tell us? That is my whole point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, there are rules in the House and you have to abide by them.

Mr. Singer: With all due respect, there are rules in the House that apparently the government is not going to exercise, so that we are not going to be able to get the information that I say, Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to.

I think, sir, we are entitled to know at this time how much this mismanaged project is going to cost the people of Ontario and how much it is costing them. If there are no answers forthcoming from either the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Tourism and Information, those facts will speak abundantly clearly for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, if no one can tell me why, in addition to an architect, we have to have a master plan and spend another $750,000, why we have to have special consultants, why we have to have additional sums here, why the architects' fees do not include drawings, why those are not part of the architects' fees, why soil investigation is not included in the seven per cent, why a flood control feasibility study has to be done and the province pays in addition as an extra to the seven per cent another $3,800?

If no one can tell me these things, these facts, Mr. Chairman, speak for themselves. The $36,000 of miscellaneous—perhaps those can be explained. We have $94,000 in Department of Public Works overhead, and total expenditures for public accounts of $1,273,000 and we have scarcely got the foundation built. Now, Mr. Chairman, if there is no explanation of that, so be it. The record will show that and the people of Ontario will be aware of how their funds are being handled and how they are being spent. There are some other figures here that perhaps make a little more sense. Perhaps the Minister can tell us about this. These figures seem to come from The Department of Tourism and Information, and surely no one is going to be able to say that this Minister is not responsible for these figures. This also was produced as I understand it through the public accounts committee—is that right? Yes. All right.

Salaries for the year ended March 31, 1966, there are two salary figures—$431,334.99—can the Minister then give us a breakdown of the expenditure of this $431,334.99. Which are the salaries quite apart from any building costs? Which are the salaries apparently spent for staff for this project?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, for the year ended when?

Mr. Singer: According to these figures we are putting two years together. There was $62,000 for the year ended March 31, 1965, and $368,000 for the year ended March 31, 1966, totalling $431,334.99. Who did all that money get paid to?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can give the hon. member the names of those who would be paid the amount in the current estimates. I am afraid that I do not have here today, the names of those persons, and the salaries which they received for the two previous years to which he refers, although I might just point out in passing, that there was no necessity to get the second figures in public accounts committee because that was in the report to which he so scathingly referred a few minutes ago.

Mr. Singer: Even at that, the figures are not right because—there is not a big difference, but there is still $1,000 difference—one says $369,184.74 and the other says $365,070.52. Even within the same department, for the same figures, you cannot reproduce them from one item to another without making $1,000 change in them. How do you explain that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can only say without looking into it that it is probably the result of the retroactive salary increase or some refund, or something like that.

Mr. Singer: Oh probably—undoubtedly.

Hon. Mr. Auld: If the hon. member would like to hear the answers to those questions which refer to my estimates and which he has asked already, I would be glad to give them.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Auld: On the other hand, if he has further questions perhaps he would give them—

Mr. Singer: Please do.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would prefer to give him the answers to the whole lot.

Mr. Singer: I will be a while yet, so for the next ten minutes why do you not give us

some of the answers and then we will carry on after dinner.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, first of all, in connection with the dam which was referred to, he is referring to a dam being built for flood control by the Metropolitan Toronto conservation authority. It is one which was originally on their plan to be built in 1970, I believe. They had agreed, in cooperation with the Centennial centres, so that the work would be done, and this would save certain expenditures which might otherwise have to be made to the site to ensure that it would not be damaged by flood in the intervening years.

The expediture by my department on the centre to January 31, 1967—the most recent figure which we have available—is $1,870,492. Now the—

Mr. Singer: How is that figure made up?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is made up of salaries, supplies, everything—all amounts spent by my department and which go through the estimates of my department.

Mr. Singer: Nothing to do with public works?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Nothing to do with public works. This is based on certain estimated figures which we, of course, have access to from Public Works but which are properly the information available to the members of this House, and from the public accounts committee from The Department of Public Works. The expenditure which I mentioned and which I could give to him, perhaps a little more in greater total and including some estimated figures because, of course, all the figures are not in, is as follows: The total we estimate to March 31, 1967, through my department would be $2,329,250. The estimates before the House now are $1,175,000. This would give authorized and spent and estimated from March 31, 1968 in my department of $4,044,250. Again, I guess at this point for 1968-1969, a figure of $2.25 million which would give us up to the full opening of the first three phases of the structure by my department a total of $6,294,250.

This includes some figures such as moving of hydro line and stuff which Public Works have done, and the cost of the building based on the low tender accepted in 1965—whenever it was—$21.7 million, a total cost of $27,994,250. We expect industrial contributions and participation to be something in the order of $2 million, so that, added to the public expenditure, would bring it to about $29,994,000.

Mr. Singer: About $29 million now?

Hon. Mr. Auld: About, all-in, including industrial participation $29,994,000 in 1968-1969.

Mr. Singer: We have just multiplied by six since 1964.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Which is a figure I have been using many times in the past.

Mr. Chairman, in the past 18 months, the official Opposition has done its limited best exploiting every crude tool at its disposal to undermine the foundations of this Centennial centre of science and technology. In the long harangues, in essence, what they have been saying this afternoon, is that the centre will be too costly and it will be too late. What they are, in essence telling us is that we should have slapped something together, anything at all, just so long as we can have an official opening in our Centennial year. According to the Opposition, as I infer, it does not matter very much what the quality of the product is as long as it rolls off the assembly line in a hasty fashion.

For the last year and a half, the Opposition has been trying to stuff down our throats, and the throats of the people of this province, the nonsense that the Centennial centre was a $5 million project in its entirety and that the project would be completed in its entirety this year. Mr. Chairman, I do not have to be argumentative to refute this. I need only quote from the statement made by the Prime Minister of the province, a statement to which the hon. member for Downsview referred, but not in its entirety this afternoon—

Mr. Singer: Oh yes, quite in its entirety.

Hon. Mr. Auld: My friend missed three pages because I was listening—

Mr. Singer: Well, I have only got two pages here. I am sorry, I thought it was in its entirety, I stand corrected.

Hon. Mr. Auld: When the Prime Minister first announced that Ontario's Centennial project would be a centre of science and technology, he said—and I quote from one part which the hon. member used and one part which for some reason or another did not:

> I wish to stress the point that the Centennial project is conceived for completion July 1, 1967 and will be only the first phase of an overall scheme which will take

> many years to achieve. By July 1, 1967, it is proposed that the central core of the project will be completed.
>
> It will be the seed from which an institution of international significance will grow. While the government has initially budgeted for an expenditure of $5 million by 1967, this figure represents only the cost to be assumed by the Ontario and federal government under the terms of the federal government's proposal.

And I end the quotation. The proposal to which the Prime Mniister referred, was an offer from Ottawa to provide a maximum of $2.5 million to the province on a matching basis for a Centennial project. This offer, of course, was readily accepted. Ontario put up the additional $2.5 million giving the project a capital nucleus of $5 million at the outset. And I might say, Mr. Chairman, that other provinces have done the same.

For instance, for Nova Scotia's project, the last figure I had came to about $10.5 million, Saskatchewan's $15.3 million and Manitoba, I believe, something in the order of $20 or $22 million of which their Centennial grant applies to the concert hall section of their Centennial project, I think.

At the time the announcement was made, the government had no architectural plans before it. Subsequently, Mr. Raymond Moryama submitted a design calling for the eventual development of the centre, consisting of there interconnected buildings. While we had first envisaged the centre at 100,000 square feet, this has been more than quadrupled. This was accepted by the government and a decision was made to proceed with two of the buildings immediately. In April, 1965, I announced in this Legislature that the estimated cost of the project was $14 million for those two phases.

Meanwhile, Mr. Chairman, we made one vital change in our thinking about the Centennial centre. Instead of developing what would be primarily a technological museum, we made the decision to further develop the centre as an educational institution of a type that exists nowhere else in this country. In short, we increased the scope and the concept of the centre to exploit its educational value to the fullest. Changes were made architecturally in the plans. Separate entrance levels and reception levels were provided to handle an estimated 3,000 school children a day. Classrooms and an auditorium were provided in the core building.

But perhaps the most significant decision was to undertake the construction of the first three stages of the centre at once, rather than developing it in separate phases as had first been considered and first announced.

This pushed the estimated cost of the centre which was announced at the time, up to $17 million, a figure which my friend has mentioned a moment ago and an estimate which was made by The Department of Public Works in August, 1965, a few months before tenders were called. The final estimate made a short time before tenders were open by Public Works, was $20.3 million. The lowest figure, accepted early in 1966, was for $21.7 million. The contract for this amount was awarded by The Department of Public Works to Pigott Construction Company.

Now the question is asked, Mr. Chairman, "Is this too much?" as the Opposition charges. Let us compare it with some other costs. For the Centennial centre the costs work out at $38 a square foot. Cost for similar structures in Tokyo $33, in Denmark $45 and in the United States $60. I think that this speaks very well for the kind of design that Mr. Moryama has been able to produce and which has been widely hailed by architectural experts, by educational experts and by a whole host of people who have written glowing reports about the centre and its architecture.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me say that in undertaking the centre of science and technology as our Centennial project, we have been attempting to build an institution as a physical encasement for an idea. Our thinking has changed somewhat since the centre was first envisaged in 1964, as I outlined a moment ago. The centre is now rising on the west side of Don Mills Road south of Eglinton and I hope a number of members of the standing committee on natural resources and tourism will be able to visit the site. Some members of the public accounts committee have already visited both the centre and the work centre. There they will be able to see for themselves how this project is going to look on completion.

Mr. Chairman, the centre is now under the direction of Mr. William T. O'Dea, whose list of credentials is lengthy and impressive. More important, he agrees entirely with what we are trying to do and is implementing our ideas for us, which I think perhaps answers some of the points mentioned by the hon. member for Yorkview.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, the criticism which has been levelled at the Centennial centre of science and technology at the provincial level is rather reminiscent to me of the brickbats hurled at the progressives

within the city of Toronto's administration during the conception and construction of Toronto's magnificent new city hall. There are those who call themselves reformers but who in fact are loathe to see the development of anything that is new or progressive. The proponents of the city hall, which was also faced with rising construction costs, were blasted at every turn. The story has been much the same with some of my hon. friends on the opposite benches about the Centennial centre. No misrepresentation is too much, unknowing though it may be, for these antagonists, if they think it will result in political gain.

Mr. Chairman, in The Department of Tourism and Information, we feature the new Toronto city hall in all our advertisements because it gives in a nutshell the change and the growth and the dynamism of Metropolitan Toronto and all Ontario. I look forward to the day when we will be doing the same thing with the Centennial centre.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to;

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the private members' hour will deal with resolution No. 9 on page 5 of the order paper standing in the name of Mr. Reuter.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 9, by Mr. A. E. Reuter.

RESOLUTION: That, in its long-range programme for the development of our public parks, the government should: (a) institute a system of classifying public parks to include the facilities available to the public in summer and winter; (b) increase the number of public parks in southwestern Ontario; (c) improve the facilities available in all public parks by the provision of such amenities as hot and cold running water, showers, electrical outlets and sewage disposal facilities for trailers; (d) encourage greater use of public parks as winter playgrounds by providing facilities for such sports as skating, skiing, tobogganing, snowshoeing, ice fishing, etc.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I move resolution No. 9, standing in my name on the order paper, which has just been read. This resolution is one which I hope will meet with an enthusiastic response from all hon. members on both sides of this House. I say this, of course, because in the fast pace of today's society, it is more and more important that our recreational facilities be extended to fill a pressing need of our people, to escape from the mad rush of everyday existence in the expanding urbanization of this province.

Professor Norman Pearson of the geography department of the University of Waterloo was appointed to the advisory committee on recreation in 1964 and stated that "recreation is not just icing on a cake, it is the measure of civilization." Ontario, with one-third of Canada's total population, is growing in popularity as a vacation province. It is becoming increasingly evident that additional lands must soon be found and utilized for public recreation. To quote Professor Pearson again, he maintains that we must move ahead of the recreational demands and search out the areas which will, in a few decades, be entirely used, and plan now for the means by which evolution can proceed.

In dealing with section (a) of the resolution, that is that the government should institute a system of classifying public parks to include the facilities available to the public in summer and winter, it is an encouraging sign to note that our new Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) made a statement in this House on March 16 that pretty well embodied the objective of section (a) of the resolution. The Minister's statement included a detailed classification of the 96 provincial parks now existing throughout the province. His recognition, Mr. Speaker, of the importance of our provincial parks is evident in his opening and closing sentences. He stated that:

> Outdoor recreation has become increasingly important in today's complex and changing society. More leisure time, increased disposal income, rapid urbanization and improved mobility have contributed to the tremendous acceleration in demand for outdoor recreation.

In closing, the Minister said:

> I am confident that the proposals I have placed before you today will usher in a

new era in the growth and management of our provincial parks system.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister's remarks are of great moment. I for one wish to congratulate him sincerely.

I move on to section (b) of the resolution, that is to increase the number of provincial parks in southwestern Ontario. I know, sir, this is indeed a problematic submission. The statistical records of last year indicate the great need. Existing parks along Lake Erie and Lake Huron were filled to capacity most of the time and on some occasions it was necessary to put out the "no vacancy" sign. The problem is not just one of finding sufficient funds to pay today's land prices, but the matter of finding the property is perhaps just as great. According to one of the leading departmental officials, there is not enough land available to meet the need and what is available is too costly.

There is, of course, some merit in attempting to coax the public to look to the more northerly facilities but this is not always practical, at least for those who cannot get away for the so-called long weekend from Friday afternoon to Monday morning. The driving distance in most cases prohibits this. It is of utmost importance that the department continue in its efforts to acquire additional land in the southern part of the province.

Before dealing with that portion of the resolution pertaining to park facilities, I will comment briefly on the subject of winter use of our parks. In December last year the Minister visited the Hespeler office of the Huron district of the department and on that occasion he remarked that one of his aims was to provide more diversified projects during the winter months. I am sure that our new Minister, who hails from the northern part of this province, is particularly well qualified to undertake the promotion of winter activities such as skiing, skating and tobogganing. It would seem to me that comparatively little effort would be required to provide these facilities to the public, and thereby create year-round use of our parks.

I turn now to the existing facilities in our parks. I believe this portion of the resolution is just as important if not more so as the extension of the parkland area. Certainly, sir, we can be justly proud of our parks development programme. Ten or 11 years ago there were only about six or eight provincial parks, accommodating a few hundred thousand visitors annually, whereas today there are 96 parks with annual attendance of about ten million persons. This to me is clearly indicative of the manner in which the demand has been met and recognizes the need. It is interesting to note that Ontario's total park and park reserve areas of over four million acres are only 25 per cent less than the combined total acreage of all state parks in the United States.

In this last decade, over $20 million has been spent on parkland, improvements and equipment. So, Mr. Speaker, I offer no criticism in respect of expansion of total area facilities. However, our changing society demands change in many things and the services and the facilities in public parks are no exception. Those who use the provincial parks are grateful for such things as the sanitary services, the fireplace grills, garbage collection and the water supply. They are also grateful for the generally high calibre of the attendants in the parks, the lifeguards and the first-aid people.

In fact, for those who utilize our parks for picnic purposes only, I think there can be no complaint of any kind. Those who make only a one-day stop will find just about everything they could possibly require. But I am not at this time concerned about this particular group. My concern is for those who stop overnight for one or more days, or perhaps weeks. In other words, the campers.

A few years ago, perhaps 15 or more years, a camper was one who mainly used a tent for his overnight accommodation. This was a back-to-the-great-outdoors programme and people who filled their recreation needs in this manner expected to rough it. This hardy type of outdoors man still exists and I can only say, more power to him, if this is his choice.

But the last ten years or so have seen more and more of the not-so-hardy types take to the outdoors and the wide open spaces for an escape from the confines and the fenced-in living circumstances in our large urban centres. There is a great need to move about with freedom and safety, to breathe fresh air, to avoid the noise and the commotion of city living and to be able to relax and enjoy oneself in peace and quietness. Our provincial parks are meeting this need in a magnificent manner, Mr. Speaker. In spite of the sometimes crowded holiday period, entire families —not just the father and the sons, but the mother and the girls and the babies and even the grandparents—now participate. This is the modern style of camping—a family affair, where everyone participates in an atmosphere of cooperation and togetherness, where family relationships are developed with a

spirit of mental and physical and spiritual well-being.

The programme is not just confined to one family, groups of neighbours and friends and relatives from distant points have an opportunity to live together and to learn to know each other in a manner not previously possible.

This movement has become so popular, sir, that there are now several campers' associations having memberships numbering in the tens of thousands. For example, the national campers and hikers association incorporated, having its headquarters in Buffalo, New York, has just recently chartered chapter No. 1000. There are several affiliated chapters of this organization in the province of Ontario and each member of these groups is dedicated to the cause of promoting good camping practices. They set the pattern for all others to follow in such programmes as the protection of wildlife and forest growth. They promote cleanliness in and around the camp grounds. They engage in programmes to prevent litter on highways and in our parks.

In 1966, members of the national campers and hikers association collected over 125,000 pounds of trash along the United States highways and parks and I am sure that corresponding statistics for Ontario could be available.

Mr. Speaker, we have today, a new fraternity representing a vast segment of our total society. The needs of these people must be met and, as suggested earlier, these needs are much different from the needs of the tent camper of 10 or 15 or 20 years ago. Evolution has produced the large modern cottage-style camp, with two or more rooms to accommodate an entire family.

We also have the popular tent trailer, which is simply a compact collapsible tent affair embodied in a two-wheel trailer, but which is a far cry from the old style tent with ground sheets to keep out the dampness.

The ultra-modern concept is the completely self-contained travel trailer. This represents the accommodation used today by the modern, sissy-style camper, but which nevertheless provides the means by which entire families, including the females, and the babies and the grandparents can now participate in this popular recreational programme.

The modern travel trailer comes complete with refrigeration, and operates usually on propane gas or electricity. Some have heating systems using propane gas and others even include an air-conditioning unit. Cooking is done on built-in stoves also using propane gas and the lighting systems operate on gas, the electrical system of the car or they can be plugged into regular electrical outlets at the camp site.

Some are equipped with water storage tanks, with their own electrically-operated compressors, to provide water pressure for sink taps or even a built-in shower compartment, while others, without their own storage tanks, have provision for connection to a camp site water system by means of a hose connector.

Perhaps the most important innovation is the self-contained toilet, with a sewage-holding septic tank. It has a capacity of from three to five days usage. These modern conveniences to be found in a modern travel trailer can go a long way towards relieving the need for overall camp ground facilities, that is if proper provision is made so that trailer campers can utilize the equipment in their trailers. Accommodation provided in the parks for other campers will not be so heavily burdened. The most important need is for sewage facilities and, while it would be desirable to have a system with individual hook-ups at each trailer site, this is not entirely essential.

A disposal station located near the trailer section in the camp ground would be adequate to begin with, as all trailers equipped with a toilet and holding tanks could use the station before entering or leaving the park. For those who would be camping for longer than a few days, of course, the individual connection would be much more convenient.

I have learned that at least two more of the major oil companies in the United States are planning to install sanitary dumping stations for recreational vehicles on their service station property along major United States highways. This makes a total, sir, of approximately 25 companies that are now catering to the campers, by providing special facilities for discharging holding tank waste. I suggest that such a programme in Ontario, and across Canada, in fact, would certainly be a great help. I am sure that campers would patronize those service stations that provided the service, particularly campers who use oil company credit cards while driving across the country.

Also, sir, in this connection I would suggest that The Ontario Department of Highways, in cooperation with The Department of Tourism and Information might well undertake such a programme at their service centres on Highways 401 and 400.

During a meeting of the standing committee on government commissions earlier this

year, the officials of the St. Lawrence parks commission informed me that they have provided trailer sewage facilities in one of the camp grounds and that two more are being provided for this year. This is certainly good news and I commend the commission and its chairman, the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Guindon), for their actions. Surely this will serve as an example for our provincial park authorities.

Recently, a survey was made of all of the Ontario camping association chapters, as well as a sampling from Nova Scotia, and one from New Brunswick, and it is interesting to note that 73.8 per cent of campers are using either tent trailers or the mobile-home type of travel trailer. The remainder were using tents. This is a clear indication of the trend in camping and points out the seriousness of the sanitation problem.

The second in importance in facilities is the provision of electrical service. All travel trailers, and some tent trailers, require this and here is one respect in which our provincial parks fall behind in bringing their park facilities up to the existing standards. A government publication for the guidance of private camp ground operators in the province sets forth licensing requirements in Ontario and included therein is the need for water, electricity and sewage connections.

Mention is also made of the need to provide proper road access to trailer sections so that maximum mobility is possible. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members will have concluded by this time, that I, myself, am a trailer enthusiast. This is quite true, sir.

During the past 10 years I have covered thousands of miles on this continent from coast to coast, using a travel trailer to do so. In addition to the need for adequate water, electrical and sewage connections, there is a great need for more attention to be given to the general layout of the trailer section in our provincial parks.

In the course of my travels, I have encountered many camp grounds on this continent that were certainly not designed to accommodate the modern trailer. The individual campsites are not angled to permit use and ease of entry and exit. The access roads consist of many right-angled turns which are almost impossible to manoeuvre, and the roads themselves are so narrow that it is very difficult, if not impossible, for two trailers to pass.

One example, sir, in our provincial parks system that I wish to comment upon, is the Pinery on Lake Huron. As fine a park as this is, generally speaking, and as highly patronized as it is, there is much to be desired insofar as the accommodation for trailers is concerned.

The roads here are narrow, the individual campsites have narrow entrances at right angles to the road and, in most cases, a modern 18-foot travel trailer simply cannot manoeuvre into position in one of the campsites. Some of the newer sections in this park have very narrow, sandy roads and many a trailer has ended up stuck in the sand and pitched at a precarious angle in danger of toppling over.

I have experienced this personally and, in my fruitless search for a trailer site in this otherwise splendid park, the most perplexing aspect is that these sections bear no warning signs that trailers should not enter. I would hope, sir, that some action will be taken to correct this situation not only at the Pinery but in numerous other parks where trailer accommodation is something less than adequate.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that we have one of the finest park systems on this continent and I speak from personal experience and knowledge. I do hope, however, that all hon. members will support this resolution and that the Minister for Lands and Forests will do everything within his ability and power, to correct some of the deficiencies I have presented to you today.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, it is always a nice sight to see the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) take the place of the Deputy Speaker's position and I am sure it is an honour to the House to have you in that chair today.

My hon. friend, who brought in this resolution concerning parks, certainly put forth the story in a good manner concerning the outlook or the concept of the trailer-owner and the camper who moves by mobile vehicle. I, too, would like to deal with this resolution in its four phases and initially that of the classification of public parks. I know this resolution appeared on our order paper on the second day of the session and it would almost appear that this was an arrangement that had been made between our new Minister of Lands and Forests and the hon. gentleman. This particular phase of the resolution has been carried forth and I have a compliment for the new Minister on this.

I would like to add a few suggestions whereby The Department of Lands and

Forests could carry this classification matter a little further. On our road maps and recreation maps, our provincial parks are indicated by a little green tree. Possibly on this classification system, other symbols could be added to indicate whether full facilities or only partial facilities are available. Also, at the park sites themselves, coloured symbols could indicate right at the roadside as to what facilities are available within the park itself for the motorist who is not carrying the map of this type.

One further suggestion: I have noted that as you go by many of our small parks, they simply have a sign "closed". I would suggest to the new Minister of Lands and Forests that possibly the closing and reopening dates be posted at these campsites in order that our travelling public might be aware of the situation. But to return to the classification of public parks—and I think that this goes far beyond just the parks that are run by The Department of Lands and Forests—I feel that one authority in our province must have not exactly full charge, but must have the direction of authority in this matter.

Where we have municipal parks, county parks, forests, conservation parks, forests and highway parks, the St. Lawrence parks commission, Niagara parks commission, our new parkway development and planning and development of parks, even including the new proposed Bruce trail, should all be answerable and under the direction of one authority. I feel that this, Mr. Speaker, could be carried out by combining many of the offices of Lands and Forests in The Department of Energy and Resources Management into one corporate body. And I believe this was recommended in the select committee on conservation. For then if this were the case, Mr. Speaker, a classification can be meaningful and effective and then long range and proper planning of parks can be undertaken. Plan variety, proper promotion and certain economies in the purchasing of equipment and supplies, and certainly more satisfactory results and economy will come to our taxpayer.

The second point to the hon. member's resolution dealt with increasing the number of parks in southwestern Ontario. Certainly as a member from this area I would not argue against this point. But I feel that this resolution should be much broader to include all of Ontario, not just southwestern Ontario. I realize the density of population in our area but parks can be an economic tool and can be used in other parts of Ontario equally as well.

As I mentioned before, we must add to the variety of parks not strictly to the Lands and Forest theme. I feel there should be more roadside parks by The Department of Lands and Forests and The Department of Highways, and these possibly could have trailer or tenting facilities. There should be more scenic viewing parks. I know in the riding of the hon. member for Kent West (Mr. McKeough) organizations to which I belong have been trying to promote the acquisition of a parcel of land which is right on Lake Erie. Hundreds of motorists stop each month where they can see Lake Erie—a large ocean as it appears to many of our inland visitors. This is the only spot, close to Lake Erie, and they are making no headway. But here is a natural for The Department of Lands and Forests or The Department of Highways to come up with a scenic viewing park.

After travelling with the conservation committee I am most impressed with conservation authority parks and their programme as it relates to the local people. I feel that we need more of this type of park, plus the fact that many of our small communities are building parks under The Parks Assistance Act, and this can be a real benefit to our small communities. Further, as we travel our major highways in the jurisdictions to the south of us we see rest areas. These could be combined with small parks along Highway 400 or 401, little rest areas with a park-like setting. To broaden this concept even further, Mr. Speaker, I feel that waterfalls, and game refuges or wetland preserves, are in fact an important type of park that could be acquired and expanded in our province.

The resolution states southwestern Ontario, for certainly this is where the centre of population is in our province. The greatest influx of tourists who come into our province certainly come into the Niagara and Windsor areas, and here is where the best chance of financial success for parks lays. Certainly the Rondeau provincial park, Holiday Beach provincial park and the Pinery are financial successes, and in these areas more resident and non-resident game and fishing licences can be sold, adding to the economy of our province. The fact that we are in this high density area, more recreation at close proximity is available to our large populace, and it is essential to have some of these parks close to our urban areas.

The hon. member in his resolution calls for improved facilities in all parks within our province, that is showers, hot water, electrical outlets and sewage disposal. Here is one

point where I disagree with the hon. member because I feel that all parks necessarily do not require this. Maybe one or two classifications of parks should have all these facilities, but certain of our parks, whether provincial or county or local, are too small to provide these facilities. Other parks should be left to nature and the rugged individualists and other parks may be in too close proximity to established free enterprise, who already are providing these facilities and I personally feel that they should not be developed to the point where they compete and put private enterprise out of business, as has happened in many cases, not only in my riding but in other areas of the province. We all have a place to work in the park and recreation field. However, all main parks in our province should have these facilities because I realize that there is a dearth of fully-serviced camp sites in our province. The trailer caravans and the week-end gatherings in these caravans are growing in number—they are growing in size and could benefit communities all over the province, if the facilities are there to attract these caravans. I know from my own experience as a merchant that the caravans that congregate in the parks in my area bring great revenue to our own communities.

Speaking of these trailers and caravans, one of the major needs along our major highways and the remote areas of our province is that sites are not fully developed to attract these caravans. I think the hon. member's suggestion that the sanitation services being available at our service stations is very worth while; these would really become service stations, not just another retail outlet. The hon. member expanded his resolution by suggesting winter promotion by adding facilities for skating, skiing, tobogganing, ice fishing. He neglected to mention skidooing, which I believe is becoming very popular in our province. From a tourist standpoint and for the economy of these outlying areas, there is a need to lengthen our tourist season.

In many areas, such as my own, there is a lack of winter recreation. I think the whole concept of provincial parks and other parks has been to purchase these and develop them strictly for summer use. This government may have to develop a new concept of parks to facilitate moving into the winter recreation business. This might entail the development of lodges in some of our provincial parks for the encouragement of the development by private industry of lodges or motels near the entrance of the parks where these recreation facilities may be available.

I believe skiing has been a real boon up in the Pinery. It attracts people from London, Windsor, Sarnia and in the southern areas. Ice fishing could certainly be developed and promoted; I believe there are literally thousands of huts out on Lake Simcoe—this is a great attraction, as I know ice fishing in my own riding attracts many hundreds of American visitors. I might mention, too, that summer fishing in our provincial parks, or other parks, can be very attractive. In Holiday Beach provincial park, sir, one of the first put-and-take trout ponds was established; it is annually drawing a good many hundred people for that sport.

This resolution of the hon. member is something that we in the House can all agree upon. Many of the items that have been suggested this government possibly should have done long ago. Parks, as I mentioned before, can be a tool of economic development. They can develop the less fortunate parts of our province where possibly industry cannot go and provide much-needed jobs. Recreation is a big industry. There are many hundreds of thousands of dollars in the people's pockets just waiting to be spent on recreation because the people need parks to escape the rat race of everyday living. I believe the recent tourist survey on hunting and fishing underlines this very substantially. We can realize the dollar value in return to our province, to our merchants and to those in the accommodation business.

As I stated at the outset, there should be one body to coordinate all activities of the various types of parks to allow flexibility by the municipalities for the small communities, townships or counties to develop parks to suit their own need. But there should be an overall coordinating body. One last thought on parks. I believe that at one of our recent meetings here a submission was made that we should have a major national park established in our province during this, our Centennial year. I realize that the province must acquire this land and deed it to the federal government. I think this is a very worthwhile objective, whether it can be carried out in 1967 or in 1970. My own experience with having the major national park within the bounds of my own riding is that it annually attracts 800,000 visitors. Its concept is somewhat different to that of our provincial system. I think it would add to the flavour of parks in our province and attract more people to our province.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution, I am very much interested in this whole problem of parks, the development of parks, and the use of parks, not only in the part of the province I represent but in the province in total. One of the reasons that I am particularly interested, perhaps, came about from an experience my wife and I had two years ago in July in driving up through western Canada to western Ontario into the northern part of Minnesota, up into the Dakotas and up as far as Montana. We checked the parks in those western states, in the northern parts where they get a tremendous number of tourists over the year, winter and summer—particularly in the summer months, of course. In going up from Shelby, Montana into the Lethbridge area and over into British Columbia, lower British Columbia, the mainland area, we came in contact with a number of excellent parks, small and large.

Mr. Speaker, these were not confined by any means to the lower part of the province of British Columbia, because in company with the hon. Speaker of the House, we visited about a month later, by motor car again, my wife and I, travelling through Winnipeg to Saskatoon, Edmonton, across to Jasper and on into the northern part of the country. We particularly chose the opportunity to visit parks, checking on the facilities that were offered in the various areas. It was quite surprising to see in many of the small communities and villages, that roadside parks had been established just beyond the confines of the village, perhaps two or three hundred yards away.

It was not difficult for people who were driving to go into the village itself and buy supplies. These facilities were supplied with excellent toilet facilities, tables and benches; the grass was properly taken care of, weeds were not in evidence, the refuse containers were colourful and attractive—not the oil barrels that we unfortunately see across our highways and in so many of our parks in this province. We found, too, that in every area in the western provinces and western states that we visited, through the provincial or the state operation, these parks were kept well policed from the point of trash being about. Water was in excellent supply. All in all, they offered a great deal to the travelling public.

I think that we in Ontario should be proud of the parks we have here. Excellent progress has been made over the years in the improvement of our parks; I speak with particular interest of the park at Kakabeka Falls, up in the Fort William area. I am sure many of the members of this House have visited that park. While it has been extended slightly in the recent past, I would call to your attention Mr. Speaker, that in 1964 Kakabeka Falls, with an area of somewhat less than 1,000 acres, had in excess of 425,000 visitors, whereas Algonquin park, with an area of just under two million acres, had visitors in the number of some 475,000. So that the area of under 1,000 acres attracted nearly the same number of people, within a reasonable stone's throw of the same number of people as did Algonquin park, with close to two million acres.

My suggestion over the past has been, and I am afraid it has fallen on rather dull or unhearing ears, that it would be a splendid investment for the province, to increase the size of Kakabeka and the facilities offered to the travelling public. It has been said by the previous speakers that people today are using trailers in greater number, and of course they are. We see them on every highway. These people want proper places for their trailers. Unfortunately, in our part of Ontario we do not have too many trailer parks, that is to say trailer parks that are properly serviced, where they can plug into electricity and get good water supplies and have other facilities and amenities that the travelling public has a right to expect.

I was glad to see that this new 1867-1967 map bears the names of the hon. George E. Gomme, the hon. James A. C. Auld, and hon. Rene Brunelle, as well as the Prime Minister of the province (Mr. Robarts). I think this is a splendid thing. But I hopefully suggest that these departments get together in this area of tourism, and particularly with regard to parks and the roadside and provincial parks. I think this is an area where the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) has a real job to do. Our roadside parks leave much that is wanting, not only in number and location, in the equipment supplied, in the surroundings. In most cases they are bare pieces of land with two or three or four tables at most placed here and there, with people sitting out in the sun while they go through their potato salad—I presume that is what they do on a hot summer day. But I would think that if these places were chosen properly—and this can be done, surely, where we have many trees—areas can be chosen that are reasonably well treed, and then the roadside parking areas developed within those areas. The same is true where there are trees; you could have

luncheon tables or picnic tables and other facilities that we know are required.

I am afraid not too much attention over the years has been paid to this very important problem. I think we all agree without argument that the number of people who are travelling our highways is increasing each year. I am sure we all appreciate the fact that as the years go by the number of cars and other vehicles using our highways is increasing. The degree to which these people are travelling, and the extended trips they are taking, proves that people are on the move; they want to go places, they want to see things, they want to experience recreational opportunities in the wilderness state that we have in this province. And we have the wilderness, we have all that these people would require, all that they need.

Getting back to some of the other features that I would like to briefly mention, Mr. Speaker, I know in such places as Kakabeka Falls, and while I have only visited one portion of Algonquin in recent years, and I have only had an opportunity to visit Quetico three or four times in the last few years, of course, the facilities there are much better perhaps, in some respects, than they are in any other part of Ontario. One of the things that I have come in contact with, in visiting the various parks, the larger parks in particular, is the fact that travellers, both our own people and people from other countries, are unhappy over the fact that telephone facilities, that is, pay telephones, are not too readily available. They would appreciate, I know, if some way could be found to establish proper pay telephones in these larger parks and particularly some theft-proof way to make it possible to supply change facilities for them, somehow or other, whether it be in the park building or where else it might be, to give these people an opportunity to stay in touch with their families or with their businesses and so on while they are away. Many people have mentioned this to me and I believe this could be done with the telephone facilities we have available to us in this province at the present time—this could be an asset financially, perhaps in a small way, but certainly it would be a method of excellent service to the travelling public.

This, I think is particularly true this year, Centennial year, when we should have—I hope we do not have too many and have the roads all blocked—thousands more cars travelling through northern Ontario, to central Ontario, to eastern Ontario into Quebec.

If we offer them the facilities that they feel they should have, and which we could well do if we put our minds to it, they may come back the same way—so that we have an opportunity to entertain them, and to assist them to spend their money, in both directions, east and west.

I would hope, as time goes on, that we may have an opportunity to discuss certain problems with regard to northwestern Ontario from the tourist point of view, as well as the general travellers' point of view, with the various Ministers involved and whose names appear on this very splendid map.

I would assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the gentlemen involved, that I will have no hesitation whatever, at any time, in making the cause of northwestern Ontario well known to your minds, and I would hope that you would give me an attentive ear. I very enthusiastically endorse the resolution by the hon. member for Waterloo South.

Mr. L. Bernier (Kenora): As the representative of that great northwestern riding of Kenora, it is certainly a pleasure, and my desire, to add my comments in support of this very fine resolution.

The previous speakers have dealt at some length on this long range programme for the development of our public parks in a number of areas in our province. I doubt, however, if these speakers, outside of the hon. member for Fort William, have an area that lends itself better to the development of these parks than my particular area of northwestern Ontario. However, I certainly agree with their requests and I know that their suggestions, when implemented, will be welcomed throughout this whole province.

Now in connection with section (a) of the resolution, I do want to join the member for Waterloo South in complimenting the Minister of Lands and Forests in advising this House of the decision to classify all public parks in this province. I would like to now just review the comments of the Minister of Lands and Forests when he made that statement in this House on March 16 of this year.

He announced to the Legislature, a policy on the classification of all present and future provincial parks in this province. The Minister stated:

> In addition, all lands within the parks will be zoned for planning, development and management purposes, and that a long range master plan is to be prepared for each park to provide this development and management, in harmony with the purpose

of the park class to which it belongs. The government anticipates that through this park classification system, the public will be enabled to gain a better appreciation of the various types of parks and the general kinds of facilities to be found therein.

Future publications on public parks, the Minister stated—I believe one of the previous speakers mentioned this, will relate existing parks to this new park classification system. I am sure that all hon. members will agree with me that the Minister of Lands and Forests should be complimented on this action.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with section (b) of this resolution, in which a request is made for an increase in the number of public parks in southwestern Ontario, the government is also aware of this need, and this was shown in the remarks made in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of this session, wherein it was announced that four new provincial parks are to be opened in this province this year, one of which is the Selkirk provincial park on Lake Erie. This park will have a daily capacity of about 2,500 day visitors and will provide approximately 150 camp sites for tents and trailers.

I must also admit that I was very pleased to learn in that same Throne Speech that an additional park would be constructed in my own area, at Sandbar Lake, just north of Ignace. It was also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that over the past two years, under its land-acquisition programme, The Department of Lands and Forests has acquired approximately 3,250 acres of parkland in southwestern Ontario, in the form of additions to existing parks such as Pinery, Ipperwash, Wheatley, Turkey Point and others, and also for new park areas.

This land-acquisition programme is continuing and a considerable number of additional areas are in various stages of negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, while this resolution requests additional parks for southwestern Ontario, I do want to point out here that we in northwestern Ontario also have a need for addition of such parks. The area that I have in mind is one that lies between Kenora and the Manitoba boundary. I must admit that at the moment, we have a very fine development some 15 miles east of Kenora at Rushing River. I am told that construction is planned on an additional park at Pipestone peninsula down Highway 71. However, there is a need for a public trailer park between the Manitoba boundary and Kenora, and I hope that the officials of The Department of Lands and Forests in their future considerations will take a long look at this very important item.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Waterloo South has dealt very ably and fully with section (c) of this resolution. I certainly want to compliment him on his thoughts in this regard.

I would, in this section of the resolution, like to take two minutes and elaborate on the policy of The Department of Lands and Forests, to provide in our provincial parks these needed facilities of which the member for Waterloo South speaks.

It is recognized that many people would like to see more facilities than now exist. In fact, some would seem to favour a virtual transplanting of urban-type facilities into park environment. I do not feel that this is in keeping with the provincial park concept. We must be mindful also, Mr. Speaker, of the cost of providing these facilities, which may involve considerable expense. Our first concern must be for the health and safety of our park visitors. To these ends, expenditure priorities must be carefully established; no doubt they are by The Department of Lands and Forests.

We know that hot and cold running water, showers and more electrical outlets are now being provided in Ipperwash, Rondeau, Long Point and other provincial parks in southwestern Ontario. The Department of Lands and Forests has these needs under constant careful review at all times. There are, Mr. Speaker, at present, or will be in use this year, 145 modern comfort stations in 43 of our provincial parks and 233 pressure systems in 67 of these parks. Included in the latter figure are 19 central water systems which are in operation, under construction or planned for construction in this current year.

In recognition of the fact that in 1966, 14 per cent of the total campsite permits issued were for house trailers and another six per cent were for camp backers and bus campers, The Department of Lands and Forests has undertaken a programme of trailer sanitary station construction. These stations are expected to be in operation this year in 27 of the parks throughout this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this section of the resolution I would like to express a few of my own personal thoughts. While this may not be the correct time, I do feel it has a certain connection with the parks system, and, of course, our major highways, and that is the

collection of garbage from the travelling public, especially along our major arteries. I believe that we in the province of Ontario can accept some of the experiences and the ideas from our prairie provinces, such as Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, in this regard.

No doubt many of the hon. members have toured the western provinces and have noticed these familiar signs along the major highways which read "Put your garbage in orbit—10 seconds". I will explain, Mr. Speaker, "Orbit" is a very large spherical design white fibreglass container mounted on four stainless steel legs, placed in close proximity to the highway pavement edge. A passing motorist has easy and ready access to this attractive refuse container. We in Ontario can compare this to our painted 45-gallon barrels that are placed along the highway, and I might add, sometimes quite a distance from the main travelled section of the highway. In fact, we see more warning signs as to the penalty for littering our highways than we actually see of these containers.

I must repeat, sir, that these white orbit refuse containers do command a considerable amount of interest and consideration on the part of the travelling public and I feel that our whole attitude of litter control on our major highways, warrants some consideration such as I have mentioned.

Now, section (d) of this resolution is a matter which demanded considerable discussion and thought in the great northwest and I am pleased to learn that The Department of Lands and Forests recognizes the demand for winter activity facilities and that they fully recognize that there is an opportunity to make more efficient use of our park facilities by extending the annual period of use.

The Department of Lands and Forests has operated facilities for winter activities in four of our provincial parks. These parks are Pinery in the Aylmer-forest district, Darlington in the Lindsay district and Kakabeka Falls in the Port Arthur district. Winter facilities include a ski hill operation in Pinery plus toboggan slides and skating rinks. During the past winter, these facilities, Mr. Speaker were used by over 20,000 visitors.

Just a few days ago in this House, we learned from the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) that there was a substantial increase in the tourist spending in the winter months of January, February and March. Certainly this is an indication that people throughout this whole province, indeed this whole area, are taking more to winter recreation. The improvement and the increasing popularity of the power toboggan alone has certainly opened up a very large field to winter recreation.

Just three years ago, we were told that in the midwestern states there were only 1,500 power toboggans and now it is estimated there are over 20,000 in this particular area. These people are certainly most anxious for a place to go and things to do in the winter months. Certainly, we in Ontario have much to offer them if we open up our parks on a winter recreational basis.

It is not my belief that the government should become involved in such winter recreational programmes in direct competition with the established facilities of private enterprise. However, I feel that thought should be given to allowing free enterprise in these areas to promote such winter sport activities.

It being six of the clock, the House took recess.

No. 66

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, April 17, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 17, 1967

Estimates, Department of Tourism and Information, Mr. Auld, concluded 2259

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett 2275

Motion to adjourn. Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 2288

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The twentieth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION
(Concluded)

On vote 2109:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, at the time the House adjourned, the Minister of travel and publicity (Mr. Auld) had just finished delivering himself of a fascinating politicial diatribe prepared far in advance of what he anticipated we might say. He was quite correct. He knew, he felt that things were very difficult insofar as this estimate is concerned and his prepared, predigested pre-insulting diatribe really did not answer any questions that we posed.

Now, let me pose the question again to the hon. Minister. He set up sort of a straw man in attempting to compare his performance with the performance of a galaxy of important individuals in the life of the metropolitan area of Toronto who designed and built—it is important, I say—the city hall. That building stands in all its glory as a memorial to those people who were responsible for it. It is there, and it is standing and it is a building of magnificence that people come from all over the world to see and examine.

The Minister, for some peculiar reason best known to himself or his advisors who write his speeches for him, designed some sort of a speech around an anticipated attack. I can only suggest, sir, that he is far too sensitive. The fact is that the city of Toronto did build a building that stands as a monument to the imagination and the ingenuity of those city fathers who were responsible for it.

But I ask this Minister what building has he built? He has got a few holes in the ground up there in Don Mills and Eglinton Avenue. That is all. Nothing there except a big hole in the mud.

Now, how can he possibly draw a comparison between what happened down at the corner of Queen and Bay streets and what is happening up in the corner of Don Mills and Eglinton? I mean, it is ridiculous. The Minister unfortunately places himself in this absolutely untenuous position where he draws a comparison between oranges and apples. So it really does not make any sense at all. What we want to know, Mr. Chairman, from this Minister is—

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): What kind of a position?

Mr. Singer: Well, a completely untenuous position. The position that you are unable to uphold of—

An hon. member: Untenable.

Mr. Singer: Untenable, I stand corrected by the more grammatically exact colleagues that I have here.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): You mean the same thing?

Mr. Singer: Yes, exactly the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, there is a wealth of difference in the meaning.

Mr. Singer: Completely untenable position the Minister has asserted tonight.

Mr. Sopha: Untenuous reasoning.

Mr. Singer: My colleague, the hon. member for Sudbury, puts it so well.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am tempted to ask my friend if he knows the difference between disgruntled and gruntled.

Mr. Singer: Well, I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Ontario are disgruntled about the position that the Minister and his colleagues take in this Legislature tonight—lacking explanation, hiding figures, refraining from revealing to the taxpayers the true position—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): You are gruntled.

Mr. Singer: Gruntled. I do not know. Gruntled is a word the hon. member has

invented tonight, and I won't even attempt to define that.

The disgruntled people certainly are the majority people of the province of Ontario. Let me say this, I think that the Minister owes to this House and to the people of Ontario several simple and specific answers.

Why did the Centennial project grow from a cost of $5 million to $30 million without any explanation? Why did the high-sounding phrases enunciated by his leader, the Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Robarts), disappear three years after they were uttered? When is the Centennial project going to be completed, would he hazard a guess? I suggest that even the brave Minister of travel and publicity is not that brave. Finally, when it is built, how much is it going to cost?

Now, if the Minister can answer those four questions we can carry on with the debate.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought that I had covered those points pretty fully with the exception of the completion date just before five o'clock. However, it would appear from the predictions of the contractors in The Department of Public Works that two of the three buildings which are presently under construction will be completed and occupied in March of 1968, and the centre building in October of 1968. It would appear at the moment that the opening would be in October, 1968, for the first part—the first two buildings that I mentioned—and the third building some time in mid- or early 1969.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I should point out again, as I have mentioned before, that our completion date is basically in the hands of the contractor. As I mentioned in this House at this time or a little earlier last year, the government decided, and I think quite properly and quite wisely, that this would not be a project which would be pressed to completion on a crash programme with extra time for overtime and so on; that we were at a time of very heavy pressure on the construction industry in the Metropolitan Toronto area, as well as other places in the province. We felt that there were other projects such as hospitals and schools, to name only two, which had priority. We wanted to have a quality product, if I can put it that way, and for this reason we are not going to try and get an unrealistically early date of completion.

I am going to say, Mr. Chairman, that at the dinner hour I was reading some of today's mail and I see at the national Centennial committee meeting which is to be held in Quebec city next Monday, the second item on the agenda is a request from the province of Saskatchewan for an extension of the completion date of their memorial project. So I might say that we are not alone in not being able to complete our provincial project—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You ought to choose your company a little more carefully.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, of course, I would say to the hon. member for York South that I believe that the Centennial project had its genesis in the government before the present government in Saskatchwan. However, as I say, we are not alone in the problem about completion date.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. White: The member for Downsview is now very gruntled.

Mr. Singer: My friend, the member for London South, builds courthouses so beautifully. I hope he will build a Centennial centre, and if he could bring the same talents to bear on a Centennial centre as he brings to bear on a courthouse, we would perhaps have both these buildings built.

However, Mr. Chairman, be that as it may, it seems rather strange that the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information would so casually and cavalierly dismiss the renowned words of his leader, the moving words of his leader, which I read to you this afternoon. Now, the leader said positively, the Prime Minister of the province of Ontario said: "By July 1, 1967. You can believe me, because I am the Prime Minister, we will open the first phase of this building."

Then the Minister says you would not want us to rush into this thing. Is the Minister suggesting that his leader was second guessing as the Minister is doing tonight? Is the Minister renouncing his leader? Was the leader wrong in August of 1964 when he made this statement? And surely this government which produces Minister after Minister who stands up in his place and says: "We are the greatest in Canada, we are the greatest in North America, we are the greatest in the world", surely this Minister would not want to follow, he would want to lead. Well, Mr. Chairman, here we are on April 17, 1967, and we are faced with the anomalous position of this Minister denouncing his leader, saying that what his leader said in 1964 was not worth the glowing phrases

that were attributed to that statement; was not worth the paper on which the PR man had written that statement.

"Ignore my leader", says the Minister of travel and publicity. "Robarts does not know what he is talking about, I know better. It will not be finished in 1967, it will not be finished in 1968 and maybe it will be finished in 1969. We cannot tell you how much it is going to cost; perhaps $30 million—we have moved from five to thirty—it is a small multiplication".

Mr. Chairman, in this day and age one would expect better of an hon. Minister who sits so proudly on the Treasury benches of the government. Surely one would expect that when the Prime Minister of the province arises in all his dignity, with all the power at his command, that his words would be meaningful, that his words would convey to junior members of the Cabinet, such as the Minister of travel and publicity, that there was some significance; that when he brings out these resounding paragraphs and phrases composed by the best PR men that the taxpayers of the province of Ontario can hire, surely one would anticipate, Mr. Chairman, that this means something.

But here on April 17, 1967, the Minister of travel and publicity casually gets up and brushes it all aside. My leader said, but pay no attention. He said one phase would be finished on July 1, 1967, and the Minister says—and he beats his breast—you would not want us to rush into anything, you would not want the people of Ontario to believe what the Prime Minister said. No, no. He was misguided; he was stupid; he was foolish. Believe what I say. Believe what I, the Minister of travel and publicity, say on April 17.

Well, surely the time has come in the province of Ontario when one should know with which voice the Treasury benches speak. If it is not the voice of the Prime Minister, how then can we have any faith in this junior Minister who is unable to tell us how much this project is going to cost; who after an afternoon of barracking, finally lifts the ante from $5 million to $30 million; who finally postpones the completion date of anything by setting up a storm and saying: "Remember what happened in the city of Toronto." Remember, the city of Toronto built a building. You have nothing more than a foundation of mud, that is all.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the time has come when the people of Ontario are entitled to an explanation. If we cannot believe the Prime Minister, how can we believe the Minister of travel and publicity?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister in respect to the report about certain phases of the annual report of the Centennial centre of science and technology. On one of the pages, under organization, he says here:

> As a result of this survey and after a study by the civil service commission, a recommendation was made that the Centennial centre had reached the level of size and complexity which made it desirable to set up the centre as a separate agency of government, rather than as a branch of The Department of Tourism and Information. This proposal was recommended to the board of trustees who approved it in the course of a regular meeting.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a copy of Bill 114, 1965, and section 4 of that bill says this:

> The affairs of the centre are under the control of a board, and the board has all the powers necessary or convenient to perform its duties or achieve the object of a centre. The board is responsible to the Minister.

And, in section 5, subsection (2):

> The director of a centre shall have the management and administration of the centre, subject to the supervision and direction of the board.

Now, this would seem, if I read it correctly, Mr. Chairman, that this was not set up as a branch of the department, but rather it was an independent entity from the very beginning. I find it hard to understand what this means. Rather than a branch, it is going to be set up as a separate agency of government. I wonder if the Minister would explain to us what is meant here?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned this afternoon, in the initial phase of the centre's existence many of the administrative functions of the centre were carried out by the administrative branch and other branches of my department. I think I used the words—in the normal evolution or growth of the centre and of its responsibilities and its staff, a point came when it was felt desirable to have its entire administration in its own hands, rather than being done by the staff of the department. The O-and-M study indicated that that period had been reached, consequently this is what was done.

If my hon. friend will read the section 2 of Bill 114 of the Act setting it up he will see that there is established on behalf of Her Majesty in the right of Ontario, a corporation without share capital under the name of the Centennial centre of science and technology.

I can only say to him that when the centre was set up there was no requirement that its administration be done by its own staff rather than another staff, and it was considered that eventually it would reach the point where it would be entirely separate. This point was reached last summer.

Mr. Young: Well, was this point reached in the fall of 1966 or earlier than that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: In my recollection, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps I can confirm it, in the late spring or early summer the request was made to the organization of the methods branch of Treasury to take a look at the organization and make the necessary or whatever recommendation they saw fit. This was done, and the final report—the preliminary report, as I recall—was in either June or July—the final report was September 28, at which time the present organization was adopted.

Mr. Young: That is, the present organization was set up after the final report was in, and this would be after the original staff had separated itself from the centre?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not quite. Actually the new organization was adopted in August of 1966—the basic changes were made at that time, the final nomenclature, and staff was adopted after the final report of O-and-M.

Mr. Young: That would be the meeting of the board in August of 1966, and this would be the first meeting of the board after May?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Oh no, Mr. Chairman. I think that the board meets monthly, although I cannot recall the dates that they met in August and July. The executive committee as it is now called—it was then called the standing committee—meets weekly, I believe.

Mr. Young: But did the board, in fact, meet during the summer months up until August?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, it met on two occasions that I can remember specifically. If my hon. friend will give me a moment I will give him the dates. I am afraid I do not have in front of me the dates of every meeting, but I know that they met on one occasion in August and I believe that they met on two occasions in July.

Mr. Young: And, the minutes of those board meetings were kept by the secretary?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I presume so.

Mr. Young: But do you know?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, the minutes of any board are kept by the secretary or his—

Mr. Singer: It says here—

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would say the minutes of all meetings are in existence, but the minutes of any meeting are kept by the secretary of the board, or whoever is standing in for that secretary, if the secretary is not there.

Mr. Young: Well, Mr. Chairman, would the Minister table the minutes of those meetings during the summer months?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would be prepared to ask the board if they are prepared to have their minutes tabled.

Mr. Singer: Minutes, minutes, who has got the minutes?

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): You know they are often written after the event. I think it is standard practice.

Mr. Singer: Oh yes indeed. In this case a year later—

Mr. Young: This afternoon, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister indicated that Dr. MacBeath had been taken on as the director and then he hired the staff. Then possibly, the Minister said, he conveyed an erroneous or a mistaken impression to the other members of the staff as to what the function of the centre should be and what their job should be in this. Did Dr. MacBeath, in fact, hire all the staff and, therefore, is he responsible for whatever erroneous impressions there might be?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can only say that as the director of the centre at the time, he and other members of his staff no doubt interviewed prospective members of the staff. The staff were not, if they were to be permanent civil servants, were not employed until such time as the civil service commission had accepted the fact that they qualified according to the job specifications for a specific job set by the commission. If they were casual employees, then they were

hired by the department on Dr. MacBeath's recommendation as director, although whether he specifically interviewed every person who was employed, I cannot say, because I do not know.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, there is a question here which emerges from one of the pages. The pages in this report are not numbered—one of the things that was forgotten, perhaps in the haste of the preparation of the report.

Mr. Singer: Such a complicated report.

Mr. Young: Yes, such a complicated report. But under "work centre," on one of the pages, there is this very illuminating sentence:

> The industry committee of the board has recently launched a drive to inform a broad spectrum of business and industry of the function of the centre and unique opportunities it offers. Response so far has been excellent and the committee is encouraged to believe that its initial target of $2 million worth of industrial participation will be exceeded.

Would the Minister enlarge on what is meant by "the unique opportunities it offers"?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I think I covered that this afternoon, when we were discussing whether this would be a trade fair or not. I do not think I can add anything to what I said earlier today. We have had inquiries from a very great number of industries. If the hon. member would like to get a list of them, I can give it to him. I have a couple of pages of it.

Mr. Young: I think it is—

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think that the interest of industry in the centre is, as I mentioned this afternoon, that they want to see that students and individuals are interested in science and would go into science as a career. This to me, and apparently to a segment of industry, is certainly a very good reason to participate in the centre.

Mr. Young: Then this again underlines the fact that the emphasis is on the industrial side in this centre for the future. This seems to be the case.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I hope that is not what I said, or what I implied. The purpose of the centre is to tell the people who come there the relationship of science and technology to our life today. As a byproduct of this, industry apparently has become very interested.

Mr. Young: I suppose industry is interested to see that point of view put across and that students understand what they are doing for the community. Could I ask the Minister who is to take charge of the educational process he mentions? Great numbers of school children are going to come in here. Is The Department of Education handling the education of the youngsters as they come through the doors?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enlarge a bit. Not only is industry interested in the activities of the centre, but educational institutions – universities particularly—are also interested and are represented either on the board or by committees of the board or committees established by the board. This includes also government departments, both provincial and federal, which are working with our staff. As far as the educational aspect of the centre is concerned, there is a committee chaired by Mr. C. H. Williams of The Department of Education which includes seven members of the staff of The Department of Education and four members of the staff of the Centennial centre. This committee is working out the details of how the educational aspect of the centre can best be put across and how those objectives can be accomplished.

Mr. Sopha: I want to address a few comments to a much more basic and fundamental issue relating to this project—the bookkeeping and the keeping of the minutes.

We had the advantage at the public accounts committee to address some questions about this—so far as that committee is effective in penetrating the veil of bureaucracy that surrounds this government. I would have to begin by saying about this very fine building that is going to be built, that we have seen a mock-up of it, and not being an architect and not propounding that I am particularly blessed with an aesthetic sense about architecture, all I can advance is a lay opinion that it is a very splendid looking edifice.

But so far as the character of our contribution to the celebration of our 100 years of success in this country is concerned, as we approach the magnificent day, that is as much as we residents of Ontario know about it—that the projection of the building—the word escapes me. We have little idea of what is going to go in it.

We have heard some intimations that there is going to be some kind of a collection of prehistoric farm machinery. I do not

know just how far back in human history that is going to go. Apparently there is going to be some effort maintained with great vigour to prevent it from becoming just a museum. I would expect in the overall picture that this Centennial project will depict in a very real way something of the quality, the flavour and the character of Canadians, not just Ontarians, but citizens of this country, their industry and their ingenuity.

In that regard, I am almost convinced to the point of disbelief in any other proposition, that before the thing was started there is an extreme likelihood that the fellow members of the Cabinet and the Minister were not circularized in order to obtain their views of what the centre should contain. Looking them over, the 22, and bearing in mind the type of activity they carry on—the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), for example, the Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope), who represent the two great industries of this province, and the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), who represents the third—then there is almost a certain sureness that their opinions were not sought about the character and quality, the nature of the project and what artifacts and demonstrations of processes, and so on, should be in it.

Proof positive of that comes, of course, with the disclosure that at the public accounts committee meeting, somewhere along the line, after the figure of $10 million or thereabouts had been agreed upon, the greatest spender in the universe—the fellow who spends money like a sailor on shore leave in Cristobal, Canal Zone, and whom we seldom see, the young man who has been pushed to the end of the row—at some point horned in, and I hope that does not descend too far into the vernacular, got his grimy hands in the pie, and said, "This does not satisfy me," and "You must bear in mind the educational nature of this institution." And after his intervention was made, away went the costs. Away they went, and they broke through the $20 million bracket, like going through the sound barrier, sort of rebounded like an aircraft hitting the barrier on an aircraft carrier at 300 miles an hour, zinged a bit and then heaven knows where they are going to end.

If the increase of cost can be placed at the door of any one Minister, then it is the young man, my alumnus, who spends more than $1 million in this province, because the evidence is there that he took this over, he took over this project, just as if he owned it. One hears some rumours ricochetting off the walls like ping pong balls out here in the corridor that the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) and the Minister of Tourism and Information have fallen out over this. I hope that is so. That is the rumour, and I hope that does not defame anybody, but usually around here when you hear rumours there is a pretty good chance they are true. I hope they fell out for a fare-thee-well—that would be great on the eve of an election, to have two of them warring the one against the other. I suppose now that he spends $1 billion, the Minister of Education thinks he owns all the money in the world and nobody else in the Cabinet benches and the Treasury board is entitled to spend any money except him. Maybe he has become completely obsessed with his control over the Queen's lucre.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton East): Let us get to the vote.

Mr. Sopha: I am doing so, and I am saying —in case you did not hear him, I will turn and say it to you—that the costs went to $30 million because of the intervention of the Minister of Education. Now, is that clear enough? Even a person as obtuse as you should be able to grasp that one.

Mr. Knox: That is just your opinion.

Mr. Sopha: That is my opinion based on certain knowledge and from being a member of the public accounts committee, of which you are a member and you do not attend.

Mr. Knox: I saw you there once and I have attended every meeting.

Mr. Sopha: And if he did attend, he would find out some of these things. Then maybe if he attended a couple of meetings he would have three facts instead of the two he carries around.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sopha: Well, he started it.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest the member stay with the vote.

Mr. Sopha: He started it. All right, I ask for your protection. You are there to protect me from these interventions.

Now that we have gone past the $35 million mark, it makes those of us who represent constituencies from north of the French River really wonder. I would like to find out from the Treasury bench, the 22 geniuses who are going to present themselves—

Mr. Singer: Twenty-four.

Mr. Sopha: Twenty-four geniuses who are going to present themselves to the people of Ontario. When a project passes the policy stage in that government, is any consideration ever given to its location anywhere else but Toronto? Is there any serious consideration, or is there a deal with that government—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sopha: Just wait a minute until I finish, will you?

Hon. Mr. Auld: If this is a question, I will be glad to answer it by asking the hon. member for Sudbury to ask his friend, the member for Downsview, to re-read the press release which he read to us this afternoon, which sets out the terms of the federal grant on provincial Confederation memorial projects—

Mr. Sopha: Based on the population.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It was by agreement with the province and the federal authorities, located in the capital city of a province of Canada.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, it has to be in the capital city. But as my friend very aptly points out to me, only $2.5 million. It is utterly unlikely any Centennial project in the boondocks, it is utterly unlikely them from that point of view.

Hon. Mr. Auld: My friend mentioned that he felt some members on this side of the House were taking the attitude, in its inflationary sense, of what "what is a billion?" I do not think that is true. We are very interested in the $2.5 million.

Mr. Chairman: I must point out that this is becoming repetitive, we went over this.

Mr. Sopha: Well, you did not go over it with me. I am the member for Sudbury and I am speaking on behalf of the people who elected me, and prevailing their views. I was not here, but I was engaged in another area of the public domain.

An hon. member: He must have been electioneering.

Mr. Sopha: If you will accept my proposition to that effect. Of course, the mere fact they got $2.5 million is not critical enough out of $30 million when they have to locate it in the capital city. That is all right if it is going to cost $5 million. That becomes something like one-fourteenth or one-thirteenth or something of that area of the total cost. I am satisfied and I hope this will be an issue in the campaign.

There is no fight in any of the Ministers from the other parts of the province at all when they sit around the Cabinet council. When something is going to be located, it always happens that automatically the people from Toronto say, "That's ours." Greedily they clutch it to their breast and they say, "Of course that will be located in Toronto."

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, plans are being made for five buildings in Sudbury right today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Well, fortunately I did not hear what was said, so I will pass on.

Mr. Chairman: Do you want the Minister to repeat it?

Mr. Sopha: No, I do not.

Mr. Chairman: Well then, we will go on with vote 2109.

Mr. Sopha: No, I am not interested. It is but another example, of course—

Hon. Mr. Connell: If the member did not hear, I would like to repeat that there are five buildings in the planning stage in Sudbury right now, so Toronto does not get everything.

Mr. Sopha: It is time Sudbury got something. Tell us how many months it has taken you to regulate the parking behind the court house?

An hon. member: Several months.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, several months.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Ask the mayor of Toronto. He says Toronto is not the one which gets everything.

Mr. Sopha: Well, of course, one of the issues in the campaign is that this is big city government.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sopha: Big city government, the exclusive fixation of what we can do for Toronto.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sopha: What do you mean, order? When we are talking about $30 million being expended in the city of Toronto, what do you mean by order? May I ask you politely?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! We are talking now about the Centennial vote, 2109.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Precisely what I am talking about—the expenditure of $30 million.

Mr. Chairman: We are not talking about public works.

Mr. Sopha: May I make a point of order? One of the fundamental rights of Parliament and members who sit therein is that when public moneys are expended, it is the inalienable right of the member to express his grievances, which is precisely what I am doing. I will not be surrounded and I will not be ushered into some corner. I am free to speak. I want to feel that I have the freedom of expression of this Parliament.

That was the point I wanted to make, and I do hope that my remarks about the Minister of Education and his sequestering of this project in the way he did and inflating the cost, added a fresh dimension to this debate.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2109 carried?

Mr. Sopha: You will note he is silent about it. Let the record declare of the silence of the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. Minister a question in relation to the architect? The information I have is that this architect travelled around the world looking at various museums and scientific centres before initiating his lines for this building. Is this in fact correct, and if so, did he do this at his own expense or the expense of his company or the expense of the government?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I could not say that Mr. Moryama travelled around the world. I know he did visit a number of other science museums and centres, and I think he also visited—and, in fact, I believe we had here—the directors of other science centres to advise. My recollection is—and I am afraid I do not have the information in front of me—that he did this at his own expense, although I must admit the other members of our staff had visited other places around the world. I know they were in the United States, Japan, in France and Germany, and some of the Scandinavian countries, as well as England to see what was happening in the field of science centres.

Mr. Paterson: Could the hon. Minister tell us how many of the staff travelled to Europe and Asia and the total expense thereof?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid I could not give that information at the moment. If the hon. member would like to put the question on the order paper—

Mr. Singer: It has been on the order paper for two-and-a-half months.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think I gave the member for Downsview the figures which my department has of the expenditures to date. I reminded him that in the report of the centre, the figures of our department's expenditures to date were included and this would, of course, include travelling expenses of our staff to either professional meetings or meetings specifically to do with the design of science centres.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I really do not think that that is any answer at all when this question of my leader has stood on the order paper for a month-and-a-half and has still not been answered. It is a detailed question. It is question No. 17 on the order paper and I wonder why neither this Minister nor his colleague, the Minister of Public Works, has taken the questions of the members of the Legislature sufficiently seriously to place an answer before us at the time we come on to this important debate. I can only conclude, Mr. Chairman, and it is with very substantial regret that I come to this conclusion that they hold the members of the Opposition in complete contempt.

They believe that we are not entitled to this information; they believe that the public of Ontario is not entitled to information as to how their money is spent; and they believe that because they have 77 members over there, they can bulldoze their way through and the people of Ontario are not going to pay any attention.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me deal with the figures. The Minister this afternoon said he did not know anything about what goes on in Public Works. Let me deal with his own figures and let me see how much he knows about what goes on in his own department. Staff travelling expenses, in this table of figures that was tabled before the public accounts committee, quotes: for the year ended March 31, 1965—$10,226.28; for the

year ended March 31, 1966—$23,836.50; a total of $34,062.79.

If we were paying to the architect 7 per cent—which I would presume, being 1 per cent higher than the normal going rate that you pay to architects, would be for everything, for their investigation, for their supervision, for their travelling, and so on—then I would presume, Mr. Chairman, that this would be the overall cost. Why then was it necessary that this department spend $34,062.79 for staff travelling expenses, over and above what the government of Ontario was paying to the architect, from the period April 1, 1964 to March 31, 1966?

Mr. Sopha: Of course, the answer is plain. The government is a veritable cornucopia for people who can peddle some talent. Look at the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). He goes out and pays lawyers far more than they are worth in the market, or what anybody else pays them. The Attorney General is the greatest mark that the legal profession has ever come upon in that regard.

Mr. Singer: Do you have an answer for us?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I thought my hon. friends opposite were answering their own questions.

Mr. Singer: Let us hear the answer to the composite question.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I mentioned a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, and as I think I said this afternoon, the travelling expenses of our own staff has been money well spent—moneys well spent. We have been anxious and I think we are accomplishing—we have been anxious to accomplish and I think we are accomplishing—a science centre which will be up-to-date and will be certainly one of the finest in the world of its size. To do this we wanted to make sure that all those members of our staff who were involved in the planning and the carrying out of the plans of construction of the centre and its exhibits would be completely up-to-date. To do this we have had substantial travel by members of the staff, both within the province and outside the province, and for myself, I am quite prepared to go into detail with the public accounts committee on every trip that was made by any member of the staff.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting for a moment that that $34,062.79 represents anything other than that which was actually spent. What I am inquiring about, Mr. Chairman, and what I do want an answer to tonight, although I do not think I am going to get it, is why, having paid an architect 1 per cent above the going rate so that he could, if he did—and we have not been able to get this because we apparently cannot get at the Minister of Public Works today—he could go around the world and get as much information as he could at his overall 7 per cent, why it was necessary in addition, Mr. Chairman, to have all sorts of civil servants travelling around to the extent of $34,062.79. Could the Minister please answer that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I thought I answered that a moment ago. As I said, to my knowledge neither our department nor Public Works paid any travelling expenses. Neither The Department of Tourism and Information —not travel and publicity—nor The Department of Public Works, paid any travelling expenses to the architect for travel around to look at new museums. I believe that Mr. Moryama, at his own expense, did considerable travelling around to see what was happening in the field of science museums.

Mr. Sopha: If this is supposed to be an expression of Canadian history, life and times and the character of its people, then what is the necessity for the consultant to go and look at European expressions?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Presumably because he wished to do so.

Mr. Sopha: I am beginning to wonder. Can we ever do anything in this country that has the mark of individuality? Do we have to continue to be cultural borrowers? I do not want to sound chauvinistic, or narrowly provincial, but I hope to disseminate the notion that I am fiercely Canadian. I would think if there was any—and of course here is the nub of the thing right here—there was no basic theme, there was no reflection about the nature of our Centennial project.

I think that is becoming horribly apparent that no real thought went into what type of expression this Centennial project was to be, to commemorate the hundred years of achievement before it began. There is no seeking of the opinions—or little seeking of the opinions—of others who might be interested in government. In a terrible act of responsibility on the part of the other occupants of the Treasury benches, that apparently, not being asked, they did not volunteer their advice about what it should be. Now we are told—and I for one am offended as a resident of this province and citizen of this country—that the consultant has to tour all over Europe in order to determine what should be the

nature of our expression—a Canadian expression—of 100 years of successful experiment as a freedom loving people who managed to get along and managed to have done a great deal.

Could the expression "needed" be anything more than that to instil enthusiasm in the hearts of the citizens of this province and this country? Would it have to be anything more than that, I ask, in the spending of $30 million—is that trip really necessary—that he has to go to Scandinavia, the Benelux countries, and other places in Europe, in order to find out what they are doing? Well, in making that confession the Minister is merely referring to one of the major weaknesses, one of the major shortcomings, of the hundred years of national life in that too often we Canadians have been guilty of cultural borrowings from other people. You know I always felt—just to cap it up—that the greatest demonstration of our inferiority complex, if we have one, its greatest demonstration, was Jack Arthur. Is that his name? He was the fellow who arranged the programme at something called "the Canadian national exhibition." That is what it is called and that incapsulates it. He never felt Canadians were good enough. He always had to go south of the border and pay a fabulously fat fee to bring some comedian in who may or may not be funny. Many of them were as funny as a busted eye in their performances down there. But he was the personification of our inferiority complex.

Here is another demonstration. We have not come to the point in our history—through the offices of this government apparently—that we allow our chests to expand perhaps half an inch more and say, let us participate in something to show something of our basic nature and the quality, the flavour of our national life. Oh no. Junkets. The greatest junketting government that ever occupied the Treasury benches. At the drop of a hat they will board an aircraft and take off for some place in order to have a look and spend the taxpayers' dollars in large quantities. My friend says how much, $34,000?

Mr. Singer: And $62.79.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, $34,000. Most of us would work a lifetime to accumulate that type of money. I hope the people of this province see how easily this government spends money—like it is going out of style. They must have a gigantic printing press in the second subbasement down here, churning the stuff out and throwing it away in the most irresponsible fashion.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think the hon. member for Sudbury, Mr. Chairman, was confusing the purpose of staff visits. We are interested in methods we propose to—as I have mentioned before—we propose to ensure that this will be a Canadian and Ontario centre. But we are interested in methods which are being used. We are interested, for instance, in the use of space, the most effective use of space. The whole effective use of bricks and mortar to accomplish the purpose which we have.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I have a few other remarks in connection with the matter I was speaking about. The hon. member for Sudbury was quick on the draw. He beat me to my feet and I think it was a fortunate thing he did, because he made an emphasis there which was a good one. This centre was supposed to reflect facets of Canadian life and the life in Ontario and a certain concept was outlined. But Mr. Chairman, the Minister has not yet satisfied this House that the original concept, which he claims is still being adhered to, was in fact adhered to and is still extant.

Mr. Sopha: It was changed by the Minister of Education.

Mr. Young: It was changed somewhere along the line, whether it was by the Minister of Education with the connivance of this Minister or by general agreement, I do not know. I know that sometime early in the spring of 1966, the chairman of the board moved in on the situation and I understand that in that meeting of May 3, he was appointed as administrator, or was given some sort of title. He became, in effect, the chief factorum of the organization and he moved in over the heads of the director and his staff.

From that point on, there was trouble in the organization. The staff was frustrated. We were told in this House before this that frustration descended to the level where every little bit of expenditure had to be channelled through the chairman, and that he assumed control of communication channels. And so the staff sat there and twiddled their thumbs, frustrated, unable to get ahead with the job in which they were extremely interested and to which they had devoted, as a matter of fact, the rest of their working days. When they left the secure jobs they had, they came here to Ontario to embark on this great adventure, and they were prepared to invest the remaining days of their working lives in this adventure. But now they find

themselves overriden by the chairman who had moved in.

My information is that from the time of that board meeting in May until the board meeting in August, there was not a meeting of the board. The Minister was very uncertain about this, about the minutes and all the rest of it, and I would be very interested to find out whether, in fact, the Minister can produce minutes of board meetings during that period. As a matter of fact, I am also reliably informed that even at the board meeting where the director's resignation was dealt with there was not a quorum in attendance.

During that period, the Minister himself seems to have been conducting the affairs through the chairman and through whoever else he designated. The staff finally, in desperation, left one by one, to seek other employment.

I have here the copy which the hon. leader of the Opposition placed on record earlier this season and I want to emphasize a certain part of a letter to the hon. Prime Minister from the then director, Dr. George MacBeath. He says this, and I quote parts of that letter:

> When you assumed personal charge of the investigation into the obviously tangled affairs of the centre, I received assurance transmitted from you that I would have ample opportunity to air my views and I waited for that opportunity. I was further led to believe that there would be an inquiry, an action I would have welcomed.
>
> Last Friday when I was called to a meeting in your office I assumed that I would be informed of the progress of the inquiry to date, since I was well aware that several other individuals involved in the events of the recent past had had such a hearing with you and I would then have an opportunity to air my presentation which would be made to you.
>
> Instead of this I found myself faced with a proposal. The solution, arrived at without consultation with me, was then explained. There was effectively no discussion about the centre's problems, but only about the details of its solution, and considering how far its approval and support had gone before I was called in, it had all the characteristics of the inevitable. The proposal itself from the operating standpoint at best makes it next to impossible to achieve the centre that you yourself described two years ago. More than this, the proposal from the standpoint of a conscientious museum professional is both unacceptable and insulting.

Then another part of that same document:

> The existing proposal is a sham and a travesty. I believe it to be a face-saving device designed to remove the embarrassment of previous actions and to condone and allow for the continuance of an unsuitable power structure. When the same officials are to remain then I must assume verbal assurance, notwithstanding, that the chairman, the Minister and some members of the board will continue on their course of drastically altering the original concept and content of the centre as it was conceived and originally approved by the full board and the government.

So Mr. Chairman, there is a real division of opinion. The people who were originally hired to direct the centre, to fill in the concept, to make the preparations and to carry it through, were disillusioned by the interventions that took place place during last summer. Finally they left and sought other employment, I think to the great loss of this province and to this centre.

So we have the cutting down of some of what this group considered vital space. A library originally to house about 75,000 volumes is now to be a much smaller affair. The Minister has explained this, but I am not sure that his explanation is valid, because in an institute of this kind there must be a tremendous amount of background material there, a place where people can come for reference work and can study and all the rest.

Then of course, the research work in the curator's division; the storage space that has been cut out; all this, it seems to me, was considered by the staff to be an essential part of a centre of this kind. So the whole thing has been changed. Modifications have been made, so that these people who have spent a lifetime in this kind of work, and who had a vision of something very significant for Ontario, its past, its present and its future, these people have been overridden by the industrial emphasis. I can accept no other explanation than that the industrial emphasis on the board has taken precedence over the academic emphasis, over the emphasis which the men with the experience in this field would have given to this project.

So, Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that this Minister is changing the concept, is making of this centre a thing which was never intended originally. Under pressures of various kinds he is capitulating and he is

changing that emphasis to the industrial one and so is leading this centre into paths which we had not anticipated. More than that, I again protest to this House the kind of thing which has happened to the men who came here in good faith and who have been left by this Minister and by this government out in the cold as far as they are concerned. Fortunately they are men of great ability and they have been able to find other pursuits. But again I emphasize they have been lost to this field in which they are expert, and where they could have made a very great contribution in the days to come.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make one comment. I direct the attention of the hon. member for Yorkview to section 4 of The Centennial Centre Act. I might say this Act was drafted with the assistance of the then director and his colleagues, and I would direct the member's attention particularly to section 4 of the Act which says:

> The affairs of the centre are under the control of the board and the board has all the powers necessary or convenient to perform its duties or to achieve the objects of the centre.
>
> The board is responsible to the Minister.
>
> The chairman shall preside at all meetings of the board, and in his absence or if the office of chairman is vacant, the vice-chairman has all the powers to perform the duties of the chairman.

And in paragraph 5 of the Act, subsection 2:

> The director of the centre shall have the management and the administration of the centre subject to the supervision and direction of the board.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that the present director general is a man of long and wide experience in the science museum field, a scientist himself, and has wide experience in technological fields. He has no difficulty, it is reported to me, of interpreting and carrying out the policies of the board, which are those that we discussed this afternoon. I just suggest to the hon. member that he recall the discussions about Dr. MacBeath's letter. There was never any question, I am sure, in Dr. MacBeath's mind as to what his position was *vis-a-vis* the board.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, if I could just point out to the Minister, this is the very quarrel I was having with him tonight, that the board is responsible. But my point is this, and perhaps I should put it as a question: Did, in fact, the board meet during that period from May to August when these changes were taking place, when the staff was gradually disintegrating and when these changes of policy were being carried through?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The answer is "yes".

Mr. Young: I wonder if the Minister would produce the minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2109 agreed to?

Mr. Singer: Oh no, Mr. Chairman. Since we are unfortunately confined with this Minister only to the figures that came out of his own department, I must confine my questions to that aspect.

In the statement that his department furnished to the public accounts committee, there are a number of very interesting figures that I think we should get an explanation of. For instance, sir, after the staff travelling expenses which we have already dealt with, the next item is purchase of artifacts. In the year ended March 31, 1965, artifacts apparently were purchased to the extent of $166,886.95. In addition to that, artifacts were purchased in the year ended March 31, 1966, to the extent of $52,375.10, or a total for the purchase of artifacts in those two years in the amount of $219,262.05.

Bearing those figures in mind in the context of the Minister's earlier remarks that really, when the Prime Minister said in August of 1964 we were going to have phase one completed, and remembering the Minister said to pay no attention to that because the Prime Minister did not really know what he was talking about—having changed your plans and somebody over there having determined to override the Prime Minister, so that you were not going to have anything finished on July 1, 1967—why did you go out and purchase $219,262.05 of artifacts for a building that is not going to be completed for two or three years yet? Where are you going to store your artifacts, what were you going to do with them and did you consult the Prime Minister while you were doing this? Because you had set aside his plan for July 1, 1967—you moved it up to 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970; whatever the Auld Centennial year is, you have moved that on ahead—why did you go out and purchase $250,000 worth of artifacts when you have no place to put them?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, the way that question is phrased, it is very simple to

answer. The centre is building displays requiring artifacts and exhibits because we do not have instant displays. When the buildings are completed, we want to be able to put things in. As I mentioned, I think last year, a number of the displays will be coming from Expo '67 and we will be able to use them with very little adjustment or additional cost. The centre is still naturally building these things, requiring things, and we will continue to do this. At the moment, some things are being stored at the work centre, some other things are being stored elsewhere, and this will continue until such time as the first building is completed and things can be moved in there.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, that is a very fascinating though non-informative statement. I would think that the figures that the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) brought before us for the construction of his magnificent building at Expo and in the furnishing of that building were sufficiently ample that he would have taken care of that. So it would be my guess, Mr. Chairman—and perhaps I am wrong, and if I am wrong I am certain that the Minister will correct me—that whatever has been produced for Expo would not be reflected in this $219,262.05 figure. And the Minister nods, I am correct. All right, so whatever you get from the Minister of Economics and Development is a plus. What did you do with the $219,262.05 and why did you rush out to spend nearly $250,000 when you had no place to put the artifacts that you spent the money on?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I think I answered that. You cannot go out and buy them the day before the building is completed.

Mr. Singer: I do not think we are talking about the day before the building is completed, Mr. Chairman. As far as I have been able to figure out, we are talking about three, four, five, six, seven years before the building is completed. Surely this government is exercising care and caution and advance thinking far above and beyond what anyone would ever expect of it, to go out and spend $250,000 many years in advance of the time that it is going to have a building to store these artifacts in. It just does not make any sense, Mr. Chairman.

I am not going to get very much further on that one. Let us move on to the next figure that has caught my attention: machinery and equipment, shop (design and photographic) $60,539.27. It seems to me that with all these grandiose figures we have been talking about all through this afternoon and the early part of this evening—$30 million for building this building—it would be unnecessary for this department by itself, quite apart from the function of the Minister of Public Works, to spend on its own for machinery and equipment, shop (design and photographic) an additional $60,000. Can the Minister tell us why, if the Minister of Public Works is already spending $30 million, he has to add another $60,000-odd into the cost of machinery and equipment?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I can only say, as I mentioned this afternoon, we are constructing a number of the displays which will be in the centre. We are constructing them either for our own account, or for people who are participating. We have 33 preparators working, who are building these things and obviously they cannot work without tools.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister give me a very simple answer? How far in advance of having the building in which you are going to house the displays would it be reasonable that you construct displays? We have tried, we laboured mightily this afternoon and this evening, to get an eventual completion date. The best date that I have been able to get—and perhaps I am wrongfully accusing the Minister, and I would not want to do that—is 1970. Now we are at least two years, three years, four years away.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I gave, just half an hour ago, a date in 1968. My hon. friend—

Mr. Singer: Oh, 1968. All right, fine. Is the Minister prepared to give as a commitment of this government the fact that there will be a completed building in 1968? Are you prepared to say that? Is that government policy? Is that a positive statement?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, my friend knows very well that I cannot give any statement. Supposing there was a general strike tomorrow. I have no way of knowing it. I can say—

Mr. Singer: Is the government anticipating a general strike?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can say, if I may answer, Mr. Chairman, that earlier this afternoon the question was asked and I said that the completion date, and I think the Minister of Public Works would bear this out, is presently about six months ahead of what we were

given to understand it might be four months ago. I have no way of saying what the completion date will be.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are six months ahead of what we were four months ago, but we are a year behind what the Prime Minister told us in 1964. If that makes any sense to anybody, I wish they would explain it to us. All right. Next figure.

Supplies, lumber, metal stock, paint, hardware and design, $39,369.18. If we are spending $30 million and the Minister of Public Works is spending that, why is it necessary to—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Public Works is spending $21,700,000. I gave all those figures this afternoon.

Mr. Singer: Well, I am not getting very far, but I am not going to give up, Mr. Chairman. There is another figure, $19,053.91 for publicity. Could the Minister tell us what that is?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can give my friend the details of that. The centre has a public relations firm employed for the reason that at the present time it is considered by the board to be cheaper to do this than to have their own staff. It is under contract. It is the firm of Public Relations Services Limited, Toronto. It is currently under contract to the board at a fee of $24,000 annually.

This gives the centre board and its directors the services of one of the largest and most reputable public relations firms, and in addition to providing the broad range of counselling, they have prepared many press releases and arranged dozens of photo sections on behalf of the centre. There is produced and widely distributed an effective general brochure and they have written and organized a full-page feature report in the *Globe and Mail* of which the hon. members are aware.

They have maintained and expanded the centre's contacts with the various media, newspapers, radio, magazines and television. They have arranged interviews and press conferences, provided basic material and more than 20 finished articles in various media interested in the centre. We have many hundreds of clippings in the files to testify to this.

The firm has also been involved in several important aspects of centre activities, ranging from attendance projections to scheduling displays of the centre's model, and preparing written material for special exhibits.

The board feels that the PRSL arrangement continues to be an economical one for the time being. The cost of setting up comparable services by expanding the centre's staff is estimated to be about $32,000 annually for salaries and fringe benefits. This does not take into account necessary space and furniture and so on, which also would be required.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a very interesting answer to a question. The answer was undoubtedly written by Public Relations Services Limited, and I suppose in writing that answer it was at least worth $20,000.

But it escapes my understanding why or how or for what commonsense it makes to spent $20,000 giving publicity to a building that is three years late already, that has climbed from $5 million to $30 million in its expenditure, and the Minister hopes—unless we have a general strike—might be completed in '68. What is the real purpose of these big files of clippings? We have nothing to show except a hole in the ground.

For goodness sake, what are you doing? The Minister has hired this gentleman who formerly worked for the Canadian Press, as his executive assistant, who at one time wrote nasty remarks about him, although now I presume is writing pleasant remarks about him, otherwise he should not be paying him any more. Why could not he do that? Why could not he be earning his salary?

Why are you throwing out $20,000 to Public Relations Services Limited, who I think are a good firm to publicize something that in fact does not exist? It is a thoroughgoing waste of money, an expenditure of money made by a government that is so caught up in this PR dream of publicizing things that do not exist. There could not be a better answer, Mr. Chairman, as to how the public money is being wasted.

Mr. Sopha: Waste has become ingrained in this government.

Mr. Singer: Classified advertising, the next item I wanted to pursue, $1,352.22. What do you advertise about? What did you want? Help wanted? Do you not have all the resources of the civil service commission? On what did you spend $1,352.22?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, of course the hon. member is asking me questions about estimates of two years ago. I have the figures of the current estimates here. I can only assume—

Mr. Singer: This is current. Why did you do it?

Mr. Sopha: You spent the money. Do you not know how you spent the people's money?

Mr. Singer: You spent the money.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Allow the Minister to answer the question.

Mr. Sopha: He cannot answer it then. He does not know it.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friends are so expert in answering their own questions, perhaps they could retire into another room and solve the whole thing.

Mr. Sopha: Oh no, the member for York South started that one. We are not going to follow that business. We are not going outside the House.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I cannot at this moment say what that specific amount was for. I can suggest to my friend that if this figure was given to him at the public accounts committee, this would have been an excellent opportunity for him to get the answer, because the figures would have been there. But I would presume that this was for advertising for staff for the centre.

Mr. Singer: By the PR firm who spent $20,000.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Or it could have been for —is that 1965?

Mr. Young: Here is part of it, Mr. Chairman. Advertising for replacements for staff which had left—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, perhaps that answers the hon. member's question.

Mr. Singer: Well Mr. Chairman, the civil service commission is available. On so many occasions we get the excuse that the civil service commission does all these things. I suppose they spent this $1,352.22 to find out whether Public Relations Services Limited wrote a good application to hire public relations services people.

The next thing that amazes me, Mr. Chairman, is an expenditure for $10,115.51 for building maintenance and security. I may be a bit naïve, but it seems to me if you have not got the buildings up yet, why you have to spend $10,115.51 to maintain buildings that you have not erected.

Mr. Sopha: Somebody might fall in the hole.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Actually, Mr. Chairman, as I have mentioned—and had my hon. friend inquired further at the public accounts committee meeting would have learned—we rent space at 8 Prince Edward Place, the work centre, for those things which already have been made. Many of them are the artifacts which my friend was asking about a few moments ago, and we like to make sure these are in good shape and being looked after.

Mr. Singer: Who owns 8 Prince Edward Place?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I hate to tell my hon. friend this, but it is rented for us by The Department of Public Works. He can ask the Minister.

Mr. Singer: He would not have the answer to that. Dear, oh dear, oh dear.

Mr. Sopha: What is particularly galling to me, if I can put it in a nutshell, is that here we are spending $30 million on this thing and we do not even know the nature of the expenditure. In the north country you cannot even pry the money out of this government to finish that road from Sudbury to Timmins. They spend $4 million and you would think they were conferring on the equivalent to the reception of the tablets on Mount Sinai. That is the way we are treated. We have no champion in the Cabinet on our behalf. They have the Minister of Mines, the Attorney General, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but we have no champion.

That could be a Centennial project, the completion of that road from Sudbury to Timmins. But it is as long delayed as this one. We do not know when it will be completed. Four or five miles a year. Yet the people north of the French River—and incidentally, I have been up to the Minister's area—and everywhere I go in northern Ontario, one hears the refrain: "We should start a separate province, we should secede from the people in the south."

I sat in the constituency of the Minister of Mines and I got a phone call at the Prince Arthur hotel from an individual who said: "Do you support the conception of a separate province?" Is it any wonder when you see the largesse bestowed by this government in favouring the metropolitan area. Joe Greene was right, he was absolutely right, he really got to the raw of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Greene said this is big city government that only cares about the "golden horseshoe." He extended his horizon too big, he did not mean the "golden

horseshoe," he meant Metropolitan Toronto—it cares about Metropolitan Toronto.

I see it now. I wish I had been asked in the early stages, I would have given them the motif—what this should have been is a travelling exhibit because I cannot for the life of me conceive that people from Ignace, from Minaki from Foleyet, from Wiskotasi, or any of the other major centres in northern Ontario, are going to see this until they reach adulthood. Very rarely does a child ever get to Metropolitan Toronto. He only visits here, travels those hundreds of miles, when he reaches adulthood.

Do you know that if you put the leg of a compass at the corner of College and Yonge, let us say, and you drew an arc to the Manitoba border, the extent of this province, then the other side of the arc is down somewhere in the Bay of Fundy? That shows you the expanse of this province. This is going to be of no benefit to the people in the farther reaches of this province, they will never see it. And that is the unfair, the inequitable, the unjust thing in the concept of planning.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Why don't you join us who are helping the north?

Mr. Sopha: Now the Minister of Mines interrupts me on the floor of the House. Do you hear his raucous interjection? He interrupts me. But I will bet you a twisted quarter that at the Cabinet councils he never opens his trap, he never opens it to advance the interest of the people north of the French River. If he did, we would have had that road to Timmins long since, we would have had it, it would have been finished, instead of the measly four or five miles a year that they are building.

This department should not exist; this department has no *raison d'être*, none at all, it should not even be there. This is a grab bag like Pandora's box, this department; it has no reason for existing. It is just a coalescence of a lot of functions that somebody shovelled into one department, and through this department, they bestow largesse to the extent of 30 million dinari—30 million they are going to fallow into some project, and the Minister demonstrates here unequivocally that he has not the faintest idea of its fruition, its concept, its meaning, its planning, its motif, its elan, its character, or anything else about it.

Of course it was said in a nutshell when the director resigned and he said, "I resign because they betrayed the concept," that is what he said. "That is why I quit." He said, "I will read The Unemployment Insurance Act rather than be connected with people like this." He said, "They obviously do not know what they are doing, therefore I am leaving," and he packed his bags and got on his camel and disappeared into the gathering sand storm, in the dead of night. And that was the end of that. Now, could there be a great indictment of it?

And then $34,000 to send a fellow around the world looking at what—methods, did he say? I cannot even get a pad of lined foolscap around here, did you know that? As a member, an elected member—and I got something like 12,000 votes—I cannot get a pad of lined foolscap free around here if I want to write something. If I send for it, I am refused, "We have not got it." The Prime Minister of the province gives us $77,000 and you would think that was something like raising Lazarus from the dead, that munificence. He gives us a measly $77,000. Well, of course, the whole thing is that the least important functionary around this place—after my eight years I have to say—is the member, he is the least important. The Prime Minister tells us if we are on a select committee we cannot go outside continental North America.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member get back on vote 2109, please?

Mr. Sopha: But some architect working for this Minister can board SAS first-class, champagne flight, and he is gone into the wild blue yonder—34,000 buckniks just down the drain. You see the paradox, the anomaly of the whole thing? I cannot get a lined sheet of foolscap for free but, oh boy, nothing is too good—the Attorney General sets the whole motif, he throws away 100 grand on some boy from down in western Ontario—

An hon. member: From London.

Mr. Sopha: Was he from London? You do well if you are from London; you do well if you are from London around here. He writes the cheque, 100-grand. That is my view of it, but I will pray, I will say a sibilant prayer the next time I go to church—and maybe I will say it before I go to church—that this turns out to be something. I really hope it does. I am sure if the leader of the Opposition forms the next government, it will; he will instil some motivation into it. I really hope after $30 million that it turns into something, it is not up to much now. And the Minister in charge of it is not up to much either.

It is hopeless, it would turn one cynical if one was of that frame of mind, but I am an irrepressible and incurable optimist and I hope that since human conscience and ingenuity always revives, this may amount to something. I am going to leave it at that point, but the election which is now, as of midnight, 13 days, plus 37, or 50 days away—June 7—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister of Social and Family Services does not have to be shocked by that. The election is on June 7; this House will be dissolved on April 28. Do you want to bet a quarter? Do you want to bet a quarter on that?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sopha: This House will be dissolved on April 28.

An hon. member: No bets here, folks.

Mr. Sopha: This is going to be an issue on June 7 when people go to the ballot box to exercise their fundamental right. And if any number of them are as angry about it as I am, then watch out.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, just one word in postscript on this sad, sad vote. Surely after listening to the lack of explanation, the lack of planning, the lack of projection, the lack of explanation for what has gone on in the Ontario Centennial project, one must conclude that this government had no idea what it was getting into three or four years ago, sir. It has no idea on April 17, 1967, of where it is going. It has committed itself to expanding at least $30 million of the public's money on a project that will end goodness knows where; it could be another $20 million on top of that; it has no staff; it has no plans, it has no completion date; it has no complete figure for construction. If that does not speak for itself, as a part of the record of this govment, Mr. Chairman, nothing will.

Vote 2109 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Hon. Mr. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, in rising to present the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management for the fiscal year 1967-68, I propose to review briefly for the hon. members of the Legislature the main programmes being carried forward by my department and to highlight some of the recent developments affecting these programmes.

The government is continuing to insure that progress is made in the field of water management. Programmes are being completed both by direct provincial action through the Ontario water resources commission and on a regional basis in cooperation with local municipalities through the conservation authorities.

I am pleased to be able to tell you that during the past year, a conservation authority was established on the Rideau River watershed, and the former Spencer Creek conservation authority was expanded to include the city of Hamilton and is now in operation under the title of the Hamilton region conservation authority. During the year, the former Grand Valley conservation authority and the Grand River conservation commission were amalgamated to form the Grand River conservation authority.

There are now 36 conservation authorities, covering most of the county system of southern Ontario and a number of the more densely populated areas in northern Ontario.

The small reservoir assistance programme, originally started in 1964 as a three-year programme to end December 31, 1966, has been extended for another five-year period. This programme to improve rural water supply through the construction of small reservoirs has been most successful. Up to the present time, 24 dams have been completed, 46 have been approved for construction and another 43 are in the planning stage. Until recently, this programme was a joint provincial-conservation authorities programme with the province assuming 75 per cent of the costs.

I am pleased to inform you that as a result of an agreement with the federal government, under the ARDA programme, that in future the federal government will share equally with the province what was formerly entirely a provincial grant. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the cost sharing will be on the basis of 25 per cent for the conservation authority, 37.5 per cent for the provincial government and 37.5 per cent for the federal government.

For some years, a similar federal-provincial-conservation authority cost-sharing arrangement has applied to the comprehensive flood

control projects of some of the larger conservation authorities. These agreements with the federal government were made under The Canada Water Assistance Act, and some administrative difficulties in maintaining these programmes have been experienced by the two levels of government.

The original agreements did not include any provision for dealing with rising construction costs, and, although financial support to conservation authorities has not been withheld, nevertheless, the available funds under the original agreements will soon be exhausted. In order to provide solutions to these problems, the officials of my department are continuing to meet with the officials of The Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, and I anticipate that a new agreement, and quite possibly new federal legislation, may result from these discussions.

At such time as agreement is reached with the federal authorities, I anticipate that new agreements with the Metropolitan Toronto and region conservation authority and the Upper Thames River conservation authority will be negotiated.

With completed work to a value of $13,000,000 and $8,000,000 respectively, under jointly-financed flood control works, these two authorities have been the most extensively involved. There are, however, other authorities whose programmes are now awaiting approval in Ottawa and I might mention two of these. The Grand River conservation authority has prepared a comprehensive flood control programme and phase 1 of this programme involves an expenditure of approximately $30,000,000 over a period of 12 years. The Halton region conservation authority has prepared a project estimated to cost $2,500,000.

A large project, formerly proposed to be included under the normal cost-sharing provisions of the joint flood control programme, is the Parkhill dam project of the Ausable River conservation authority. Rising costs increased the share to be provided by the local municipalities beyond the financial ability of the municipalities concerned.

Having reached an impasse in the financial arrangements, and being aware that the area concerned was entirely a rural one, the government opened discussions with ARDA authorities in Ottawa to see whether this programme might not be included in Ontario's portion of the ARDA programme.

I am pleased to be able to report to you that an agreement was reached based on estimated costs, and with the authority's maximum contribution being calculated at a level which the member municipalities will be able to support. It is anticipated that the federal and provincial governments will share equally in about 90 per cent of the total cost of this project.

The policy to aid private landowners to play their part in a water conservation programme by establishing farm ponds has continued actively. As I reported to you when presenting my estimates last year, this programme is also included under the federal ARDA assistance and about 500 ponds per year are being constructed under this programme, at a total value of about $450,000.

The river gauging programme carried on by the federal government in Ontario has been greatly expanded to meet our needs and is being coordinated through my department. The number of gauge installations has been increased and many of the old type manual gauges have been replaced with continuous recording gauges to provide more meaningful and accurate records.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, may I rise on a point of order. Would you advise the House as to whether or not we have a quorum in keeping with the rules to operate the House?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): We do not at the moment so I guess we might as well go home.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, there is a quorum here.

Mr. MacDonald: The House requires that there should be a quorum of 20 and we do not have 20. I move that we adjourn; in fact, Mr. Chairman, I think it is your obligation to call adjournment when there is no quorum —we cannot officially carry on.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Oh no, there is a quorum here.

Mr. MacDonald: There are not 20 in the House and 20 are required.

Mr. White: Nineteen including the Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: There are 18, Mr. Chairman. I have just counted them again.

Mr. White: There are 20 including the Chairman—that is a quorum.

Mr. MacDonald: No, 19 including the Chairman.

Mr. White: Twenty including the Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if you talk long enough you will get a few of your boys in from the tap room.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Are you not sad? Where are your members; all at home asleep?

Mr. MacDonald: There are half of them here. If half of yours were here we would have no problem.

Mr. White: There are 21 including the Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: Now we are operating legally again, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, may I continue?

Mr. Chairman: Proceed if you will, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: A number of telemark gauges have been installed to provide the flow information required for the efficient operation of the various dams. This programme also is a joint cost-sharing one with the federal government, the province and the conservation authorities sharing in the cost. Ontario's share amounts to about $30,000 annually.

In 1966, 13 conservation surveys were carried out. As part of the department's policy of encouraging active participation in conservation, the programme of supplying conservation authorities with available films and copies of pertinent material is being continued.

A junior conservationist award programme, involving 10 young people of high school age, who had already demonstrated their interest and ability in local conservation projects, was completed last summer. During their period of training, these young people were given an opportunity to see what the conservation authorities are doing and to work with them, and were also given an intensive programme of conservation training, supervised by the appropriate technical staff of the department. You will notice that an amount of $10,000 has been included in the estimates to continue this programme in 1967 with a somewhat larger number of participants.

All participants will be selected from young people recommended by organizations with conservation programmes, and it is my hope that many of these young citizens of the province will become active in the conservation field in the future.

Conservation authority parks and recreational facilities open to the public continue to grow in popularity. More than two million people visited conservation areas in 1966 and attendance is expected to increase appreciably every year. Nature trails, conservation displays and demonstrations are becoming increasingly popular features of the conservation area facilities, not only for school groups but for all visitors.

A large proportion of the visitors to these parks take part in some aspects of these activities. The use of these lands for recreational purposes serves to introduce people, especially urban dwellers, to the benefits of wise management of our natural resources.

Considerable progress is being made by the government in the provision of adequate water supplies to municipalities and in the control of pollution, through the work of the Ontario water resources commission.

The acceleration which is occurring in the construction of facilities throughout the province at the present time is reflected in the large number of municipalities taking advantage of the provincial financing scheme, which was introduced by the government in 1964, with respect to water supply facilities, and in 1965 with respect to sewage treatment facilities.

As of December 31, 1966, a total of 97 municipalities were participating in schemes with provincial financing, involving expenditures of almost $53 million for sewage works, over $7.5 million for water works, and over $30 million for water pipelines. Altogether, a total of 125 provincial projects are in various stages of development.

These programmes, which provide major facilities such as treatment plants, pumping stations and major connecting facilities between such works and municipal systems, are financed entirely by the province. The service is sold at cost to the municipality or municipalities involved, based on usage. There is every indication that this programme will continue to expand in the future, and the resulting increase in the construction of such facilities will have a pronounced effect in furthering water supply and pollution control measures in the province.

The regular construction programme of water supply and sewage treatment facilities continues throughout the province, with projects being undertaken by municipalities independently or by municipalities in agreement with the OWRC on an individual or area basis. Of the $1 billion which has been spent

on water supply and sewage treatment facilities in Ontario during the past ten years, approximately $150 million of this has been for projects undertaken on the basis of agreements between OWRC and municipalities.

The expansion which is taking place in the commission's construction programme is reflected in the fact that, whereas its 1966-67 capital budget was $35 million, involving new projects as well as the acquisition of existing plants under the provincial financing scheme, the 1967-68 capital budget is $65 million. Of this latter figure, $58 million will be spent on provincially-financed projects—as compared with $25 million spent on such projects last year.

The concept of providing such facilities on a regional basis has been receiving increased attention in recent years. As the province develops, it is increasingly apparent that long-range planning must be carried out with respect to future water needs.

It seems probable that increasing use will be made of Great Lakes waters to supply the needs of inland municipalities when existing supplies prove to be no longer adequate to meet the demands which are being placed upon them. Two major water pipelines which are under construction at the present time—one to serve the London area and due to be completed this spring, and the other to serve the St. Thomas area—were undertaken on the basis of an area concept, having been designed to serve a number of municipalities along the pipeline route.

Thirteen regional studies are being developed in various areas of the province at the present time for water supply systems as well as three studies for regional sewage treatment facilities. Such studies include anticipated population growth, land use trends, the compilation of surface and ground water resources, the evaluation of existing water supply and pollution control facilities and the determination of future requirements.

While individual water and sewage projects will continue to be developed to meet the needs of growing municipalities, it is to be expected that more and more emphasis will be placed upon the development of regional systems. In this way a more accurate determination can be made of the diversified demands being placed on our available water resources, not only for the present but also for the future.

Furthermore, area sewage schemes provide an opportunity for the removal of sewage effluents from streams with insufficient ability to assimilate the wastes and, by proper planning, disposal of them to waters more able to cope with them. Included in such proposals is the oversizing of water or sewage works so as to provide for the future growth of an area. The recovery of the cost of oversizing is eventually worked out as the facility comes more and more into full use.

The control of pollution resulting from industrial wastes continues to form a vital part of the government's programme. Industries discharging wastes to public waters are examined and kept under surveillance and the installation of treatment facilities for industrial waste discharges is being actively promoted throughout the province in accordance with the requirements of the OWRC Act.

Through direct contact with new industries, the commission approves all waste treatment installations before the industry goes into operation. As a result of this intensified approach to the problem, the industrial waste pollution situation is steadily improving and the overall response of industry to the government's pollution abatement programme has been encouraging.

The increasing volume and complexity of domestic and industrial wastes reaching many of the watercourses of Ontario require, however, that more sophisticated techniques in sewage treatment be developed in order that the pollution loads reaching these watercourses may be reduced and effluent quality objectives may be maintained.

Particular emphasis is being placed upon the importance of research, both with respect to the refinement of present treatment methods and the development of new ones. The increase in the growth of algae in some of the waters of Ontario as a result of the enrichment of such waters by nutrients contained in industrial, domestic and agricultural wastes, is being given increasing attention by the OWRC. Its research programme is being extended in this area in an effort to find satisfactory waste treatment methods which will reduce these nutrients, particularly phosphorus, and thereby control the growth of algae more effectively.

In the recent past, great concern has been expressed by public groups over the problem of foaming occurring in sewage treatment plants and in our natural waters resulting from the use of detergents. The detergent manufacturers themselves have exerted very considerable efforts on their own part to find a solution to this problem, and after carrying out a substantial research programme have

not only found out the solution, but have put it into effect in Canada.

I am pleased to report to you that, as of December last, all detergents being sold in Canada are of the new bio-degradable type. Tests on this new type of detergent indicate that 95 per cent of the foaming agent is decomposed while passing through a secondary sewage treatment plant. Even where no treatment plant exists, the rate of natural decay of the new material is much faster than that of the former type.

In 1966, good initial progress was made in the Great Lakes survey programme held under the auspices of the international joint commission, and with participation by the United States as well as Canadian scientists and technicians. This continuing programme is designed to enable us to bring all our forces to bear on the problem of deteriorating water quality in the Great Lakes.

While Canada's portion of the programme is largely being provided by federal government staff, they are being joined in this programme by the staff of the OWRC and all information is being exchanged and results coordinated. I am advised that the federal authorities propose to maintain and perhaps improve the calibre of ships engaged on this survey.

Support of the Great Lakes institute is continued in the department's programme and a figure of $105,000 has been earmarked for this purpose. The training of graduate students in hydrology, sir, and the research programmes on the Great Lakes are of considerable value to the department. I might mention that preliminary discussions have been held with representatives of The Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources towards coordinating the work at the proposed new federal establishment soon to be constructed at Burlington. It seems likely that this development will be complementary to and will assist the Great Lakes institute in its research programmes on the Great Lakes.

With the expansion of the commission's programme throughout the province, the necessity of setting up regional offices is assuming a new importance. In the past, field staff have operated successfully from the centrally-based Toronto office of the commission. However, the increasing public awareness of the need for adequate water supplies and for pollution control has increased the importance of the commission and its services at the local level.

It is intended, therefore, to bring these services closer to the areas where they are required so that more direct and immediate assistance can be given to the solution of the many problems which arise.

Consequently, the OWRC will be decentralizing some of its field activities and, as time proceeds, will establish regional offices in carefully selected locations. One such office will shortly be established in the eastern area of the province. A field laboratory has already been established in the London area in connection with the Great Lakes pollution survey.

The commission will continue to sponsor the industrial waste conference. The 14th industrial waste conference is scheduled for early summer of this year—and this will be supplemented by other water and pollution conferences to be held later in the year.

As you know, the government has initiated a programme to control pollution from pleasure craft. The regulation, which was approved by order-in-council last year, will become effective on June 1, 1968, with provision being made for the issue of certain temporary permits until June 1, 1971.

In the field of pollution abatement, there is an unavoidable overlapping of work in the various departments of government. In order to minimize the problems created by this overlapping, the government, in October, 1966, established a committee of senior officials from the departments involved to advise it concerning the whole range of pollution today.

The committee is composed of the Deputy Ministers of Agriculture and Food, Health, Lands and Forests, and Mines; the general manager of the OWRC and an executive officer of the Prime Minister's office. The chairman is the Deputy Minister of Energy and Resources Management. This committee has established working subcommittees which are now active in carrying out detailed programmes, using the resources of the individual departments but having the policy coordinated by the advisory committee.

The extension of existing streamflow gauging stations will be undertaken in the five major river basins in northern Ontario which drain into Hudson Bay and James Bay. Field surveys will be continued in order that the vast water reserves in the northern part of our province may be assessed and intelligent control exercised over present and future development as it affects the whole of Ontario.

Throughout the province greater emphasis will be placed on the strengthening of networks for the measurement of streamflow and ground-water levels. It is planned to prepare a series of maps outlining the location, quality

and quantity of our water resources. These, in turn, will form part of a water atlas of Ontario.

From the foregoing it will be apparent that the problems of water management are being given increasing attention by the government. As the province continues to develop there will be keener competition for water, and hence the provision of adequate water supplies and the protection of our water resources from the effects of pollution will remain matters of concern in the years that lie ahead.

Turning now to the energy side, I am able to report to you that the demand for all forms of energy continues to increase. The use of natural gas increased during the past year by 10 per cent over 1965. Estimates for the total demand indicate that the present 240 billion cubic feet per year will increase, as I mentioned last year, to 500 billion cubic feet per year by 1980. Residential consumers account for 91 per cent of the users and 34 per cent of the gas consumed. Commercial users account for 8 per cent and consume 18 per cent of the total and industrial consumers account for 1 per cent of the total but 48 per cent of consumption. The total number of gas users has now passed 700,000.

Propane consumption in Ontario increased by 13 per cent over the previous year. Due to export commitments, relatively little change in propane receipts from western Canada over 1965, together with increasing demand, has resulted in some restriction of supply.

The petroleum industry continues to expand with Ontario refineries now accounting for nearly 30 per cent of Canada's total refinery capacity. With a present refining capacity of 322,400 barrels of crude oil a day and with additional capacity being added as the consumption of petroleum products increases, the industry appears to be in a strong position to meet markets.

These substantial increases in consumption of various forms of energy require a correspondingly increased effort to insure that adequate safety precautions are being taken in the handling of these substances, and that regulations and codes be continually up-dated to meet changing conditions.

During the past year, the regulations under The Gasoline Handling Act were completely revised. I would like to express my appreciation to the automotive transport association and the petroleum association of Ontario for the unstinting assistance which they provided in this work. This type of participation by industry is particularly welcomed by my department, providing as it does regulations which are well understood and the need for which has been carefully examined by those who will be required to comply with the regulations.

The natural gas utilization code, containing in one book all regulations with respect to the use of gas, has been printed and presented in a convenient pocket-book style. This code includes provisions based on the most recent research and development advances which have occurred in the industry.

Nevertheless, it has been prepared keeping in mind the need for ease of understanding by the gas fitter in the field. It has been designed to be carried in his pocket or tool box. Work on a propane code to cover as a regulation the handling, storing and utilization of propane, is being completed and I hope the code will be issued shortly. This, too, has been an industry-government partnership and I believe the result will be more uniformity in the application of safety requirements.

One of the important areas which we have continued to examine has been the problem of gas furnace heat exchangers. These units are subject to corrosion problems and heat stresses which can affect their performance. The staff of my department have worked with representatives of industry and the Canadian standards association in the revision of specifications which are designed to eliminate some of the earlier problems. In addition, accelerated aging tests have been designed in order to discover units which have a tendency to premature failure.

Our inspection programme has been maintained without any increase in staff and the increases in energy utilization, which I referred to earlier, together with the increasingly sophisticated equipment being used, provides a greater challenge to the inspection staff of the department.

In the development of gas and oil, exploratory work continued in 1966 and a total of 56 wells was completed. Of these, four produced gas, four produced oil, and 48 were dry. In addition, 62 development wells were drilled and of these, eight produced oil, 40 produced gas and 14 were dry. The programme of plugging abandoned and leaking wells was continued and at present the department has a list of more than 1,000 wells requiring proper plugging. A priority has been established and each year as many wells as possible are plugged.

Another industry-government project has been the preparation of a model lease form. This form, copies of which are available from my department, is intended to provide a

guide to those persons who may wish to lease their gas or oil rights for development and is not intended to preclude the possibility of individual negotiation.

The department is continuing to develop the Ontario well data computer system, which contains on magnetic tape historical, geological and engineering data from about 8,000 Ontario wells. Many companies are now using this data, and as a result I expect there will be increased exploration activity in the province.

The energy board keeps under continuing review matters relating to the oil and gas industry where the interests of the province are involved. Of particular concern at this time, is the matter of an adequate supply of gas for the winter of 1967-68 and thereafter. Representatives of the board have attended hearings in Ottawa and Washington on the Great Lakes Gas Transmission Company's application to construct a major pipeline south of the Great Lakes from Emerson, Manitoba to Sault Ste. Marie and Sarnia. While not directly involved in this application, the board has held a watching brief for Ontario.

The most important single aspect of the board's work is the fixing and approving of rates to be charged for natural gas. In addition, the board is responsible with respect to franchise agreements, the construction of transmission lines and distribution systems, the development of gas storage projects and certain aspects of oil and gas production operations.

The board recently completed public hearings to review the rates of Lakeland Natural Gas Limited and a decision will be issued shortly. The case was of particular importance because extensive evidence was given by financial and economic experts as to the cost of capital and fair rate of return for the company.

To assist the board in making readily available the information it requires to carry out its function, a uniform system of accounts for gas utilities was prescribed by a regulation established in July, 1966. The gas distribution companies are now converting to the new system required by the regulation and the board will be devoting considerable time during 1967 to the implementation of this standard accounting system within the industry.

Among construction projects approved by the board during 1966 were two Northern and Central Gas Company pipelines which will provide large volumes of gas for iron pelletizing operations in the Steep Rock and Bruce Lake areas of northern Ontario. In addition, service will be extended to the town of Atikokan.

The most important transmission line proposal approved for the current year is Union Gas Company's 34-inch pipeline between Woodstock and Hamilton. This project is the third of four stages of construction of a major pipeline link between the Trans-Canada Pipe Lines system and the underground gas storage areas of Lambton county. It provides a key link in the chain providing adequate supplies of gas to our main markets.

During 1966 a total of 137 public hearings were held on a variety of matters relating to many phases of the expanding oil and natural gas industry in the province. Some adjustments to the board personnel were made during the year, with the resignation of Mr. L. R. MacTavish, QC, a part-time board member since the inception of the fuel board in 1954, and the appointment of Mr. I. C. MacNabb, formerly board engineer, as a member and vice-chairman of the board.

The continued success of the Ontario energy board in maintaining a balance within the gas and oil industry, in reconciling the sometimes conflicting interests of the consumer, the general public, and the industry, does, I think, provide an adequate degree of government supervision while maintaining the advantages of a strong private enterprise system.

The programme of joint action in the construction of nuclear power stations is continuing with Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and the provincial government joining the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in the financing of these large capital projects. An amount of $7,500,000 has been included in the estimates as Ontario's share of the cost to be incurred during the 1967-68 fiscal year, and this figure represents approximately 27 per cent of the estimated construction costs of the Pickering nuclear generating station.

The assistance of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission in the rural electrification programme is continued with an amount of $750,000 included in the estimates for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my sincere appreciation and thanks, not only to the hon. members of this Legislature, but to all departments of government as well for their cooperation, and to the members of the several commissions for which I report to the Legislature, the Ontario energy board,

and the members of my immediate staff for their loyalty and support.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, as I rise to take part in the estimates of this department for the second time I will try not to be repetitious, but the policy and the operations of this department over the past year have not changed to any great extent. In the last session, and up to this period of time during this session, little legislation has been introduced to effect the required changes to provide a more progressive programme to deal with many areas of responsibility with which this department must deal.

The recent Cabinet shuffle did not provide a change in either this department or The Department of Mines. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that a new department of mines and resources would provide administrative savings of more than $500,000 and provide a more efficient service in the province. The select committee report on mining, tabled last year, recommended that the Ontario energy board and the energy branch which deal primarily with gas and oil supplies in the province should be removed from this department and merged with The Department of Mines.

The new Department of Mines and Resources would be responsible for all the functions now under The Department of Mines and under The Department of Energy and Resources Management, excepting the Ontario Northland Railway and The Parks Assistance Act.

The Ontario Northland Railway, because of its supposed nature as a development road, should be placed under The Department of Economics and Development and the responsibility for the administration for The Parks Assistance Act should be placed under the control of The Department of Lands and Forests.

The Ontario Northland Railway for the year ending December 1966 shows an operational deficit in excess of $1,200,000. I understand the deficit for the current year will be greatly reduced and that within a year or two an operational profit can be expected due to the increased business provided by the Texas Gulf, Sherman and Adams Mines.

These deficits, Mr. Chairman, are not alarming when one considers that they are perhaps the only tangible evidence of this government's programme for development in northern Ontario. The main question, Mr. Chairman, is: are we receiving value for the money we are asked to vote to pay the deficit?

The operation of the roalroad in an efficient and progressive manner is still hampered by management problems or lack of proper management. The present general manager is a person exceptionally qualified in the field of communications and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that he should be placed in charge of communications, which is a major function of the organization.

A general manager of railroad operations should be hired or promoted from the present staff and given terms of reference from the commission which would allow him to proceed to bring the railroad operation to a standard in keeping with good operation and provide the necessary impetus for northern development.

Neither the commission nor the chairman of the commission should perform managerial functions, but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is presently the case. Elected members of this Legislature should not be directly involved in the management of provincially owned corporations.

The recent appointments to the Ontario Northland Railway commission were disappointing to the people of Timagami and Tritown areas, which are located along the route. The Timagami area deserves representation on the commission, particularly because of the development of the Sherman Mines and the tremendous growth in the area providing new business for the railroad. Surely we have progressed to the point in this province where more than the status of a defeated Tory candidate is the main requisite of appointment to commissions which govern such important arms of the government as the ONR.

I would now like to deal, Mr. Chairman, with a subject which was covered during the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development to some degree, but which I think rightly comes under this department. That is the application of Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Ltd. to build a second line through the United States. In Ontario there is an urgent and growing need for greater supplies of natural gas, as the Minister has outlined in his opening remarks tonight, and this provincial government must interest itself more in this supply, as well as the cost to both the residential and industrial consumer in the province.

On August 25 last year, the federal government stated that it would not approve issuance by the national energy board of the necessary licences to allow Trans-Canada to transmit natural gas by the Great Lakes route. On October 7, the Prime Minister in-

dicated that the company concerned had given undertakings to the federal government concerning the supply and control of the gas, that would enable it to build the line through the United States and stay within the spirit of the policy of the federal government to protect the Canadian national interest. Since this later decision the plan has run into difficulty in receiving approval of the authorities in the United States.

If the reluctance of the United States government delays construction to the point where needed supplies to Ontario will be impaired, then I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is the obligation of this government to make strong representations to the federal people for an immediate start on construction using the all-Canadian route.

There is no doubt that there are advantages inherent in both routes to the general public. If the Great Lakes route were followed there is no doubt that a greater abundance of gas would be available in all parts of Ontario, including northern Ontario, and that a lower rate would be enjoyed in all parts of the province. At the same time export sales for foreign consumption would be opened up and this could do nothing but benefit our whole country. The undertakings that have been given by Trans-Canada to the federal government, along with the powers of the national energy board over export sales, would certainly protect Canadian interests and control of this natural resource.

We in northern Ontario regret the loss of the short term advantages that we would have gained if the all-Canadian route had been followed. The construction expenditures and the maintenance that would follow would have created jobs in northern Ontario. I believe, however, that if the southern route is finally followed now we will receive a greater supply at a lower rate to develop industry in the north which, in the long run, will provide more stable jobs over a lengthy period of time. The fact is that construction of the looping of the present line, it is understood, will begin in 1970, and will return to the north the short term advantages we are now losing.

The Ontario energy board must make an immediate assessment of our needs and advise the federal government how long we will be able to wait for the completion of either second line. This is the responsibility of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management and it is certainly time this government made their position clear.

Mr. Chairman, the other party to our left has been attempting to make quite a lot of political gain with this issue and has been sitting back counting their votes, especially in northeastern Ontario. They have tried to be all things to all people. Throughout northeastern Ontario they have distributed a piece of propaganda under the guise of a questionnaire. Some of the statements in the questionnaire are questionable, to say the least. Mr. Chairman, to some in that party facts do not count as long as you can mislead.

Mr. MacDonald: Pretty feeble. Pretty feeble.

Mr. Smith: Even in this Legislature, the leader of the NDP has taken two different stands on this question. It appears from his remarks that his party has a different policy for different parts of the province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Smith: I would like to quote from *Hansard* of January 30; I think the member for London South tried to do that the other night.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It is better forgotten.

Mr. Smith: Well, I will quote it anyway to make sure—

Mr. MacDonald: It was quoted earlier by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher).

Mr. Singer: Let us make sure it is on the record again.

Mr. Smith: It reads as follows:

> There is a considerable body of opinion that since we have only one line wholly on Canadian soil and this has assured us the possibility of industrial development through the use of gas in northern Ontario, that there is no sense in looping the old line. Rather there would be greater sense in bringing the new line from western Canada, looped as far as they could through the prairies but then cut south of Lake Superior, coming to Canada in the Sarnia area and lead directly, Mr. Speaker, into one of the incomparable resources that we have in this province.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the hon. member mind repeating that sentence? I did not quite get it.

Mr. Smith: You said it, you should—

Mr. MacDonald: I did not quite get the words. Would you mind repeating that?

Mr. Smith: —"lead directly into the storage areas of Lambton". Now we will pick up on that a little bit later.

An hon. member: He has an explanation.

Mr. MacDonald: You bet I have an explanation.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I am not questioning the storage area used. I am questioning what he said about where the line should go to get to the storage area.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): He is no friend of Tommy Douglas. He is a friend of Laurier Lapierre.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Smith: During the debate of these same estimates last May, the leader of the NDP again spoke on the route of Trans-Canada Pipe Lines. However, he supported at that time the all-Canadian route. It apparently had become more politically advantageous in some parts of the province to take that stand.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know whether you can get the explanation but I will give it to you.

Mr. Smith: That is fine. I will wait and hear it.

Mr. Sopha: He was talking out of both sides of his face at the same time.

Mr. Smith: He said at that time that the government was talking out of both sides of its mouth at the same time. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the leader of the NDP has been doing exactly the same thing.

Mr. MacDonald: It is obvious you know who is going to lick you anyway.

Mr. Smith: I am not worried about you either.

Mr. Sopha: I will give you nine to five on this guy.

Mr. Smith: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that he himself has been speaking out of both sides of his mouth and that it fits right in with the divergence of opinion that exists on the government benches.

Mr. MacDonald: What about the Liberals?

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, he is going to speak next. Can he not wait for a few minutes, or does it bother him too much? Is that it?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the main responsibility of this department, that of the water supply and water pollution under the OWRC. During its 11 years of operation it has in this province set a standard that has not been reached by any other province of our country. It must be remembered, however, Mr. Chairman, that in our province we have a more densely populated area and a much greater industrial complex, which in themselves produce greater pollution and water scarcity conditions that do not exist elsewhere in the country.

Last October, the Canadian council of resource Ministers sponsored a national conference on pollution and our environment. At that time a paper was presented by each province indicating the work of their respective governments in the control of water pollution. The paper presented by Mr. Caverley, the general manager of the OWRC, was a concise report of the activities of this province in that particular field. The report indicates the history of pollution abatement, the progress that has been made, and the organization under which the divisions of the OWRC work in conjunction with municipalities and industry. It goes on to outline the accomplishments under the headings of domestic wastes, industrial wastes and water supply.

The difficulties in controlling pollution are outlined at the end of the report and I would like to quote from that report in this regard, because I feel that the OWRC itself has pinpointed the problems that still exist. The report says:

> Most pollution control measures in Ontario are directed to the interception of polluting materials before they reach the lakes, rivers and ground water. Anything which inhibits the development of an interception programme is a source of difficulty. All such problems might be grouped under three headings: technical, financial and political.

Under technical the report is broken down into treatment of exotic industrial waste; separation of storm and ground water from sanitary sewage; agricultural run-off; dilution. Many industrial and domestic waste discharges are made to small receiving streams.

Under financial, the report indicated industrial waste control and it went on to say:

> Many industries have discharged wastes into lakes and rivers for generations. It is

often argued that their economic conditions are such that an extensive pollution control programme will force them out of operation. It is difficult to convince elected representatives that it is in the public interest to force industry to clean up its pollution. A number of municipalities with sanitary sewer systems do not have treatment plants notwithstanding their desired willingness to provide adequate treatment facilities. Very often financial restrictions on the municipalities prevent the construction of the needed works.

It goes on then to rapidly growing areas:

In the areas of rapid and unpredicted population and industrial growth, it is difficult to construct pollution control works that will not be overloaded as soon as they go into operation. The initial financial burden on the taxpayer may be too heavy.

Next it outlines the administrative problems:

Under regional control concepts, pollution control programmes which are feasible technically and financially, too often are not accepted politically. Where a number of complex entities are involved, difficulties in having them all agree on a plan of action may be great. The result is delay, no action at all, or uneconomic action.

Competition for tax dollars: Many other services compete with pollution control programmes. The allocation of available resources to meet the needs of society today is a greater challenge than it was a generation ago.

Overlap of interest at various levels of government: Municipal, provincial and federal governments are all involved in pollution control. General acceptance by the three levels of government of their respective roles is not yet fully understood. A more clearly defined water policy in which the three governments can function will become more imperative.

This outline of difficulties, Mr. Chairman, by the OWRC itself, indicates political decisions which must be made at the provincial level in order to strengthen our pollution control and provide water supplies to each area of the province in need.

The responsibility of the federal, provincial and municipal governments must be redefined, taking into consideration the tax base of all three levels of government and their ability to contribute to a total programme.

The OWRC must be commended for its work in administration and advancement in the engineering science of pollution control, but we must not overlook the fact that the capital expenditures made up to this time have not been made by the province. The municipalities have carried the burden and the homeowner has paid the bill. The degree of success of this government in sanitary pollution is only a reflection of its powers to force municipalities to spend the homeowner's money.

For years the municipalities made large expenditures with no direct help from the province to the point where they began to flatly refuse, or even where the Ontario municipal board refused to allow new debenture spending. This government then found new methods of financing municipal construction but again, directly at the municipal taxpayers' expense, usually through doubled or tripled water rates to provide payments on a lease basis for facilities. No grants or direct financial assistance have been given up to this time by this province to its municipalities for the cost of treatment plants, water works or sewer construction. The municipal taxpayer has for some years now reached his maximum ability to pay.

Our present shortage of housing reflects the inability of these municipalities to keep up with capital construction costs and the lack of assistance in providing services to undeveloped land by the province. The spiralling cost of land is partially the result of this government's policy.

Mr. Grant Duff, president of the urban development institute, at the recent housing conference stated:

The provincial government has abandoned its municipalities and left them financially incapable of supporting adequate residential growth. The crushing load of educational costs borne by the municipalities has forced them to prohibit new housing in many major urban areas but cost of new housing is beyond the reach of most of the residents predominantly because of the policies and demands of the provincial and municipal governments.

A major cause of the high cost of housing is the excessively high cost of land. The housing crisis will not be solved until the supply of this basic commodity has been increased sufficiently to meet market demands. The government must assure through regional government or the OWRC that major trunk services are provided to this land. The provincial government must reorganize its municipalities on a regional basis and relieve them of some of the cost

of education so that they are financially capable of accepting residential growth.

Mr. Chairman, two examples in totally different areas of the province in regard to the financial problems which municipalities are suffering, are in the town of Red Lake and in the Kenora area, where the problem is pollution of the water supply and provision of sewage treatment, and in the city of St. Thomas where the provision of water is of particular interest.

The situation at Red Lake has existed for many years and the OWRC has suggested different programmes to the municipality over the past nine years but it has not been within the financial capabilities of the town to provide the facilities. Since 1960 it is estimated by responsible people that at least 12 children have died as a result of drinking contaminated water. On October 3 of last year, out of five children in hospital, there were three suffering from gastro-enteritis. The doctor has had laboratory tests made on water taken from the taps in his office. They showed that the water was contaminated with a substantial amount of organisms found in human and animal waste.

The real problem in Red Lake, Mr. Chairman, has been that the OWRC has not been able to cope with the problem because the municipality just could not afford to pay the required capital costs. In the meantime, there have been a number of deaths and the lives of both children and adults in the area have been endangered. As I understand it, a programme has now been provided by the OWRC to the municipality which will cost over $1.3 million. Beyond that, the municipality will be expected to provide trunk sewers to service the community. The local people in Red Lake are still worried that the eventual cost will be beyond their means and that full treatment will not be available. The increased grants to the community, announced some weeks ago by the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), because of its status as a mining community, will meet part of the costs but not nearly the full costs. Perhaps if that injustice had been corrected some years ago the situation would not still have existed as it has.

In the city of St. Thomas, the costs of water supply will be at least double and perhaps triple with the provision of water by the contemplated Lake Erie pipeline. It appears that the homeowners and present industry in St. Thomas will be forced to pay greatly increased water rates in order that water may be supplied to the new Ford Motor Company plant in Talbotville.

It is the contention of many in St. Thomas that the present water supply would service the city for the next 20 years without additional costs. Apparently, however, this government gave an undertaking to the Ford Motor Company that the water supply would be available through the proposed Lake Erie pipeline. The city of St. Thomas was then presented by the OWRC with a completed programme and was given no choice as to whether they would participate or not. Although they will benefit in years to come, it appears that the citizens of that city are, for the present time, being forced to underwrite the cost of water to the Ford Motor Company. The government has used high-handed tactics to provide water to a major industry at the expense of the small taxpayer.

If it can be shown that the present water supplies of St. Thomas are sufficient for their needs, I believe that the OWRC should charge rates no higher than those presently being paid. The difference in cost should then be charged to the Ford Motor Company, for whom the pipeline is primarily being built on the instigation of this government.

Industrial pollution, however, remains the primary area of concern in the ultimate control of pollution. Over the past two years, some steps have been taken to come to grips with this problem. The prediction of the Minister last year that the pollution would be under control or cleared up by 1970 still seems to be a figment of his imagination.

For the first time a number of prosecutions have been made under The OWRC Act, and perhaps this indicates the commission's intention to get tough with industry. Many of the industries who had been given notice last year have brought pollution control programmes to the OWRC for their approval. The paper industry, in particular, has started to make great strides and has shown the way for other industrial corporations. There are still, it is estimated, 300 industries who are polluting seriously our waterways with no plan to provide proper treatment.

The operations of the OWRC and its inspection forces have not reached all the offenders. Many polluters have ignored the warnings or have not come under the inspection branch as they should have. Industry contributes a more potentially harmful type of pollutants, such as organic chemical exotics and mineral and chemical substances. This type of pollution makes for especially difficult treatment and more toxic effluent. The financial prob-

lems of some industries, coupled with the complexity of the type of effluent, precludes them from controlling their waste in a reasonable manner.

The OWRC must provide technical assistance to these corporations, along with a form of financing which will enable them to borrow money at reasonable interest rates over a long period of time that will not endanger the existence of their operations.

I would like to refer back again to the council of resources Ministers conference held in Montreal last fall. For the first time in Canada, all the most informed people in Canada and other countries in matters of pollution control were brought together. It could prove to be a milestone in the history of pollution control if the guidelines and recommendations of the conference are accepted and acted upon at a political level. Reports of the conference are many and varied, but most in attendance and observing agreed that governmental action over the next months and years will decide the success of the conference.

The guidelines and recommendations provided by the participants outline a basis for federal and provincial action which could provide a standard for country-wide control by agreement, stretching across provincial boundaries with coordination at the federal level.

The conference recommended among other things:

> The need for a federal organization or agency which could develop a pollution abatement code, coordinate and disseminate available information, conduct research and cooperate with other agencies working in the field;
>
> The preparation of some form of national standards or national objectives;
>
> A guiding principle should be that "polluters should bear the cost of treatment and of pollution damage inflicted on resource users";
>
> There should be financial incentives to industry to improve its anti-pollution measures and to encourage research;
>
> There is a shortage of trained experts in the field; and
>
> The best unit of pollution control is a region, and attack should be formulated on a multifunctional basis.

The conference also suggested the examination of all laws across the country both provincial and federal, to see what areas are being overlooked and where they overlap.

Carrying this a step further, it is also very desirable that the laws be basically uniform and that they be supplied so that all provinces would provide a united front, particularly to industry, who would then not be able to choose locations with respect to anti-pollution laws and their enforcement.

The operation of the conference was a success, except that it was held for the most part behind closed doors. The press were not allowed to quote statements made in the conference meetings, but had to rely on the final recommendations quoted by individuals outside the conference. This national problem is too great and is in need of too much public support for conferences of this kind to be held in that manner. If this is the attitude of the resource Ministers and those directly involved with pollution control, they can never seriously expect to receive public support and have people accept their social responsibility in this matter if they are not allowed to listen in on such important conferences.

The Canadian council of resource Ministers is, as it name implies, a group composed of the Ministers of each province responsible for resource management. The province of Ontario, however, has not seen fit to appoint that Minister responsible for resource management in Ontario to the conference. Rather the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) has been appointed. How could we possibly have coordination developed with the federal government and other provinces when our resources Minister is not allowed to act as the political liaison with his provincial and federal counterparts. Surely with his departmental knowledge he should be able to contribute more and to learn more at the national level conference than the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

This government's appointment of someone other than the Minister of Energy and Resources Management is either a slight towards his ability, or an acknowledgment that the council itself and the problems it is attempting to overcome are of little interest to this government.

Within the next few months, and perhaps sooner, a new government will be formed in this province. The programme of that government should include a complete and immediate study of this department taking into consideration the following recommendations:

As I have stated earlier, to provide large savings to the taxpayer and increased governmental efficiency, this department should be joined with The Department of Mines;

Proper appointments should be made to boards and commissions so that worthwhile contributions can be made by these political appointments;

A definite programme of regional government should be instituted across the province to facilitate the provision of proper sewage and water facilities in the most economical and practical way;

A formula of direct financial contribution to municipalities in need to provide for water services and sewage treatment, including sewer separation in older communities;

The establishment of a programme for a water grid system in those parts of the province in need of fresh water. Where municipalities must use the service provided and where it can be determined that their existing facilities are adequate, this charge against these communities should be no greater than their present cost;

A plan to provide industry with capital cost financing, extended over long periods of time at a reasonable rate. The removal of the sales tax at both the federal and provincial level from devices and installations for pollution control;

A stepped-up programme of policing industry with the establishment of regional offices of the OWRC. A proper enforcement of the law, with charges being laid if required;

A renewed activity programme in the survey of our northern Ontario inventory of water supply so that answers could be provided in a much shorter time, and a decision could be made on both a federal and provincial water use policy;

A thorough study of the report and recommendations of the conference of the council of resource Ministers previously referred to and continuing pressure being applied at the federal level and to other provinces for the initiation of the report of that committee.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I take it that the leader of the New Democratic Party would like to go on with his remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: No, I am not particularly anxious. I would like to get home for the national news.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise, report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we might spend a little time on the order paper, on second readings and the House in committee, and we will proceed with the estimates as indicated by the Prime Minister on Friday.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.50 o'clock, p.m.

No. 67

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 18, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 18, 1967

County Judges Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 2291

Surrogates Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 2291

Police Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 2291

Statement re government assistance to Hensall area tornado-damage victims, Mr. Stewart 2291

Presenting reports, Mr. Spooner 2292

Statement re increase in subsidies to charitable institutions, Mr. Yaremko 2292

Questions to Mr. Wishart re inquest into the death of Francesco Gualtieri, Mr. Renwick 2292

Questions to Mr. Rowntree re Ontario securities commission, Mr. Renwick 2292

Questions to Mr. Spooner re Chapleau municipal finances, Mr. MacDonald 2293

Statement by Mr. Robarts re approval of three major Hydro projects 2293

Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading 2294

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett, continued 2304

Recess, 6 o'clock 2330

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, St. Barbara's separate school, Scarborough, St. Nicholas separate school, Scarborough, Second Street public school, New Toronto; and in the west gallery, Orde Street public school, Toronto, and Stouffville district high school, Stouffville.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Justice and Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The amendment provided by this bill makes it possible for the county court judges, district judges, to receive the increases recently granted by the federal Parliament.

THE SURROGATE COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This bill, Mr. Speaker, is complementary to the bill which I first introduced—it transfers the allowances which are presently paid by the province into allowances under The Surrogate Courts Act.

THE POLICE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, there are 11 amending sections—various sections—of The Police Act. None of them are of any great major importance.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I am certain that all members of the House will join with me in expressing our sympathy to those farmers and townspeople who suffered severe damages as a result of the tornado that swept across southwestern Ontario yesterday afternoon.

It is particularly regretful—and I know that the House expresses its sympathy—that a life was lost following the collapse of a barn. I can assure the House that officials of The Department of Agriculture and Food in the stricken areas are bending every effort to assist those unfortunate enough to have suffered damage.

The tornado struck just about 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon near the village of Hensall and Hay township and tore a path for about 25 miles across Tuckersmith and Hibbert townships before losing its velocity in Logan township. The material damage is expected to be quite heavy with houses, barns and silos reported to have been demolished.

I therefore wish to announce that the Ontario government, through The Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food, is offering to match on a dollar-for-dollar basis every dollar raised locally for the purposes of rehabilitating the damaged properties. At the same time, representation has been made to the federal government to participate as was the case in the 1944 and the 1953 tornadoes which swept through parts of the province of Ontario.

I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that we are not able to give a full and accurate report of the extent of the damage. It appears from reports that have come in, and they are increasing hour by hour, that about 40 barns have been either totally demolished or very severely damaged. I understand about 20-some homes have been badly damaged, and several silos have been torn down. Of course, there has been damage to woodlots, trees, hydro lines and telephone lines; communications generally are pretty well knocked out.

We are putting the resources of The Department of Agriculture and Food on a technical basis at the disposal of the people of the community which has been so badly struck, that is, in providing assistance from our engineering staff and advice as to how best to cope with the situation at the moment.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I beg leave to present the fifth annual report of the affairs of the Ontario municipal employees retirement board for the year ended December 31, 1966.

And I beg leave to present the 61st annual report of the Ontario municipal board for the year ended December 31, 1966.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of the Legislature that An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act has been proclaimed as in force. This amendment increases the subsidy to charitable institutions from 75 per cent to 80 per cent of net costs. The charitable organizations benefiting from this increase include 68 homes for the aged, five homes for youths, three halfway houses, and 13 receiving homes for unmarried mothers.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

Will the adjourned inquest into the death of Francesco Gualtieri at the workmen's compensation board hospital in Downsview reconvene tomorrow, April 19, and continue to completion?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the inquest into the death of Francesco Gualtieri will reconvene tomorrow evening, April 19, at 7 p.m. at which time evidence will be adduced as to identification and medical aspects of the matter.

I believe it altogether likely that the inquest will be adjourned. This is from evidence I now have in my possession as a result of a very comprehensive investigation which has been going on. I would anticipate that after the inquest has been reconvened and certain evidence taken, it would be adjourned to some date at the discretion of the coroner presiding, in the light of the very comprehensive investigation which is being carried on; in order that further evidence may be obtained. I would anticipate that.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General would permit a supplementary question. Does the adjournment or the possible adjournment that will take place tomorrow, have anything to do with the appointment of the Royal commission to deal with the matter of Dr. Shulman's dismissal?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, Mr. Speaker, I think this has no relationship to the Royal commission. This is an inquest into the cause of death, and as I have said, a very comprehensive investigation is going on.

I know that the commissioner who has been appointed to conduct the inquiry with respect to Dr. Shulman would have no objection to this and it simply would be a continuation of the inquest. I anticipate, as I say, the adjournment in order that further evidence may be obtained and the date of the reconvening of the inquest will certainly be left to the coroner in charge.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Will the Minister make arrangements for the Ontario securities commission to publish promptly and regularly in such a newspaper as, for example, the *Globe and Mail*, using a distinguishing format, brief summaries of decisions and orders made by the commission affecting the public interest, such as the decision of the director about OBSCO Corporation Limited and its affiliated companies?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the whole question of informing the public with respect to the law pertaining to securities matters, or law pertaining to financial or other areas of legislation which come under the jurisdiction of this department, is under study at the moment.

The question of conveying information is one thing. The area actually goes into the question of education of the public with respect to the law and the various responsibilities of those involved in these matters, whether they be a buyer or a vendor. These are all matters that are being taken into account. As to the request, as is probably known to the members, Mr. Speaker, there is a bulletin, which is a very short, easily readable document, published and distributed monthly by the securities commission. Probably the question at the moment is whether or not the publishing and distribution of that bulletin meets the needs I think the hon. member suggests, and as I believe the needs of the public exist today.

These are matters which to me are quite important and are not being ignored.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would permit a supplementary question? Does he not think that the decision about the OBSCO Corporation Limited which was made on February 7 of this year, should be published in some document other than the bulletin of the commission which arrived to the members of this Legislature in the last few days?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The operation of the securities commission, as should be known to the members of this House, is on an autonomous basis. I would be glad to take that matter up with the chairman of the commission.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions, the first for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Has The Department of Municipal Affairs conducted an audit of municipal finances of the town of Chapleau, and if so can the Minister report on the results of the audit?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, the officers of The Department of Municipal Affairs have been in touch with this situation in Chapleau and they have analyzed the financial problems of this municipality. They have been at this work for some time. There is a situation. By the way, I may say I think you are referring to the township of Clapleau; the town is not separately organized. I believe that was what you were asking about.

The problems have arisen because of a number of things. I might mention three of them. There is a substantial deficit on the current account of the township and the non-collection of a very high percentage of the town's taxes. As a matter of fact, I think at the end of last year there was still 43 per cent of the 1966 tax levy unpaid. Then there is also another situation, and that is that the municipality has borrowed capital funds in excess of the amount which had been authorized by the Ontario municipal board.

The officers of the department are in touch and have been in touch with the council and the officials of the municipality and also the bankers for the municipality in the hope that they may be able to straighten this up. I would hope that before much more time elapses that I will have a complete report as to how this matter is to be straightened up. We have been on it since we received the auditor's report early this year.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Minister—rumour has it that the department is contemplating putting the town under a trusteeship. Is this under consideration?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Unless the matter is settled to the satisfaction of the officials and to my satisfaction when they report to me, we are going to see whether or not we can place the municipality under supervision.

The easiest way would be for them to refuse to pay one of their bills and then we would have no alternative but to take it over. But as long as they are paying their bills and trying to get their own affairs in order, I think that we should cooperate with them, and that is what we intend to do.

Mr. MacDonald: My second question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Prime Minister. Is it the government's intention to proceed this session with Bill Pr31, An Act respecting the University of Western Ontario?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there are some aspects of that bill that require further consideration and I assume that it will take its place. There has been no decision made not to call it, but there are, as I say, certain aspects of it that are presently being studied

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that construction has been approved for three major Hydro projects — one in southern Ontario and two in the northeastern part of the province. These projects will add about 1.5 million kilowatts of new generating capacity to the resources of Ontario Hydro by 1973. To give you some idea of just how much power is involved, the additional amount in these projects would be enough to supply the needs of about one million homes, or the combined peak demands of 11 major Ontario municipalities — Windsor, Niagara Falls, Sarnia, Barrie, London, Peterborough, Ottawa, Hamilton, Port Arthur, Fort William and North Bay, and I use this illustration to show just what the total power capacity of these additions will be.

This is just further evidence, Mr. Speaker, of what is being done in order to ensure the continued growth and development of the province to maintain the dynamic expansion which we have experienced over the past many years. On an average basis, Hydro estimates that the requirements for power in this province are increasing at the rate of about 10 per cent per year, which means that in any 10-year period, we have to double or reproduce again what is in existence at the beginning of that period.

In addition to providing the actual electric energy involved to accelerate the growth of

the province, this expansion will have an important effect in terms of equipment and jobs for our people. It will involve a capital expenditure of about $325 million; it will create close to 1,000 new jobs during the construction period and this, of course, is in addition to the general stimulus which it will give to the economy of the province.

At the top of the new power project list is Pickering nuclear power station, 20 miles east of downtown Toronto, which will be doubled in size to more than 2,000,000 kilowatts. The cost of the two additional units in this plant will be borne entirely by the Ontario Hydro.

As members will recall, under a cooperative financing agreement on the first two units, the Ontario government is contributing 27 per cent of the estimated capital cost of $272 million. The federal government is contributing, as is Hydro, and it is anticipated that out of that, both the federal government and the provincial government will be repaid. These additional facilities about which I am speaking, will be financed entirely by Ontario Hydro, with the very large exception, of course, that the province stands behind their bonds.

The Pickering development will produce over 1,000,000 kilowatts of new power, which out of that plan alone would be enough to supply the combined peak demands of Hamilton, Kitchener, Oakville, Kingston, Guelph, Ajax, Belleville, Brantford, Peterborough and Sudbury.

In northeastern Ontario, a new 244,000-kilowatt hydroelectric plant will be built at Lower Notch on the Montreal River near Cobalt. The power from this development alone would be sufficient to meet all of the peak needs of Timmins, Kapuskasing, North Bay, Sudbury, Kirkland Lake and Oshawa. In addition, the capacity of Hydro's existing George W. Rayner station on the Mississagi River near Thessalon will be increased by 174,000 kilowatts and the power from this particular addition will supply the total energy needs of Timmins, North Bay, Sudbury, Kirkland Lake, St. Thomas and Welland. In northwestern Ontario there will be a rehabilitation of the Kakabeka Falls plant near Fort William and there is a new dam which will be necessary in that area.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Can my hon. friend tell me the projected completion date of this project?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I cannot give the specific dates. These projects are part of the forward planning. This is 1967 and Hydro anticipates that these units will be in production and putting power into our grids by 1973, which is six years from now. In order to get these completed, the planning, the engineering, and the financing has to be done of course, at this time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister would permit, it could be two to three years before the construction even begins under those circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I could not tell the hon. members; these things are all in different stages. For instance, the Kakabeka Falls project that I mention, I would think would proceed very quickly. From an engineering point of view it is not nearly as complex as the nuclear plants, for instance, at Pickering. So that to say precisely when any portion of this will commence is difficult, but certainly it will all be completed by 1973 on the present plan.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE MUNICIPAL UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 80, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the principle of the unconditional grants as they have been developed in the province of Ontario has been basically one that has stressed the sums of money that would be made available on an unconditional basis for the larger centres.

The government over the years has attempted to justify this by pointing to the special problems that the larger centres have had to meet with this money that comes without strings attached. They have pointed, I suppose, to the special problems for the provision of housing, welfare, to some extent education, and other areas of public responsibility that have been kept at the municipal level—those the province has been unable to assist with, particularly in these larger municipalities.

There is a feeling that is very widespread indeed, and we can even detect it in the metropolitan areas, that the development of a good many of these municipalities outside the large centres have had their development

somewhat stunted by the lack of availability of funds without strings attached which could in fact finance the development of these municipalities on a fair and equitable basis.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, even though these new grants at $1.50 per capita are the same size for each municipality whatever its size, the fact remains that the basic inequality remains. And if the government is prepared to enlarge the grants without any indication as to the need for having an enlargement of a more significant nature for larger areas than for the smaller ones, surely the time is also upon us when the unconditional grants themselves, by their very nature, should be made a per capita grant so that the funds will be based on the population concerned and not simply on the size of the municipality.

I am sure the Minister will defend in the same terms that he has used in years gone by the continuation of this inequity. But I can say to you, sir, that there are many municipalities in this province who have had their development very seriously impeded by the fact that this government is not prepared to deal with them on a fair and equitable basis.

The Prime Minister himself in returning from the financial conferences at the federal level has often complained that the senior government, or at least the federal government, has simply told the provinces what they are prepared to do on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. He has come back with very serious complaints in this area of his responsibility.

It appears to me that those people with responsibility at the municipal level must feel the same way: that the government of the province of Ontario has the attitude, sir, that the taxation pressures must be maintained at the municipal level; in fact, that if more funds are made available so that the municipalities can meet their responsibilities, there will be no thought of any savings being passed on to the local ratepayers.

Surely this lack of confidence exhibited by the government of the day at the provincial level in the democratic process in our municipalities is a very serious matter. Naturally, we would approve of extending these unconditional grants, and I would further approve that the extension is the same size for municipalities of all sizes because, in fact, it recognizes the basic inequity that I am attempting to draw to your attention. And that is, the grants themselves as basically set out do not give the fair treatment to these smaller municipalities that would permit them the opportunity for development that they have so lacked in the past.

This is the principle of the bill. I believe that the principle as it is expressed here is a good one and it is against the principle that has been set out by the government in their basic legislation. So it is with this in view, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side will support the bill, and we would call on the government to back down from their hard and fast rule that has really given the smaller municipalities so much difficulty and trouble in years gone by.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the general principle of an increase in the grants to the municipalities in the province, and I suppose from all the municipalities will come a partial sigh of relief now that an election is imminent because it is going to bring them this little bit of relief.

But again this situation is an illustration of what happens time after time with this government. They react to crises instead of planning ahead to do the job that has to be done. Our municipalities today are facing a situation that borders on desperation. Just this morning, Mr. Speaker, I had a letter. I am not going to quote it all, but it says, in part, this:

> I have been reading with great alarm the predicted high rise in property tax. It has become more difficult each year to meet the increased federal, provincial and civic taxes, not to mention the sales tax. I know that you are quite aware of the situation so I will not elaborate. However, I want to tell you that we love our home which we earned by the sweat of our brow and we do not wish to part with it.
>
> If the threatened increase in taxes takes place you will have forced one more house-owner to sell and either leave the city or to be forced into an apartment, which for us is most undesirable. It is not a credit to Canada that so many married women and mothers must work in order to keep a house. We have decided to sacrifice many things so that my wife can stay home with the children. It has been most difficult but if taxes go up again you will have succeeded in literally throwing us out of our home.

This is an attitude which is expressed, Mr. Speaker, by many people across this province, and all of us are having concern registered with us because of the rising municipal tax rate. As the former speaker has said, one of the great problems here is that this increase is a straight across the board matter—$1.50 per capita.

When we look at the situation we realize this. In municipalities such as the one where I live, North York, each mill now is worth $1 million. This increase will bring to that municipality something in excess of $500,000, half a mill, whereas in many of the outlying smaller municipalities this increase can well amount to two, three, four or more mills. In a municipality, for example, of less than 2,000 population this means a 50 per cent increase from $3 to $4.50. But in Metropolitan Toronto, it means a 27 per cent increase, or from $5.50 to $7. In other words, the increase in the large cities will be about half the increase in the outlying areas.

This may be a fair political move for this government to foster support in the rural areas of Ontario. I have no objection to those areas getting an increase. All I am saying to the Minister and to this government, Mr. Speaker, is that the increase should be greater in the metropolitan areas in the larger centres of population in order that these centres may come up to equality with others.

Last year, this government granted the municipalities something like 44.7 per cent, if my figures are correct, of the total revenue. This year, it is 43.3 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, the problem is a very vital one to all our municipal taxpayers and there is no reason, with buoyant revenues in this province and as our gross provincial product rises, why the municipal share should not rise with it and, in fact, because of the failure of the government in past years to share profits, why that share should not go up.

In other words, a larger proportion of the increase should go to help the municipal taxpayers, with less of it siphoned off for other purposes. This government has plenty of sources of revenue if it will use them. The municipalities are limited drastically in their tax base. And so this bill should be amended by this government to provide for a much greater increase across the board for our people, and then the government should go out to get the money where the money is. Time after time in this House we have brought before the government the fact that we have great natural resources in timberlands and in mines. Those resources can be tapped far more effectively than they are being tapped today.

We have, for example, from our logging pacts and stumpage charges something over $15 million coming into the Treasury. That does not much more than pay—if indeed it pays—for the services that we as a province render to the timberlands. The Mining Profits Tax Act brings us something around the same figure of $15 million, out of which the municipalities get something.

But, Mr. Speaker, the time seems to be here when this government should seriously consider the proposition that these great natural resources of this province should yield far more income into the provincial Treasury, and from that income the taxpayer be relieved of much of the burden that he is now carrying.

So, Mr. Speaker, while we agree that this bill is good as a half-step, it just does not do the job it ought to do. I remember some years ago, something happened in this country which was dramatic. For an average family of four — man, wife, two children, which is about the average family in this province—this means that the family gets through this bill a tax relief of about $6 in this coming year. In my own municipality, the tax increase may well amount to $50 to $60. The tax rates are not yet set in most municipalities. As a matter of fact, very few have set them. That means that one-tenth of this amount will be provided for in this legislation.

The incident I refer to is the time when the Liberal government in Ottawa, as it faced an election, raised the old age pension by $6 per month. Hon. members will remember the phrase that was coined by the then leader of the Opposition, who later became Prime Minister, and is again leader of the Opposition. He called the Liberals of that time the "six-buck boys," and it may well be that this phrase is going to be reactivated in this connection and that the municipal taxpayers are going to call the members of this government the "six-buck boys who approve a six-buck bonus at this time."

And just to paraphrase again, I would simply say that when the record is in this may well prove to be the $6 dirge of the $6 dreamers of this government, because they are dreamers if they think for one moment that this is going to satisfy the municipal taxpayers of this province, the taxpayers who are feeling the tremendous squeeze at the present time.

We must face the fact that a reorganization of the whole tax system of this province and of this nation must come, and the longer we postpone, the more acute the problem is. As the tax bills come out this spring, certainly the $6 dreamers on the government bench are going to get the shock of their lives in public reaction.

So Mr. Speaker, we support this bill with some hesitation. We believe it is a half-step

towards what ought to be accomplished, but that half-step, I suppose, is better than nothing. But I would hope that the Minister will bring it back and will begin to understand what the people of this province really need.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two about this bill because I have always been interested in The Unconditional Grants Act of this province. I remember some years ago, probably 10 or 12, when we on this side of the House were belabouring the government for the fact that unconditional grants were not the same in one area of the province as the other. The then Prime Minister suggested that the main reason why the larger centres got more than the smaller ones was the fact that in Toronto, as an example, welfare on a population basis cost a great deal more there than it did in the rural centres of this province.

Now, presuming that he was correct 10 years ago, in those days the province paid 50 per cent of the welfare costs and the municipality paid 50 per cent. Now we have reached the stage where the province is paying 80 per cent of the welfare costs. If that argument was correct in those days gone by, then surely it has changed somewhat in this year, 1967.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I never felt that the Act was fair to start with, and I do not think that it is fair today. I feel that in rural Ontario, the smaller centres of this province—and I am sure that all rural members here will agree with me, and on the Conservative side too, we who represent those areas—need just as much money per capita as they do in the city of Toronto. Certainly we in rural areas, most assuredly speaking for myself, have nothing against this great city. I know that they require the extra money that is going to be given them in this bill that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is bringing forth.

May I remind you, Mr. Speaker, and all members of the House, that while we from the rest of Ontario, when tourists from all over the world come to see the great Toronto city hall that cost $31 million, there is not one other municipality in the whole province that can put up a city hall like that. The reason is very simple—because we simply have not the money.

Jealously we say that in Toronto they have it here and we are glad to be able to come down and to appreciate the things that they are able to build because this is by far the wealthiest municipality in the whole province.

We have no subways. In many instances of course we would not have subways because the population would not warrant it. In the city of Hamilton, there are no subways; nor in the city of Kitchener or in some of the larger cities, Windsor, Ottawa and in London itself. The reason of course is very simple, that the other municipalities in this province cannot afford it.

When we from rural areas who say in the various hotels of this great city come out after a snowstorm we see six inches of snow at 12 o'clock at night. The next morning we come out in the city of Toronto and the snow is all removed, not only off the main streets but off the sidewalks.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Where has the member been?

Mr. Whicher: I have been right here. May I say to you, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for York South, that some of the snow in rural Ontario is still there, because it got to such a depth it takes old man sun a long time to melt it away, I assure you.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, certainly in my area of the province, that while The Department of Highways comes and removes the snow from the main highways, and our towns remove the snow from the streets it is not removed from the sidewalks, that is an absolute fact. It is just piled up alongside the road. But here we see hundreds and probably thousands of trucks which take it away, and we are glad that this is done.

Mr. MacDonald: Side roads, side streets —there is a difference, you know.

Mr. Whicher: Side roads, side streets. But we are glad that this is done and we appreciate what the city of Toronto has done, but the fact is that Toronto can afford to do it and nobody else can do it. I read about such things as zoos—that Toronto is going to have a big addition or build a brand new zoo in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Young: They do not need one in Bruce.

Mr. Whicher: I will consider where that one came from. All the monkeys are not in the zoo. But we appreciate the fact these things are going to be built, we appreciate the fact we have such things as the Royal Alexandra theatre and the great Maple Leaf gardens and the O'Keefe centre, but what other municipality in the province of Ontario could afford such a thing? As a matter of fact, we in the county of Bruce, which I have the honour to represent, cannot afford to take

the snow off many of the roads, in fact we canot even afford in many instances to have good roads. Show me one street in the city of Toronto that is not in a reasonably good condition; the majority of them are in wonderful condition.

Mr. MacDonald: Where has he been?

Mr. Whicher: I have been all over the place. When the member for York South went over the various farm areas of this province, he was not in some of the sideroads of this province, I assure him.

Mr. MacDonald: The member should have a look at the roller-coaster roads in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Whicher: But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this great city is where the money is; there is no question about it whatsoever. I know that the taxes are high, I know that the newspapers and the members who represent Metropolitan Toronto kick about the taxes that they have in this great city, but the fact is they have a city hall—would the member for York South answer that one?—worth $31 million, probably the finest city hall in the whole world, bringing in thousands of tourists into this area—

Mr. MacDonald: A good investment.

Mr. Whicher: —and a credit to the city of Toronto and a credit to the province in which we live. But what other municipality can afford even the smallest similarity to such a hall? Under those conditions, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the government opposite, under what possible line of thinking can they give $7 to the poor residents of Metropolitan Toronto and only $4.50 to those in rural Ontario—55 per cent more per person to residents in the city of Toronto compared to the area that I have the honour of representing? And you may consider, Mr. Speaker, that we are second hand citizens. I know the government, certainly in an election year, will not call us second hand citizens, but the fact is the they are treating us as such.

Mr. MacDonald: Second class.

Mr. Whicher: Second class citizens. We need new roads too.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the member feel he has been paved over?

Mr. Whicher: We need new roads too, we need new schools, we need new hospitals. And, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: New jails, too.

Mr. Whicher: Yes, somebody suggested to the rear of me here, new jails too. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Reform Institutions might be interested to know that one reason we are not getting new jails in rural Ontario as he wishes, I know, and as all of us wish, is because we simply cannot afford to put them up.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): We are getting some.

Mr. Whicher: We are getting some, but not very many.

Mr. Speaker, under these conditions I think that the government, particularly in an election year—and I have no axe to grind in this affair, because I am not running again—would review the situation before this has a third reading, so that we would treat the people of the province of Ontario all equally, and so that people from northern Ontario, the people from the city of Chatham, from the city of Kitchener or Guelph or Windsor or Ottawa or London, would be treated on a par with those of the great city of Toronto—which already is the greatest city in Canada, certainly the greatest one in the province of Ontario, and has the assets, the physical assets and the physical means of providing these things by itself.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask this through you to the Minister, whom I know has always been fair and whom I know, as a private member 12 years ago, had the same views about this that I have this afternoon.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I think the comments of the hon. gentleman from Bruce might be summed up as the lament of a Liberal dropout.

Mr. Whicher: I do not know that I am a dropout.

Mr. MacDonald: The member just said he was not going to run again, he is not going to stay in the fight.

Mr. Whicher: I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not a dropout. If the member thinks I am, he is wrong.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to pursue the lament in terms of trying to set country against city.

Mr. Whicher: I had no intention of doing that.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, have I the floor? One cannot on one hand be critical of Toronto and the building of a city hall and

on the other hand express great pride in it as a tourist attraction and everything. I suspect there are many cities with city halls —and I have seen them, in Hamilton, in many other places across the province—where I suspect the per capita investment in the city hall was as much as the per capita investment in the Toronto city hall. In addition to being a city hall, it is a tourist attraction, as the hon. member conceded. So let us not pursue the lament.

Mr. Speaker, my complaint about this bill is it is one more patch upon the thousands of patches we have been laying since The Baldwin Act of 1849. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you have ever had the experience of moving into a house which was a somewhat older house and you decided you wanted to do some redecorating, and you started to take—you shake your head? Well, I feel for you; I am glad you have not had this experience. You start to take the paper off the wall and you discover there is not one or two, but there are six or eight or ten layers, and what a problem it is.

This is basically our problem in The Municipal Act and in the government's whole approach to financing. We have been going for 100 years in patches upon patches and this is one more patch. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the government says, "We are doing something about it. We set up the Smith committee four years ago and the Smith committee is going to report. We cannot do anything fundamental about this until the Smith committee report comes in." Mr. Speaker, this is an excuse. If the government wanted to have had that report earlier, if the government felt it was as important as it now professes the whole issue to be, it would have been within the means of a government that has now got a budget of $2.2 billion to have focused necessary resources and personnel and otherwise to have gotten a report earlier. This is just an excuse so that it can get by another election and really procrastinate for another period of four years.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to anybody who has read, for example, the briefs of the Ontario association of mayors and reeves and the Ontario municipal association for some years, that there are certain responsibilities laid on the municipality which are not a legitimate charge on the property tax. The government knows it; everybody knows it! I am referring, for example, to the administration of justice and to the remaining portion of the charge on welfare. There is no reason why this government has to wait until it gets the Smith report to know that this needs to be done; this can be done now. I repeat, this is just an excuse, and in moving now to relieve the municipalities of that share of the burden they now have and which is not a legitimate burden, the government would not be standing in the way of following up later plans for a fundamental solution to the problem.

My colleague, the hon. member for Yorkview pointed out a very significant point, and this is the answer to the plethora of figures that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is now supplying to every one of the members on the government side of the House, but not to the Opposition side of the House, over his name and paid for by public servants to meet the needs of the Tory party in its propaganda —all the plethora of figures of the grants that have been given and the increases in grants in 1943, 1945, 1955 and today. The overall answer to that great plethora of figures, Mr. Speaker, is a simple one.

When the Budget came down, this government was making 44.6 per cent of its revenue last year available in grants to municipalities, and this year it is making available a smaller proportion. Admittedly the grants are bigger because there is more money available. Our Budget now exceeds $2 billion for the first time.

If this government was really impressed with the problem of the burden at the municipal level, it would have been needing as much and, I suggest, more than it was doing last year, and this would have been a token of good faith on its part in doing something about the problem. But it is making excuses; it is waiting for the Smith report, and so on and so on.

Indeed, let us not try to browbeat the government. The Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) is being very frank. He says to the municipal leaders: You are exaggerating the problem. It is rather good that the municipal leaders have to face up to this problem; you know that there is a sort of Victorian virtue in suffering and pain and facing up to the grim facts of life—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Did the hon. member read today's *Globe and Mail* about his attitude?

Mr. MacDonald: I do not care what the *Globe and Mail* has to say on my attitude. As a matter of fact, the *Globe and Mail* on that point is just as much out of tune as is this government, and I venture to predict when the votes come in at election time, sir, the

government will learn a little bit too late, to its sorrow!

Mr. Speaker, obviously one can do nothing but support the principle of the bill because it provides some assistance. As my colleague has said, for an average family of four, $6. Six-buck Robarts rides again, just as it was six-buck Harris rode again in the first instance. I think, quite frankly, that slogan was coined —to show the lovely feeling sometimes in the Liberal Party—not by Mr. Diefenbaker, but by the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) who, in a leadership battle in 1957 said of Mr. Harris, "six-buck Harris rides again."

Well, it is six-buck Robarts riding again, and it is an inadequate meeting of the problem. It is a patch among the many patches. It is not a solution to the problem, but we have no alternative but to support it because we have to take our support in dribs and drabs from a government that has no real appreciation of the proportions of the problem at all.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, this bill probably brings back to mind the way Prime Minister Frost used to say he governed the province of Ontario. He said: "We do a little bit here, we do a little bit there, and we wait for next year." I recall how he was quoted in *Macleans* magazine. Well, this is typical.

The hon. member for York South has called it a "patchwork", and truly this is the system by which we have been governed for a number of years and it still is not meeting the major problems throughout the province of Ontario.

There is this matter of the real estate taxes continuing to rise despite the fact that we have had in this province supposedly—according to this government—no increase in taxes this year. It is obvious that taxes have increased tremendously this year and they have increased the burden on the shoulders of the property owners.

I can no doubt say that this Bill 80 is an election weapon, to be used in election year to go into these various communities and say, "Well, look, we have raised your grants such and such an amount and in this respect we are doing something for the average homeowner throughout the province of Ontario." Now anyone who has looked into the various studies made on regional government, anyone who has looked into the costs of education, knows perfectly well that the answer to the problem of the real estate owners and the average citizen in the municipalities throughout the province of Ontario, is not going to be found in such bills as Bill 80.

Of course, it is a mincing step. It is a handout, but it is better than nothing. That is why we support it here in the House. At the same time we realize that this is not coming to grips with the problem. We still are shackled by a bill that was passed in 1849—which incidentally, Mr. Speaker, was a very good bill—The Baldwin Act of 1849. But when we bear in mind that more changes have taken place in this province and probably throughout the world in the last 50 years than have taken place in the last 5,000, we can see that we who live in the jet age are still playing around with legislation that was passed in the ox cart age. This Tory government will not get it out of its mind that a municipality should not be judged and run and operated on the time that it took an ox cart to go from one town to another. This is, in essence, what we are doing. We are trying to amend and monkey around with ox cart legislation when we live in an entirely different age.

I say to this House, through you, Mr. Speaker, that it is regrettable that, despite all the power and all the influence that this government has had over almost a quarter of a century, still it comes forward with these election time handouts. This government is not good, especially for the people of the province of Ontario.

I know what they do in other provinces is not necessarily a guide for what we do here, but certainly it is worthwhile taking a very deep and careful look at what they are doing in the province of New Brunswick. I had the opportunity to go down there and see what they are doing. What is being done in New Brunswick should be done here. Instead of taking these mincing steps, New Brunswick has had the courage to come into the twentieth century to take an overall look at the problems that government faces today and is going to increasingly face in the years that lie ahead.

It is not just what we do today for today that is important, it is what are we going to do to plan for the next 10 to 25 years ahead, and this Bill 80 simply is not meeting the problem. We are still floundering around, dreaming and wishing that the ox carts had not gone. That is what this government is doing, thinking in terms of the family compact and not wishing to disturb the old way of doing things. Whether we want to disturb it or not, the world is changing completely around us.

We should organize our thinking, we should organize our municipalities, we should go into regional planning and completely reassess our education costs—and, again, this is what these grants are for essentially, Mr. Speaker. The fact that the education costs in many of our major centres are now over half of our real estate taxes is something we are trying to ignore in Bill 80. Yet this is really what is behind the need and the necessity for giving our municipalities more help. We are simply not going to be able to have the new jails or the welfare and health services and the proper schools that we should have, unless we get away from these mincing steps, this business of "a little here and a little there" and, "tomorrow we wait until next year."

Let us bear in mind—despite any comparison with other jurisdictions throughout the world—we are a so-called affluent society. We still do not get the value out of our tax dollars. We still do not give to our people what we could give. With what assets and resources we have here, we still do not give our people the housing that they should get or the benefits in health, or even in the proper administration of justice, that they should get.

All we have to do is go down to our old city hall here in the city of Toronto and see the sausage machine that we call law courts and know that the municipalities are still not able to satisfy needs that we have here in the city of Toronto and throughout the province of Ontario.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is simply an election handout. It is a good thing that the people of this province are waking up to the fact that they have been governed by a philosophy of a little here and a little there. I am certain that they will come to the conclusion in the not too distant future that this simply is not good enough for them today. It would be a tragic disaster if they were to consider that this was good enough for the future citizens of the province of Ontario.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment on this bill. I am partly moved to speak because of residing in a borough which is, to say the least, immeasurably hard pressed by the state of municipal taxation and municipal finances. I am also moved to speak by the mood of self-congratulatory inertia which characterizes the Tory benches whenever this kind of subject is discussed in this House.

There is simply no question, Mr. Speaker, that the property taxes as they presently exist in areas like my own, and certainly throughout the metropolitan complex, are both oppressive and impossible. They make it absolutely impossible for municipalities to do the jobs for which they are supposedly designed and which they are supposedly to undertake on the basis of present legislation.

Indeed, so severe has it become in my particular borough that within the last few days even something so small as a branch of the library had to be closed because of the nature of municipal finances.

Now this $1.50 per capita affected by this bill, Mr. Speaker, is obviously a cynical pre-election act, and every member of the House knows that. Whether one describes it as a handout, or a patchwork, or a pittance, it is, in fact, an offensive insult to the electorate and it will solve absolutely nothing. There may be a pained smile on the part of municipal representatives, but that is just the prelude to the continued anguish which they feel because of the financial straitjacket imposed by this government.

Many of us, for very obvious reasons, have been involved in a great deal of riding and constituency activity over the last few months, maybe more than is normal, and I would like to say to the Prime Minister—this may be a conviction which is not borne out, but I would like to say to him through you, Mr. Speaker—that he is about to reap the whirlwind of voter discontent. The feeling on the tax issue, on the state of property taxes, is such that it knows no limits, particularly in the metropolitan area. The inertia on tax reform is galvanizing the discontent through these areas and may well catapult this Tory government out of office. Indeed, it will be the single most effective measure of moving these gentlemen from the benches which they now occupy.

I cannot stress enough, Mr. Speaker, that the pathetic overture which this bill represents is simply not sufficient. I suspect when historians look back on the last 10 days—the 10 days which have shaken the Tory party in Ontario—when they look back on the last 10 days, they will see in this small bill the death knell of Toryism, because the refusal of the government to recognize the extent of feeling on this issue is to me incomprehensible. If they wish to persist, that of course is their right.

The principle which we are forced to support, of giving more money, is something which will evoke Opposition response in a positive way. I put on the record, sir, as all Opposition members would put on the record, and as I am sure some government members must feel, our assertion that

the situation is intolerable, and this bill in no way affects it materially.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I should rise for a few moments just to make a few remarks. I think hon. members must remember that this is not the only grant that the province of Ontario provides to the municipalities and to boards of education.

With reference regarding $6 and Mr. Harris and so on, there is no $6 rate in this bill, so hon. members cannot manufacture that one on us.

Mr. MacDonald: An average family of four—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is taken out of thin air, and the gentleman who made that statement is not even here now.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, he knows about municipal affairs.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Let us take a look at some of the additional support which is being paid to our municipalities today. The education budget of this province is going up about $75 million. That is going to assist the local tax rate. We have taken over a greater share of the cost of children's aid societies expenditures. We have taken over a much greater share of social welfare expenditures. We have also taken over a larger proportion of the costs of street and road maintenance.

As a matter of fact, I think there is one figure in The Department of Highways budget that would indicate that an additional amount—the additional sums going to maintenance and construction of roads and streets in the province at the municipal level—is something like $25 per capita additional increase this year.

Municipal drains is another area where we assist development of municipalities. We assist them also with grants for improving the administration of the municipality, whether it be at the level of equalized assessment, setting up better assessment functions, and things of that kind.

Mr. MacDonald: How does it add up?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I appreciate the fact that the reorganization of tax responsibilities in this province is imminent. I do not think there is any doubt of that. The hon. Prime Minister has spoken of it on many occasions. But the research that we have conducted in the department, in cooperation with The Provincial Treasurer's Department, would indicate that this method which we have used here in increasing the amount of the unconditional grant by $1.50 across the board is really going to meet the needs for which the unconditional grants were provided for in the first place.

You may remember that when this form of support was first made available to the municipalities it was to cover the municipal share of certain stated expenditures. When the Ontario hospital insurance scheme came into effect, it was necessary for us to amend the preamble to this Act so that we gave it still broader connotation than it had had before. But the principle for which these unconditional grants were established are still there, and I might say that there are some municipalities that made money on this type of grant.

I am not saying that this is going to be the way in which the tax responsibilties, or the reorganization of tax responsibilities between the province and the municipalities will take place in the future, but I do say that for the moment by adding another $12 million in the Budget this year, we have provided some considerable amount of assistance to our municipalities. When you consider that in the case of the larger centres it has meant an increase of about 27 per cent in the amount of the unconditional grant, whereas in the smaller communities this will mean an additional 50 per cent of the per capita grant.

I would ask the House, Mr. Speaker, to vote in favour of the second reading of this bill.

Mr. Whicher: Where did the Minister get the $12 million?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Last year there was $28.3 million and this year it is $40 million. Anybody who can add can figure that out. As a matter of fact, the amount is exactly $11.7 million more than there was last year.

Mr. Whicher: I could not understand the $1.50 per capita. If there are 7 million, that would only come to $10.5 million.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: There is also an adjustment because of an increase in population.

Mr. Speaker: Motion carried?

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is carried, may I ask either the Minister or the Prime Minister, is there any indication of the Smith report getting close to us, or are they still as far away as ever?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to answer this question and perhaps I could take this occasion to answer the comments of the hon. member for York South about the Smith report. He almost makes it sound as if this government were keeping the Smith report back for our own purposes.

I have said publicly, I have said in this House—I do not know whether the member was here or not—but I said in the last two weeks in answer to another query, nobody is more interested in getting the Smith report than the government.

Mr. MacDonald: We have heard that, but actions speak louder than words.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We appointed a committee, and certainly if the Opposition members could ever have any cause to say that we interfered with the functioning of that committee, the first thing they would do is go out and say it for political purposes. They cannot have it both ways. We avoided an independent committee. We have given them unlimited funds; we have given them access to everything this government has in the way of assistance; and we have asked them to bring in a report at the earliest possible moment.

I also might point to the experience of the Carter commission which was something over which we had no control. Here was a committee appointed at the same time, and the federal government, indeed all of Canada, has gone through the same period of waiting in order to get its results. It never occurred to me that it would take this long to get the Smith committee report. I have been in touch with the chairman of the committee in the last week, discussing it with him and asking him what he can do to speed it up.

He can speed it up to the point where it would not be as good a report as it would be, but that is simply the answer to this question. I cannot tell the chairman of an independent committee that is sitting under the powers conveyed upon it in The Public Inquiries Act in this Legislature. I have no control over that committee any more than the hon. members opposite have. He was given terms of reference and asked to do a job. His powers come under that statute and for the hon. member to infer that we are in any way trying to hold this up is utter and absolute nonsense. He is the first man in this House to know it, and I just do not like the allegations. Nonetheless I am used to these things.

I would also like simply to reiterate the words of the hon. Minister that if you are going to look at grants from this government to our municipalities you have to look at them in their totality. And as for this effort that is made over here, for once I agree with my friend from York South that this attempt to pit the rural people of this province against the city people of this province is to me something that should not be countenanced. Any responsible government certainly would do everything in its power to see that all parts of the province are treated fairly and equally. This we attempt to do.

This particular piece of legislation is only one very small part of the total grants this province and this government makes to our municipalities. If you want to argue your point you can go into the field of educational grants. We can demonstrate quite clearly that in some of the rural areas up to 95 per cent of the total cost of schooling is paid by the province—and then back into some of the city areas where it drops down to something below 40 per cent.

You cannot have it both ways and it is impossible to say that any flat rate is going to meet all the needs of all the municipalities of this province. It is like trying to compare, for instance, the production in gasoline tax in a mile of highway in northern Ontario and a mile of highway down here. I have used this example many times, but when Highway 401 was first built over the northern part of Toronto—and I have not had the figures checked out recently—but several years ago we computed that the gasoline tax alone on Highway 401 north of Toronto would pay for that road completely within about six years. And if you estimate the life of that road for 40 or 45 years it means for some 30 to 35 years that road is going to be producing taxation which will be spent in some other part of the province.

You simply cannot govern a province in the way in which you are trying to say that we can. You cannot make equal grants to different areas—you have different needs, and a different capacity to pay. We have a system of equalization throughout the province in order that we may equalize the opportunity in every part of the province and the poorer parts of the province receive more money.

Now let me get back to the argument about the original purpose of this grant and the differentiation that was made. I think the Minister has explained this. In this case we have not followed this differentiation. In actual fact the riding the hon. member for Bruce comes

from is receiving proportionately more and his leader recognized this. I just point out to you that if you are going to reassess what is being done, do not take this one bill and this one area of grant, because it was made originally for certain specific purposes.

Certainly the municipalities, some of them at least, I think, have forgotten what those purposes originally were. But it must be considered in the total of the grants that are made; for instance, the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) will tell you that the grants for education for our municipalities are increasing $61 million this year—this plus increases in highway grants. And these were all outlined in this House and have been outlined in this House during the debates of this present session. I say it is a deliberate attempt, of course, on the part of the Opposition to miscast this bill and to miscast the effect of this grant, because this is only part of a large whole and you must look at the whole and not just the part embodied; and I notice you are all going to vote for it anyway.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Prime Minister would permit a question? He stood up originally to comment on the date of the report of the taxation committee; can he still assure us that we can expect it early in May?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I made it very clear—I can give no assurance.

Mr. Nixon: No, but he did once.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not control the committee and the committee chairman is not able to give me a specific date that I can report to this House when that report will be available.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, let us be specific. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) said "in May", and news reports over the weekend said that it was completed and ready for printing. Is this inaccurate?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I heard none of these reports. You mean this past weekend?

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That there has been a report; that it is complete?

Mr. MacDonald: One of the news stories this weekend said that the report was completed and in the process of being printed.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not know where that information came from, but I was speaking to the chairman of the committee last week and that was not the information that he gave me. I would have to look at my diary, but in any event it was last week and certainly he did not give me that information and I have no date that I can give this House.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The sixteenth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

(Continued)

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, in his lead-off statement the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) dealt with the full range of votes in this department. I do not propose to comment on all of them in my introductory statement—there will be plenty of opportunity as we deal with each of the individual estimates. I do want to centre my attention on what I think is one of the most important aspects of this department's work, and that is the provision of adequate energy for the continued expansion of the economy of the province of Ontario, and more particularly that new source of energy, namely, natural gas.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize that Ontario has become the industrial heartland of this nation. More manufacturing is done in this province than all of the other nine provinces put together, including the province of Quebec. There are many reasons for this extraordinary development—geographical position, rail, water, air and road transport; one third of the Canadian market lying within 100 miles of the city of Toronto and just over the border a major portion of the American market. But beyond any doubt one of the cornerstones upon which Ontario's industrial development has been built is cheap power. Early in this century the vision and tenacity of Adam Beck built the great hydro electric system. Sir Adam fought the vested interests —including the government, on occasion—to build a power grid which developed and carried cheap power to all parts of the province. His contribution is beyond doubt, but nonetheless inestimable.

Unfortuntely, we have no Sir Adam Beck in our generation. The modern breed of Tory, unlike his forbears, does not recognize

the validity of public enterprise—even in the utilities field. When the new source of power from natural gas became available, powerful private interests dominated its development and scrambled for its control. The whole process resulted in scandals that reached into municipal governments and into the provincial Cabinet itself, and reverberations are still being heard across the province.

With the assistance of the government, these private interests gained control of the distribution of natural gas in this province, and today they are reaping profits which have denied power at cost to both industry and to our people. The public interest has been sacrificed to this government's doctrinaire, free enterprise beliefs, even when our traditional power at cost, through public enterprise, has established such an enviable record.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to waste time this afternoon pursuing this fundamental difference which the New Democratic Party holds with both the Tories and the Liberals. We are proud to be associated with Ontario's traditional approach in this field, and will do no more than regret in passing, that this government, with the support of the Liberals, has broken with that tradition.

But there is one aspect of it which I do want to dwell on for a moment. The distribution of natural gas involves not only major pipelines from the gas fields of western Canada and the whole network of local transmission lines, but also storage areas for the surplus gas which must be accumulated in off-peak periods, in order to meet the needs in peak periods. In this connection, Ontario is blessed with an incomparable natural asset—great storage basins with a capacity in excess of 100 billion cubic feet, centred chiefly in Lambton county.

If power at cost had remained our guiding principle, these vast storage basins would have been tied in with an integrated local distribution system, so as to provide a power grid for natural gas all across the province comparable to that built by Sir Adam Beck in our father's day for hydroelectric power. But as handled by this government, these storage basins have also been the object of a scandal by private interests and, once again, with the assistance of this government and its agencies they, too, have been handed over to the private interests.

Union Gas and Oil has been in the field; it holds a lion's share of the storage capacity; it has used it as much as its economic interests make it advisable, and of recent years it has built a connecting line from the Dawn field in Lambton county to the "golden horseshoe," so that it is in the position to profit increasingly from the use of this vital storage capacity.

Imperial Oid traditionally has been in the field, but with its interest originally only in oil and I quote: "Imperial Oil is not interested in storing gas, but we are interested in seeing that nobody else does." That was the comment of one of its agents in days gone by.

Meanwhile, some years ago, Consumers' Gas professed not to be interested in extensive storage use, ostensibly because it costs too much, as its president told me personally in the late fifties. But Consumers' Gas has grown to recognize the economic potential of storage basins, and what originally cost too much, was purchased from others and has now become very profitably controlled by Consumers' Gas.

So Imperial Oil and Consumers' Gas have combined forces through a subsidiary, Tecumseh, to seek and gain control from the Ontario energy board of most of the remaining storage capacity of the Lambton county area.

Mr. Chairman, the availability of all this storage space in the control of Union Gas, Imperial Oil and Consumers' Gas will shortly be assured to the industrial heartland around Lake Ontario, because Union Gas is currently looping its original 26-inch line connecting it to the golden horseshoe, with another 34-inch line. As usual, the building of this line has brought a storm of protest from property owners—at least in one area in Waterloo county—because of a controversial rerouting of the line. Of that, more later.

I am going to quote from one paragraph of the judgment that was handed down by the energy board in connection with that quarrel, a quote that is in reference to the importance of this line:

> The pipeline under consideration in this case, is the most important pipeline under provincial jurisdiction in Ontario. When completed, it will comprise 142 miles of 34-inch high pressure line connecting Dawn township gas storage fields in Lambton county with the major Ontario market and the pipeline facilities of the Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited. It is of vital importance in meeting the public needs in southern and central Ontario for adequate supplies of gas.

That is the end of the quotation from the judgment of the Ontario energy board.

In short, Mr. Chairman, with the completion of this line, the great storage areas of Lambton county are now tied in with the main pipeline from western Canada, and can now be used to their full potential. I emphasize once again that as the government has permitted things to develop, a few giants in the field are in the position to reap extraordinary profits from gas transmission, distribution and storage. The principle of power at cost has been lost sight of; it is power at cost, plus, plus, plus, but for better or for worse, this is the system which the government has brought into being.

Mr. Chairman, I now want to go back a bit. For years the New Democratic Party has been the only party which has fought for building a publicly owned gas distribution grid, integrating our vast storage cacapity with it. The Tories have opposed it and created the present system. The Liberals, by their silence, implied consent and, indeed, on occasion have given their approval.

Now, during the years when we were fighting alone for the full use of Lambton county storage potential, before the 34-inch loop from the Dawn township provided an adequate link for its full use into the golden horseshoe and before—I might add—Trans-Canada had announced any plans for looping its line from western Canada, I raised in this Legislature the question of whether the eventual looped line from the west might not come through the United States and tie directly into the Lambton storage area. This is a quotation with which the Liberals and the Tories have become obsessed.

I did so, Mr. Chairman, without detailed knowledge of the factors involved—indeed, years later, several years later—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): You mean you were ignorant.

Mr. MacDonald: The only difference between you and me is that you are still ignorant and at least I am now on top of the facts.

I did so, without detailed knowledge of the factors involved—indeed, years later we still do not know all the factors involved, but we have certainly got an eyeful of them in recent months. I did, as I argued four years ago, chiefly to assure the full use of the Lambton storage basins, and Mr. Chairman, just let me pause here for the interjections of our Liberal friends.

The interesting thing is that I have been raising this matter almost every year for 10 years—

Mr. Whicher: But not effectively—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, of course, a lot of things that we advocate do not get through effectively to that government over there. You ought to know that. In fact, you have thrown in the sponge; you are not going to run, so just remain silent. You are out of the picture from this point forward.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Like your friend beside you in the front row.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for London South, Mr. Chairman, is out of his seat and therefore should be silent because he cannot speak.

Mr. Chairman, for 10 years those who are interested in the full use of the Lambton storage area and those who are plagued with the problems that the farmers there have been living with for 10 years or more, have been coming and presenting their brief to the Liberal Party as an Opposition party. The only thing I can conclude is that they do not even yet comprehend it, because not once in the last 10 years have they had anything more than passing reference to all of their problems in the Liberal party.

Mr. Chairman, they may support the farmers, but they do it by their silence—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We did it as effectively as you did it! More effectively—

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, it is this kind of silence and failure to do the job that is making more people leave the Liberal Party and go to the effective Opposition, of which we will see more, in the fullness of time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. MacDonald: Let me pick up—

Mr. Whicher: You said you were ignorant of the facts—

Mr. MacDonald: I have since got the facts to the extent that they are available, and my hon. friend over here has not even tried to get the facts.

Mr. Whicher: Nonsense!

Mr. Chairman: I realize that the member for York South has been somewhat provocative, but I would ask the members to refrain from interjecting.

Mr. MacDonald: I am enjoying it, Mr. Chairman, so please do not feel ill at ease on my account.

But all the same, I was interested then and I am interested now, in getting the full use of this incomparable natural asset of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Whicher: You are only interested in votes.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Let us polish up our halo. These little men here who are not in politics are just playing tiddley-winks; they are not interested in votes—how ludicrous.

Mr. Whicher: But the member does not mind how he gets them.

Mr. MacDonald: This is the key point, Mr. Chairman, if we can get down to the facts, and let us deal with facts, since the hon. member for Bruce and others might like to face up to them. In the interval, in the last four years, through the energy board's approval, of this new 34-inch line from Dawn to the Hamilton-Toronto area, the government has approved an alternative system for linking the Lambton storage to the distribution system of all southern Ontario.

I am not going to argue the merits of whether or not it is the best way of doing it, the fact is it is done, or it is in the process of being done. The line has been authorized and they are building it in sections, some sections of it are being built already. We had completed our distribution system within the province of Ontario, integrating the storage capacity fully, and, as I shall point out in a few moments, the case for maintaining the line from the west wholly on Canadian soil is now a solid one, if the public interest is going to be our top priority.

Before I leave the Lambton storage area and its problems, Mr. Chairman, there are a host of them in relation to it on which this government has been dragging its feet for 10 years. Some of them have to do with assessment. Municipalities in the area, for example, have raised the question for years as to why storage companies should not bear assessment on their underground facilities and share in the burden of municipal services. If a gas company builds storage facilities above the ground, its assessment is automatic and it thereby shares in the cost of municipal services. The government's refusal to face up to this issue is just one more instance of its refusal to make certain that the public should share in the economic benefits of this great natural resource, instead of letting the rewards go so completely to a few private interests to whom exclusive use has been given by the Ontario energy board, an agency of this government.

But, Mr. Chairman, most of the problems that the farmers have to cope with are in relation to the storage basins themselves, and I want to turn now to those problems.

The interesting thing, by way of a bit of historical recapitulation, Mr. Chairman, is that for 10 years these people have been coming to this government trying to get some action. Just let me review briefly the sorry tale of procrastination.

Back in 1956 and 1957, our administrative machinery to cope with energy and particularly natural gas, apart from hydro, was admittedly inadequate in the province of Ontario. One of the real contributions of Bob Macaulay was to move into this field with all his dynamic imagination, and organize the energy board and the energy department. In the process of doing all this, the great Macaulay was not particularly interested in, nor did he have time to deal with, the mundane problems of the farmers out in Lambton county. So they got lost in the shuffle. There may have been some measure of excuse at that stage. But the pressure continued and the only party in the House that was putting that pressure forward, except for about one or two speeches by the former member for Lambton county, Mr. Janes, was the New Democratic Party. Finally, Mr. Chairman, the government gave the problem to be looked into by Professor Langdon. In the process of his investigations, that committee was sidetracked into investigating a problem of oil leakage in the Great Lakes. It became so completely preoccupied with this problem that there was no reply, no answer at all, in the first report from the Langdon committee. Later, when the Langdon committee reported finally, it in effect threw in the towel on the issue. It stated that it had not been able to cope, that the technical requirements were beyond its resources. Whatever be the reason, it did not come in with the report and the ball was tossed back into the government's lap. This was in the year 1962. I note, Mr. Chairman, this is now five or six years after these problems were first brought to the government, the only place where their solution could be provided.

Finally, in 1962, Mr. Macaulay handed the whole problem to the Ontario energy board which studied it for two years and produced a report, a copy of which I have here and

which is available to all members. Undoubtedly they got copies at the time and they are in their files. It is dated May 4, 1964.

In this report—I just make this by way of my conclusion, and I will document it and come back to it in a moment—you have a solution to the problem. The government asked the energy board to study it, the energy board came up with recommendations. The year when the recommendations were given was 1964. Three years later, characteristic of this government, they have done nothing.

So once again—hat in hand, like so many of the citizens of this province, who cannot get their government to cooperate with them in solving long documented problems—this year, once again, the Lambton gas storage association came and presented its brief, and had interviews with the Ministers involved and with the Opposition parties. Over the signature of H. E. Wellington, president, and William Wark, secretary, it presented a brief to all hon. members of the Legislature. I want to hit a few highlights in this brief, Mr. Chairman:

> Why are landowners in Lambton county asking for changes in The Ontario Energy Board Act?

—they ask, rather plaintively, after nearly ten years. And the answer is a simple one: "For years many of them have been the victims of expropriation without any real compensation." That is the sum and substance of it.

They point out, for example, that as far back as 1957, when these storage basins were being handed over, new amounts of them went to new companies that were coming into the field. It was then that the expropriation of gas storage rights started and, during the intervening ten years, their efforts to get a solution have resulted in one case being carried through all of the prolonged arbitration channels. It was arbitrated in 1960-1961, and finally an appeal was heard by the Ontario municipal board in 1965, after which the board made an award dated June 14, 1966. I ask you to note, Mr. Chairman, the speed with which the solution to problems here flows with this government. Start in 1957 and you finally get some sort of a solution from a court in 1966.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Faster than usual.

Mr. MacDonald: The Ontario court of appeal—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): May I interrupt for a moment? Is the hon. member attempting to say that is the fault of the municipal board, because I would suggest to him that in many cases the delays are not on that level at all. It is, in most cases, the fault of the participating litigants by requesting adjournments.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right? I will tell you where the fault is. Right in that seat the Minister is sitting on instead of doing something about it. For three years now, he has had the solution to the problem and you are sitting on that solution. He asked for the solution, he got it, and he is sitting on it.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am only talking with reference to the statement the member made, about the Ontario municipal board. I wanted to get that clear.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The Minister led with his chin. He should not make it any worse.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is all right.

Mr. MacDonald: However, Mr. Chairman, I just draw your attention to the end of this little chapter in the long story. When they got the Ontario municipal board ruling, they sought to appeal it to the court of appeal and the court of appeal refused to grant a right of appeal because it said there was no question of law or jurisdiction involved. As the brief from the Lambton gas storage association adds, and I quote:

> —although the OMB had described compensation for gas storage rights as being in a field barren of legal precedents in our jurisdiction.

Yet there was no basis in law with which to come to grips with this.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Complaining about the judiciary now.

Mr. MacDonald: Now Mr. Chairman, I do not think I should be sidetracked. I think you agree with me, you smile benignly at me, with your Irish whimsy, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: He smiles at everyone.

Mr. MacDonald: I should not be sidetracked by him, should I? Agreed, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I should say you should stay with the vote.

Mr. MacDonald: Now the difficulty and uncertainty of this whole situation, Mr. Chairman, is illustrated by a comparison which

the brief from the Lambton gas storage association puts forward. I quote:

> In May 1964 the Ontario energy board, acting under order-in-council 1354-62, made a report to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council following a two year inquiry in which gas storage rights were carefully considered. The energy board suggested on page 29 of its report that landowners in the Payne pool should be compensated for gas storage rights at the rate of $13.88 per acre per annum. By its decision on June 14, 1966, the Ontario municipal board awarded landowners in the Payne pool as compensation for gas storage rights $5 per acre. Thus—

and I continue with the brief, Mr. Chairman, let it speak for itself:

> Thus for one and the same thing the energy board in 1964 recommended $13.88 and the municipal board in 1966 awarded $5. Obviously there is a fantastically wide difference between these two figures.

And the brief continues:

> It is clear from the comparison above that the principles of compensation for gas storage rights have not yet been established in Ontario, and that the whole subject is in a state of great confusion and uncertainty.

They point out that the uncertainty and the difficulties are going to grow, because with the increased use of gas, there will be increased need for storage more and more of these fields—in other words more and more of the 105 billion cubic feet capacity, are going to come into use each year.

I point out that the answer to the problem is now no mystery, as I said a moment ago to the interruptions of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The government has had them for four years and it has been sitting on them. If you go back to the report of the Ontario energy board, on pages 20 to 29 they spell out what they describe as principles.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): What date was that?

Mr. MacDonald: May 4, 1964.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That would be four years ago.

Mr. MacDonald: In my calculations, that is three years ago, almost to the day.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You said four years ago, I just wanted to corerct you.

Mr. MacDonald: Did I say four years ago?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, you did.

Mr. MacDonald: I appreciate that little mathematical assist from the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well you need a little help.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a substantive contribution to the debate.

As the brief from the Lambton gas storage association points out, four of these principles point to the solution of this problem. Principles six, seven, eight and nine. Principle six is that "storage rental payment should be based upon the capacity and performance rating of the storage reservoir," and then they go on to discuss some of the technical details involved in that kind of calculation.

Principle seven says there should be a minimum storage rental payment per acre, and this is to cope with those storage basins that are not going to be used to a very great extent. The suggested amount is $1 per acre per year. This apparently obtains in many instances so that there is no serious problem in that.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Do you agree with that?

Mr. MacDonald: Of course I do. The question is: Do you and when are you going to act on it?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes I do.

Mr. MacDonald: When are you going to act on it?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Go ahead.

Mr. MacDonald: Your actions could be a a lot more convincing than your words. You have been sitting on it for three years, by your own accurate count.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh no. I am not sitting on it.

Mr. MacDonald: Principle number eight, Mr. Chairman: In the determination of storage rental payment, account should be taken into the use and usefulness of storage.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, what the energy board was saying is that there is no fixed amount that is going to go on in perpetuity for storage rents that the farmers are entitled to get. It will depend on what the market happens to be. They point out that during the last 10 or 15 years, there has been a consistent upward trend in the market and in the use of storage. It started back in 1950 or 1949, when Union Gas through a contract with Panhandle in the

United States brought in more gas from the United States through the Detroit area and it was stored in the storage basin.

It was followed through by Consumers' in 1958, when they entered a 20-year contract with Union Gas when they first broke the first line, the 26-inch line from Dawn down to the Toronto-Hamilton area for some 7.5 billion cubic feet annually. It has been upped again in more recent years with the subsidiaries created by Imperial Oil and Consumers', known as Tecumseh, in which they are going to be storing upwards ultimately of 30 billion cubic feet in the current year.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, if you have that much increased use of storage anticipated over the years, the board points out, as a matter of principle, that the amount would have to be gauged in accordance with what the market demand is, and the farmers are entitled to some payment that would reflect that market demand.

Finally, principle number nine—storage lease agreements: "agreements in respect of storage rights should be subject to renegotiation or redetermination of storage rental payments at stated intervals, with provision for arbitration in the event of disagreement." In the subsequent elaboration on this, they suggest that renegotiation or redetermination should be opened at 10-year intervals at the request of either party.

Just let me wrap up this aspect of it. The Minister says he is going to comment on this. I shall be very interested in his comments because I repeat to you that this report came in 1964, after nearly 10 years of procrastination by this government, of doing nothing either at the Langdon committee or the subsequent hearing of the Langdon committee, now the energy board. For three years the Minister, or his predecessors have been sitting on the report, and as the representations from the Lambton gas storage association point out, the answers to the problem are in the report. It is one thing for the government to say that they do not know what the solutions to the problem are. What makes it even more exasperating for the people coping with the problems, is that even when the government is provided an answer by a commission which they themselves have set up, through their own agency, the Ontario energy board, after three years they have still done nothing about it.

I invite, and look forward with some degree of interest to hear what the Minister might have to say in light of these comments.

I leave these unresolved problems in the Lambton storage area, Mr. Chairman, to turn to gas distribution in northern Ontario and the vital issue of whether our further supplies from western Canada are going to be routed through the United States or used as a basis for economic development through those parts of our north which do not enjoy now the benefits of natural gas.

Last August, the Liberal government in Ottawa announced its support for the recommendations of the National Energy Board, that Trans-Canada's second line from western Canada should be an all-Canadian route. Some weeks later it reversed its stand. The Victoria *Daily Colonist* summed up the situation neatly, and I quote:

> The powerful and dominantly United States owned western oil industry objected vigorously to the government decision. It enlisted the aid of many groups and gas consumers to lobby the government into a change of policy.

There has seldom been a more blatant case of public interest being subordinated to politically powerful private interests. The main excuse given is that the lines through the United States would provide gas more cheaply. All right, Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at this.

To the extent that this Minister, our Minister of Energy and Resources Management, has revealed his position, it is in favour of the southern route through the United States, and along with the federal government he has accepted the company's contention that gas would be cheaper. I quote the Minister: "The only reason we are keeping a watching brief," he told the Legislature last May 9, "is to make sure that costs are established, and that we are getting gas in Ontario by the route that will bring it here the cheapest."

Well, Mr. Chairman, what are the facts?

Trans-Canada first argued—this was before the National Energy Board, way back in the story now, there have been about 15 chapters since then, if not 1,500 chapters. Trans-Canada first argued that the line would be cheaper through the U.S. because it could sell gas along the line and that would help to pay for it.

But that intention, for whatever reason—and I suspect it was because of pressure from the powerful gas interests in the United States that did not want the competition in the area—was dropped early in the plan so that the original calculations require some adjustment.

Furthermore, there is the danger that the U.S., under pressure from powerful gas interests in the country, will tax gas coming in from Canada; that Damocles' sword will always be hanging over our heads. The Hon. Mr. Pépin, the federal Minister of Energy, has acknowledged and I quote:

> I do know that there has been considerable agitation in the United States to impose an import duty on Canadian gas in retaliation for the present duty of 3 cents per thousand cubic feet levied by Canada on gas imported from the United States.

So, Mr. Chairman, all of the cost calculations are subject to known and threatened increases for the southern route. I say "known" increases because they dropped selling along the route, and "threatened" increases, such as a tax in the United States.

But in specific terms, Mr. Chairman, what were the estimated costs? Well, using Trans-Canada's own statement of costs per mile, the cost for laying the line through Ontario would be about $235 million—and incidentally there are many people who think that those costs are high for a number of reasons, one of which I will come back to in a moment.

Estimates for building the southern line were $200 million but the *Financial Post* has pointed out on April 16, 1966, that another $15 million must be added to cover tax revenues for the states of Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan. So the total becomes at least $215 million, so that the margin between the southern and northern route on the basis of figures given at the National Energy Board and revised by the studies of the observations of the *Financial Post* is no more than $20 million—$215 million as compared with $235 million.

The National Energy Board considered the alternative route carefully. If I may just interject here, Mr. Chairman, as a layman looking for all the facts which are difficult to find, we inevitably have to rely on the assessment of the National Energy Board which I would suggest, and I would imagine nobody would disagree, is a competent body to look into it. Therefore, its conclusions would be pretty valid and authoritative.

Well, the conclusion of the National Energy Board said that the margin in costs would be some 5 per cent which means that on a project of $200 million or a little more, a margin of a little more than $10 million between the northern and southern route. The National Energy Board put it another way. The average cost of transmission per thousand cubic feet on the southern route was estimated at 19.55 cents per thousand cubic feet, and for the northern route, 19.77 cents per thousand cubic feet. The difference is only .22 cents—just one fifth of one cent per thousand cubic feet.

Now, if I may pause and make a comment on an observation by my hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. Smith) yesterday. After he had attempted to make the best of a bad situation—to make a virtue of necessity and support the Liberal government's stand at Ottawa – his argument was that maybe it would be a good thing to have the line come through the United States because we would get gas cheaper, and industry in northern Ontario would benefit from this because northern Ontario is going to share in these benefits. I asked him to face up to the fact that the National Energy Board assessment, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): These facts are your suppositions and not the facts.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, my suppositions are not being put before the House at the moment at all. I am putting forward facts as concluded by the National Energy Board, and the facts are that the difference in cost for the transmission by the southern and northern route are 19.55 cents as opposed to 19.77 cents or just a shade over one fifth of one cent more. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that that is not the kind of advantage that northern industry is going to find meaningful at all.

Furthermore, and now I come back to another important factor in this $235 million cost that Trans-Canada has given for the northern line, their calculations are based on Trans-Canada's assumption that the money to build the southern route would cost 6.5 per cent while the money for the northern route would cost 7.5 per cent. I do not know where they got the figures, or why they came to his conclusion, but I do say that, if the government of Canada, or the government of Ontario, really want the line built in this country—and the argument is that it is going to cost more by building it in this country—surely they can provide the money at an interest rate which will eliminate altogether the alleged higher cost of bringing gas by an all-Canadian route. Why have the Liberals at Ottawa or the Tories here at Queen's Park been silent on this issue for nigh on 12 to 14 or 15 months?

However, let us turn from the question of cost to another key question. Are we going to get gas to eastern Canada by this winter

in order to meet an impending shortage? Our Minister blurred this whole question of whether or not we are going to have an impending shortage this fall in answer to a query of mine a week or two ago when he said that he had been assured by the gas distributors that there would be no shortage, that presumably somewhere they would get the gas. But how do you reconcile that statement from our Minister, Mr. Chairman, with the firm warning of Mr. Pépin on February 2 to J. W. Kerr, Trans-Canada's president? Mr. Pépin wrote to Mr. Kerr and I quote as follows:

> As you are aware, the government considers it essential that alternative plans for bringing more western Canadian gas to eastern Canada through additional pipeline facilities in Canada be available for implementation this year if the Great Lakes project cannot be approved by the Federal Power Commission in time to permit the commencement of deliveries by Great Lakes to eastern Canada this year. Accordingly, should it become apparent that the Great Lakes project cannot be approved in time to permit deliveries to eastern Canada this year, Trans-Canada should promptly submit to the National Energy Board an application for certification of additional pipeline facilities to be constructed in Canada.

The deadline fixed by Mr. Pépin was May 1, which is less than two weeks away.

Finally, in terms of questions, we should examine what are the prospects that the Federal Power Commission in the United States is going to provide a ruling by that time—May 1—either favourable or unfavourable. I suggest to you that the answer is virtually nil on both scores. The deadline cannot be met, and the answer is going to be an unfavourable answer.

On April 1, I remind the House, the Federal Power Commission counsel urged rejection of the southern route and argued in favour of a complex alternative which is being submitted by American gas interests for using a network of American lines further south. Furthermore, the FPC hearing does not begin until April 21, some time later this week. The possibility of any decision before the end of June is discounted, even on the speeded up schedule, according to most of the news reports that I have read. Beyond that there is the likely prospect that the FPC ruling will be appealed to the courts.

Mr. Chairman, there is still another reason which points clearly to the need for an immediate directive to get into operation with the construction of the line in Canada. An alternative proposal has been put forward by Northern Natural Gas, one of the giants in the American field, which has occasioned the rehearing by the FPC to begin on April 21. It is for an exchange of gas, with Canada exporting it in the west and after it has travelled through this network of American lines, Canada importing it again in the east. Here is a key point, Mr. Chairman. Trans-Canada has flatly rejected this, the *Globe and Mail* reported on March 10 and I quote:

> Trans-Canada has taken the position that it would not enter into a gas exchange programme with Northern in any circumstances. It has insisted that if the FPC turns down the Great Lakes application it would move instead to loop its own Canadian line, despite the substantially higher costs that might be involved.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have already seen that the substantially higher costs are little, if any, when all of the economic factors are taken into consideration, to say nothing of the monetary factors of using this line to strengthen Canada and build this nation on the pattern established by the fathers of Confederation 100 years ago.

So, what are we waiting for? Why in the name of Canadian interests, do we not get moving? And if the Sharp-Winters group that dominates the federal Cabinet is not free to move, where does this government stand, other than silently on the sidelines holding a watching brief, and talking out of both sides of its mouth at the same time?

Mr. Bryden: The Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) signed the petition.

Mr. MacDonald: While the Minister has given every sign, albeit oblique, of favouring the southern route, the Minister of Municipal Affairs tells the folks back home that he is opposed to this. If he is opposed, what is the Cabinet doing to reconcile this open division in its ranks?

Mr. Bryden: Nothing.

Mr. MacDonald: When we were discussing this matter during the early stages of the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development, the Minister of Mines kept interrupting in his inimitable way to the effect that he had signed a petition—which incidentally was launched by the labour council and the NDP at the Lakehead—favouring an all-Canadian line.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): That is right, I was sixth on the list.

Mr. Bryden: The last time the Minister said fifth.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines said: "You'll see." Those words came hurling across the House. Well, Mr. Chairman, what are we going to see and when?

Let us have some action and not the easy verbal drivel of the Minister of Mines. If this government does not move to assure the line through northern Ontario, it will have thrown away the greatest single opportunity for economic development throughout those sections of the north to which natural gas is not now available. Silence makes a mockery of the government's oft-trumpeted assurance that it is doing everything possible to assist the development of the economy of the north. Again, I want to make a comment on the observation of the hon. member for Nipissing yesterday. He said the north has now got natural gas.

Mr. Smith: I did not say that.

Mr. MacDonald: It now has natural gas, and we could wait until a little later when the requirements that are laid down by the federal government will obligate them to build a second line.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MacDonald: I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, if I may—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, if my hon. friend, the member for York South, makes a statement attributed to the member for Nipissing and that statement is not correct, then surely the member for Nipissing has the right to interject—

Mr. MacDonald: Just let me complete my statement. If the member for Grey South wants to mother the member for Nipissing, let him mother him, but just wait until I have made my statement.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister without Portfolio): Oh, do not be so "holier than thou".

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey South has stood in his place on a point of order. I think the point of order is well taken, that if something has been said that is out of order, the member has a right to—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am halfway through my statement and when I have finished it, I will sit down and give him an opportunity to correct it. What I said, was that in the comments of the hon. member for Nipissing yesterday, he ignored the fact that gas in northern Ontario covered about one half of the north.

An hon. member: That is not what he said at all.

Mr. MacDonald: One half of the north, not the other half. In the building of the second line, if this government is going to use the line as an instrument of economic development in the north as well as just bringing gas, they will use the construction of this line to provide natural gas to all of northern Ontario.

For example, let me deal with it in specifics. This government is neglecting the interests of the people of Ontario, not only those who face the prospects of gas shortage in the south next winter, but the long-term interest of the north. They should have been raising their voice long ago to insist on plans to make certain that this line from the west is used not only to bring gas to the east, but to route it through the more southerly portions of the north, to provide lower costs for existing industry and laying the base for an expanded industrial development in those other parts of the north.

Consider the possibilities for a moment, if the route were to come east from the Manitoba border to Kenora, looping the existing line thus far, and then cut south along the western shores of Lake-of-the-Woods, down into the Rainy River valley, and then east to Fort Frances and Atikokan and on to the Lakehead, where it could connect with the existing line and follow that line to Nipigon. Then it could branch off southerly along the north shore of Lake Superior, through the existing communities of Terrace Bay, Schreiber, Marathon, with a spur line up to Manitouwadge, on through White River, Wawa, and on to the great industrial centre of the Soo, eastward through the many north shore communities, to meet the needs of Elliot Lake and Espanola, and finally interconnecting once again with the existing route at Sudbury.

By following that more southerly route, it would be providing this new source of power—and I draw this to the attention of the House—to a pulp mill in Fort Frances; to two iron mines, a pelletizing plant and another soon to be built, in Atikokan; pulp mills in Terrace Bay and Marathon; three base metal

mines in Manitouwadge; two iron mines in Wawa; all of the industries of the Soo, whose needs are so great that spur line was going to built even from the southern route to meet them; the mine and forest industries at Elliot Lake and Espanola; to say nothing of the domestic supply of gas to those scores of communities throughout that whole section of the north.

This is the part of the north which does not have natural gas at this moment. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that if we do not get the line built in Canada and on this rerouted fashion, if it goes to the United States, the north is never going to get natural gas into those areas in the foreseeable future.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Who says that?

Mr. MacDonald: I am saying it.

Mr. S. Lewis: The Minister should prove differently.

Mr. MacDonald: Prove differently, right. The prospects that such a development raises for existing industry and new industry in northern Ontario are so exciting that it is incredible to me that any Ontario government should remain silent.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The member says it is incredible, and with that I agree. I have been telling you that for years, you would not believe it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Heal the rift in your government.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I will say a word afterwards.

Mr. MacDonald: That, I look forward to. The Robarts government's silence in this connection is another convincing example of its neglect of the needs of the north and its potential.

Let the government speak up. If the federal government insists in procrastination, let the Ontario government move in anticipation of the May 1 deadline. If Trans-Canada insists that the costs are too high, as it did once before, remember another big business friend, C. D. Howe, stepped in and he pulled them out of the hole. The government built the line and then rented it.

We have already given the lie to the proposition that a northern route is not economical. It was so profitable that within a very few years Trans-Canada took up their option and they bought the line originally built with public moneys. In so doing they got a greatly appreciated project at its cost value, thereby making a capital gain of tens of millions of dollars. Indeed, this government theoretically and legally, was involved in the building through public moneys, although I understand later Mr. Frost was so ashamed of it that he did not advance any of the money. But theoretically they were responsible for some $30 to $40 million—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Let us be fair. What happened was that the federal government changed the deal and were not going to charge the proper interest involved in carrying this case. Therefore Mr. Frost refused to continue with the deal.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that why they did it?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Sure.

Mr. MacDonald: I will not go off on a great digression, but I suspect that the number of debates in this House showed just what an indefensible deal it was, and not the least indefensible aspect of it was that it was built with public moneys at a cost if I recall correctly, of $129 million, with the option, in years following that, that Trans-Canada could buy it at a time when it was an appreciated going concern worth $200 million or more—

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): $220 million.

Mr. MacDonald: $220 million, my hon. friend from the Lakehead says, and they got it for $129 million. Indeed, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I will tell you Mr. Chairman, the federal government were the ones who made the deal, and then they changed the rules of the game halfway through, and we would not go along with it.

Mr. MacDonald: If this Minister is going to be so sharp on the draw, I wish he and his government would be sharp on the draw and not let the federal government procrastinate and make such bad deals on behalf of the economic interests of the province of Ontario. This is my very point. If the government thought then, and if the government thinks now—if we could only figure out what this government does think, instead of its double thinking—that the federal government is not doing the right thing, why is this government not moving into the picture and doing something about it? I say to this government, build the line if Trans-Canada will not. You will not only make money, but you will give

finally some convincing proof of your desire to develop the economic potential of the north in something other than political propaganda. So far your inaction speaks louder than your idle words, and I am referring particularly to that part of the north which has not got a natural gas line through at the present time.

I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that a New Democratic government will proceed with such a project right after the next election. Ontario developed the northeastern region of this province with a development railroad, a public railroad, when private enterprise would not do the job and it is the basis of economic development of northeastern Ontario. We can develop the northwest from Sudbury through to Kenora with a publicly owned pipeline—the basis for economic expansion that is meaningful and something more than your idle words. That would be in the tradition, I remind the House, established by Hydro in this province more than 50 years ago; a tradition of public enterprise in a field where private enterprise cannot or will not do the job, a tradition which this government has sold out on.

Mr. Chairman, let us hear what the Minister has to say on some of these things. He seems to be bobbing in his seat as though he had something to say. I wonder why he did not say it earlier when he had a chance?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am tired of listening to you.

Mr. MacDonald: Because he has been silent for too long. At least let have some reconciliation of the conflicting voices that we hear from the various members in the Cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, first I might deal with the remarks made by the critic from the Opposition party. In his few remarks last night—from those I could hear—I gathered that he was in agreement with the government policies in the majority of the cases. There were a few things he might change, providing his party got in power, but it seemed to me that most things were in accord and running the way that they would like them to run.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is roughly the state of the Liberal Party. They—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, that is all right. Will you listen? I am talking now; you are not. We hear enough from you.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is fair enough.

Mr. MacDonald: He is supporting you.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is all right. You do not need to agree with me. We do not need your agreement.

Mr. MacDonald: How perverse can you get?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: In the beginning of his remarks last night, for some reason he would like to see The Department of Energy and Resources Management done away with and split up and put into other departments. I do not know his reason for that statement. I could not see, as he continued with his remarks that he had any particular reason, unless he felt that the Minister was getting too fat sitting down here, that he did not have any work. But I assure him that we keep quite busy down here and I do not think that the actual splitting of the department would save the people of Ontario any money, because we would still require people to do the work that we have to do in the department.

I assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the House, we have very few drones around our department. It is a small department, but it is a hard working department. So I do not think we need worry about splitting it up at this time. In fact, I know the government is not thinking about it and I doubt that it will split up even after the election. Because no doubt we will be the government.

I think that is about all he covered. He did speak about the gas proposition which the hon. member for York South has just discussed. He dealt with pollution and water supply for a few minutes, but we will deal with that when we deal with the estimates of the Ontario water resources commission. I believe that was about the gist of his remarks, and as I said earlier there was not too much criticism. I think he agrees, if not wholly, then in part with what we are doing.

Now to deal with the remarks of the member for York South, and of course he is very exercised today. There would be no need for anyone to tell you that an election is coming very soon, because in the four years that I have been here he has had a lot of new ideas—old ideas today that he tried to rephrase, and I can see what is coming out as soon as he gets out on his campaign.

I do not know how long the member has been talking in this House—because I have only been here eight years and it was prior to me coming here—about public ownership of the gas companies. This is an old story, as I said, much older than I am in this House. He has been talking this but nobody has bought it yet. He wants to revive it at this time because he thinks that if he and his

party ever got elected they could operate this utility much cheaper than the private companies.

I think most of us in here would argue that point, and I do not think we have to, because I would doubt very much if they will be in power after this next election, although there seems to be a scrap on now between he and the Liberal Party over who is going to be the official Opposition. But we will not worry too much about that; we will let them fight that out and we will carry out the policies as instituted years ago and update them as we feel fit.

The member dwelt at some length on gas storage rights in western Ontario and on a gas storge report produced by the energy board and tabled in this House in 1964. I was very happy to hear him say that he agreed with this report and that it is a good report. That is the first time I heard that from anybody other than members on our own side of the House, and I would like to tell him and tell the House at this time—

Mr. MacDonald: Many people came and told you in a brief.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They did not tell you—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh, no, they did not. Just let me talk now.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a copy of their report here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They did not.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I want to say that two years ago, when I met with the gas storage people, along with their solicitor Mr. Jolliffe—

An hon. member: Jolliffe?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Jolliffe.

Mr. MacDonald: What is wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I was told that that report was no good at all, that we should discard it. This was what Mr. Jolliffe told me at that time, that the report made no sense at all; it should be discarded and we should write a new report. At that time they were there discussing leases for storage in the Lambton area. Finally, after Mr. Jolliffe got through expounding on how bad that report was and we were able to talk to the land owners up there, to try and talk some sense in their heads, we asked them at that time if they would use that report as a basis to go back to Union Gas Company and try and negotiate for their storage rates.

After we discussed this problem for some time, they agreed that they would go back and discuss with Union Gas prices for their gas storage as based on the report. And as I said at that time, the report did not draw any hard and fast figure; it could be lowered or it could be made higher. When they left my office they agreed they would do that and I asked them upon leaving that if they were not successful they should come back and discuss this matter with me before they went on to the municipal board.

They did not promise that they would do this, but I expected that they would. I might say that I never heard from that day until this—I heard in this House last fall that they had gone to the OMB.

Mr. MacDonald: They lost confidence in you.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They did not need to lose confidence in me. I do not think they have yet lost confidence in me or in the government. I think they were advised by their solicitor to go to OMB and get a better price than was set out in that report.

Mr. MacDonald: You are only guessing.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am only guessing and you are only guessing at a lot of things, but at least they did not come back and try to negotiate any further and I do want to get on the record that Mr. Jolliffe was their solicitor at that time.

After the hearing of the OMB, and you covered it very well, they tried to appeal this and it was thrown out. They did not try to appeal the decision to the government, because they were too late. But then they came back to me and were at the Opposition and presented that brief. And at that time they did not agree that the report was right. They thought it was a fair basis, but it should be updated, or the prices should be updated 50 per cent.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Now how can you say then that you think that is a good report?

Mr. MacDonald: It is the principle—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The principles are good to them now provided they are updated 50 per cent. It was two years ago—when they were there discussing it—and the report was no good then. Now the principles are all right, but they should be updated. I wonder if it were updated today what we should do with it next week. I do not know whether

Mr. Jolliffe is advising you yet or not, but I would imagine that if he is it will never be enough.

I am not going to dwell any longer on that. We have met with these people; the hon. member has met with them and the Opposition have met with them. I do feel sorry for them. I think there was an opportunity for them getting a settlement on the basis of this report and I think that through bad advice they find themselves getting much less money than they could have gotten by negotiation.

I do not want to talk about the Trans-Canada pipeline coming through the south route or through northern Ontario. First, I would like to say, and it is known to the government and to the people of Ontario, that this is not our decision in the province of Ontario. This matter was dealt with before the National Energy Board and is now before the Federal Power Commission. I think we all know what happened; there were decisions made one way and another and I am not going to discuss those. I said and this government has said, that we were interested in getting supplies of gas, interested in getting a good supply at a price that we could sell to our industries and hoped to get more of them into the province of Ontario. We have never said which was the cheaper or which was the most expensive way to bring it in, but anything that I read last year—and of course I read the magazines that the hon. member reads and I talked with people who, I think, should be knowledgeable in the gas business, that is their business, anyway—and I do not think that at any time there was a figure of exactly how much more expensive it would be to come in the all-Ontario route versus the northern United States route.

I was told by many people that there would be a difference and that this could cost our large users considerable in the amounts of gas that they would use. But we never said that they should go one way or another.

I understand that this matter is, as I said before, before the Federal Power Commission, and from what I hear today, this line might be approved. I am not saying that it will, because I do not know anything about it, but from the rumours I hear, there is a good chance that it might be approved that way.

Mr. MacDonald: There is nothing in the paper to that effect.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You do not have to see everything in the paper. There are a lot of things I do not see in the paper. There are a lot of things the hon. member said today that he did not see in the paper either.

Now, if that is the case, we really should have ample supplies of gas in here by that route. We do not need to worry. Again I will stand on the statement that I made in this House some three weeks ago, that I am assured by the suppliers of gas in the province of Ontario that we will have no shortage in the winters of 1967 and 1968. I think we can rest easy on that; we are going to have gas.

I would also like to say to the hon. member for York South that I was advised by a reliable authority today, that an application has been introduced to the National Energy Board to loop the all-Ontario line.

Mr. MacDonald: This is the most interesting presentation of contradictory information. The Minister, no more than two minutes ago, said that he had just received secret information that has not appeared in any of the press that FPC is going to okay the southern route. Then like a Cheshire cat, he sits down grinning when he informs me that already an application has been made for the northern route.

My point is this, what is this government doing to make certain that we get it as a northern route? Getting it as a northern route means that you not only get gas at a price which is very little, if anything, higher, but you then have an instrument for the development of northern Ontario and for bringing gas into the great sections of northern Ontario which do not have it now. The Minister is still talking out of both sides of his mouth!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am not talking out of both sides of my mouth. I think if the hon. member—and he does read the newspaper—would tell the truth, he knew that before they would consider the southern route Trans-Canada had assured the federal government that they would loop this line inside of two years. Do not tell me that you do not know that!

Mr. MacDonald: In the 1970's.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, 1970—all right, we will say 1970.

Mr. MacDonald: In the 1970's—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: In the 1970's. But I am telling you now that they have an application filed for consideration to start looping now. Do you not like to hear that?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I like to hear it, but what is the Minister doing? A moment ago he said that he had heard that the FPC is going to okay the route and presumably—

Hon. Mr Simonett: I did not say that I had heard; I said I had reason to believe—

Mr. MacDonald: You had reason to believe —well, I accept that re-phraseology. But let us deal with the facts and not draw red herrings across them. The Minister has reason to believe that the FPC is going to accept the southern route, and then before he sits down—in the passage of no more than 120 seconds—he starts arguing, "What is the member worried about, because I have already made application for an all-Canadian route." Are we going to build both of them at the same time?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, we are not in the immediate future going to need both. We are going to need one, and what I am interested in is that this government live up to its promises of developing northern Ontario. This easy business of the Minister now getting up and saying that they are going to loop the line—this application at the moment is not for looping in the 1970's—they will begin it somewhere in the 1970's. They received a letter from Jean-Luc Pépin on the first or second day of February to the effect that they should make application and be prepared to move on May 1. My point is that I would think that if this government is interested in the development of Ontario, they would have moved and raise their voices. But the fact of the matter is that the government is playing "cosy" with the company in its silence. You normally are willing to raise your voice if Ontario's interests are being affected adversely. In my view, they are now being affected adversely and you are not saying anything about it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think—

Mr. Chairman: I think out of fairness, we should let the Minister finish his statement.

Mr. MacDonald: He sat down!

Mr. Chairman: I do no think he had finished.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, he sat down.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to say—and perhaps I phrased it badly—is that if the southern route is not approved, an application has been filed to consider the northern route. The hon. member mentioned that in his debate today—

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: —and he was talking about May 1. It has already been done; it is April 18.

Mr. MacDonald: Right:

Hon. Mr. Simonett: So if that line is not approved, they will no doubt go ahead and consider—

Mr. MacDonald: By May 1?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is filed now, April 18. I do not know what they do at the National Energy Board; I have no control over that.

Mr. MacDonald: Are you going to exert your pressure to move on May 1?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not think that I have to exert pressure. I think the pressure is being exerted, and if we do not get gas by the southern route, we will get the northern line looped. If we get gas by the southern route, then we will go ahead and have the northern line looped in the 1970's as well.

Mr. MacDonald: In the 1970's?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, 1970. All right, I did not say January or December, I said 1970.

Mr. MacDonald: In the 1970's—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I know, but they feel that they will need additional gas and an additional line by 1970. I do not know, I cannot prove this, but this is what I am told, and I am giving the information to the House.

You know, Mr. Chairman, this gentleman changes his mind quite often, too, because he tried to say today that it was four years ago that he recorded in *Hansard* certain things about certain gas lines, and the reason he put them there was for storage purposes in Lambton.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I cannot see that the storage has changed any. We still want to get gas into storage. Why has that made so much difference now that it should come north when it should have gone south four years ago?

Mr. MacDonald: Because we had built a line to connect the storage areas with the main market.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Not necessarily. We have to get that storage down here so we can bring it in. If it was cheaper then, it is cheaper now.

Mr. MacDonald: You are missing the point.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not think that I am missing the point. I am going to put all of this on the record.

Mr. MacDonald: Good.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This is what the hon. gentleman said on January 30, 1964, on page 325 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now to other aspects within this department's concern and jurisdiction, and comment on them in terms of the future and the kind of jobs that I think this department should do.

He was giving advice to this department at that time three years ago and, of course, he is a very knowledgeable man and we listened to him. No doubt somebody from Ottawa read *Hansard* and they listened to him because he is very knowledgeable on this subject, as he will—

Mr. MacDonald: You are still in favour of the southern route, then?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Wait until I finish:

> The first is that of natural gas. I think we in this province should take cognizance of the fact that if my information is correct within about two years' time the capacity of the Trans-Canada bringing gas down from western Canada is going to be completely exhausted. They will not be able to build up pressure and put any more gas through a single line. In other words, Mr. Speaker, they are going to be forced to loop this line.
>
> There is a considerable body of opinion that since we have only one line wholly on Canadian soil and this has assured us of the possibility of industrial development through the use of gas in northern Ontario, and there is no sense in looping the old line, rather there would be greater sense in bringing the new line from western Canada, looped as far as they could throughout the prairies, and then cut south to Lake Superior coming to Canada in the Sarnia area, and leading directly, Mr. Speaker, into one of the incomparable resources that we have in the province and that we, I submit, are toying with instead of using it in a coordinated fashion to its full potential.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. The storage area.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, what is the difference? The storage area is still there, it has not changed.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Then why should you change your mind? It is not a political issue, is it? Well, I cannot see why the change. Now I want to go on, and he talks about a "storage area"—that has not changed a bit. I quote:

> I am referring to the fact that in the Lambton area we have underground storage areas almost without parallel in the world. Indeed, I think I am wrong there—without parallel in the world in terms of their capacity to hold gas with no leakage. You can put gas in and I think you can take out roughly 99 per cent of it so that there is virtually no loss. They have capacity that used to be, according to figures that I was getting years ago, 100 billion cubic feet. Now it is estimated the capacity is in the range of 125 to 130 billion cubic feet. In other words, if we wanted to bring the pipeline from western Canada and it were tapped directly into the capacity of 130 billion cubic feet, some of which is now in the hands of Union, some of which has been, or is going to be given, I would judge, into the hands of a new company, Tecumseh, a subsidiary of Imperial Oil and Consumers' Gas, then we would be able to use the full potential of this storage area. We would be able to bring gas down in an off peak period when it is cheaper. We would be able to store it in the areas; we would be able to take it out of these storage areas into the distribution system in southern Ontario during the peak period.

Mr. MacDonald: Good—you can do that with an ordinary line.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Gentlemen, I think that was a good statement, and I think he was sincere when he made it, but during the past year there was a petition circulated up through the north country and there was a lot of pressure brought to bear on this gentleman, no doubt, and—

Mr. MacDonald: Have you read my speech a full year ago?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: —and he changed his mind. Now he thinks it would be cheaper to bring gas by the northern route rather than the southern, but I cannot see that there is any change in the situation. But I would like to state this—that we are interested in seeing that we get a good supply of gas for the people in the province of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I was going to suggest to the member for York South that having listened to the lead-off speakers that we prefer to enter into the votes at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, except that I think, Mr. Chairman, you will find that if we are going to conclude the debate on this pipeline in the north I believe it will come under the first vote.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, are you prepared to enter upon vote 601 at this time then?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, I hope you will give me a chance to speak on this matter.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh yes, we would like to hear what you have to say.

Mr. Chairman: If the member for York South will defer to you?

Mr. MacDonald: I would love to hear from him now.

On vote 601:

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, this is naturally very close to my heart. It is in my own political area that I represent, along with the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) and the member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden), this is the area we represent and we want to represent our people and that area to the best of our ability.

Now I have listened—I must congratulate the Minister on his statements—I have listened to the leader of the NDP make a brave statement of what he would do and rather ridicule me about what I had failed to do.

I told him that I was the sixth name, I think, on the union petition that went down from that area a long time ago, and I was criticized in other places for having gone on that union statement to the dominion government. But I was so incensed with the fact that I thought this line was going to go south of the border and not through my area that I could not help but do that and everything else possible to protect my people.

Now the member for York South says that I have not fought to get the northern Ontario gas pipeline through northwestern Ontario, and I would like to say this: Speaking of our area, if I might go into it for a minute to tell you the need, Mr. Chairman, of gas through that area—we have the largest iron potential in the world in one property away north of Red Lake. We have the new Bruce Lake complex coming in; we have Anaconda and other enormous iron producers, also Canfer, Steep Rock, and Caland Ore are using gas now. But Steep Rock and many of these properties, Manitouwadge, Geco, Willroy—I could go on for an hour on that subject—will need, I would say, thousands—yes millions of cubic feet of gas to develop the great natural resources in my area. Why would I be sitting back as Minister of Mines and not talking about the need for that gas pipeline going through our area?

Mr. Chairman, I do believe that this gas pipeline will be going through our area. I also believe that Sault Ste. Marie will be served by it and it will branch off to International Nickel and these other big properties and then, if necessary, it can go south of the line if there is enough to serve our southern neighbours too. It will also take in the area of the member for Fort Frances-Rainy River and the member for Kenora; those great industries in that area will have this facility running through their area as well.

Now I do not want to say anything further because the Minister has spoken briefly, but I wanted to put my own thoughts on the record and tell how I have helped, along with every other member there, to see that this pipeline goes through our area in the northwestern end of the province and takes in, as I said, the other areas—mining areas and cities east of it. In closing, if this is not a conflict of interest, I would just like to say to the member who was speaking that if he would like to make a little wager sometime about that pipeline going through our area I will give him odds that it will. But of course we will have to do our betting outside the House.

Mr. S. Lewis: On what basis?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: What do you mean by basis?

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, what does the Minister mean? Does he know authoritatively that it is going through or is it not going through?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am positive that it is going through. I am betting my position that it is going through.

An hon. member: When?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: So do not worry about it.

Mr. MacDonald: You mean your Cabinet post?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Anything.

Mr. MacDonald: Anything? Have you got that on the record, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Because if it did not go through I would not want to be a Cabinet Minister for that area.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right? Well, fair enough.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Quite right. So now you have it on the record and I hope now that you believe somebody. You ordinarily never do. But our government is not going to let that gas pipeline go by if they can help it. So, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for letting me speak and put on the record something I wanted to get on before but did not have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, how do the Ministers reconcile the assertion on the part of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management that he has private information —secret information—which leads him to believe that the FPC is about to approve the southern route? Now how does that jibe—and we heard it in this House no more than 15 or 20 minutes ago—how does that jibe with the absolute confidence of the Minister of Mines?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, I will tell you. There are two lines coming down, one south, another through our area. That is my own thinking, but I know that the Minister was telling the story as he knows it, too.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Your line is going to be the secondary one. Well, that is no bet.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is one of the most charming individuals I ever met. If his thought processes matched his charm, he would be a wingdinger, but sometimes his thought processes get a little bit confused.

I agree that the Minister, for the sake of his political hide had to sign that petition in northwestern Ontario, but I draw his attention to the fact that the petition was launched not by the Tory party, not by the Liberal Party, but by the New Democratic Party in cooperation with the local labour council. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Let me say this—

Mr. MacDonald: No, no, I have the floor. I let the Minister speak with all his charm; he can come back afterwards. We are in committee—he can come back as many times as the Chairman lets him, and he is a rather lenient and congenial fellow.

Mr. Chairman, the position of the Minister is a very, very strange one indeed. As my colleague, the member for Scarborough West, has just pointed out, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management talked in two or three different directions. The Minister perhaps did not get it, but the Minister said he has "reason to believe"—that was his correction of my phraseology—he has "reason to believe" that the FPC is going to okay the southern route. Well, the Minister of Mines' seat is pretty shaky right now. The Minister of Energy and Resources Management was not speaking as though he were unhappy about it. He was almost taunting me, that I am wrong, the FPC is going to okay the southern route.

My point is this, Mr. Chairman, where in heaven's name does this government really stand? It is all very fine to have the Minister of Municipal Affairs making speeches in Timmins saying where he stands. It is all very fine to have the Minister of Mines interjecting and telling us where he stands. But where do they stand inside the Cabinet? Are they a majority or are they a minority within the Cabinet?

If you are a majority in the Cabinet, which is the only basis for your bravado a moment ago that the line would go through Canada, then why do we not have the government raising its voice? Why are they not speaking?

That is a logical sequence of ideas that even the Minister in his rational moments, shaking his head affirmatively now, apparently agrees with. But his government is not doing anything. The Minister is silent with regard to, for example, what is going to be done after May 1. He is not raising his voice and saying to the federal government, as he should be if he is acting on behalf of the interests of the province of Ontario: Move now and make certain that the commitment of May 1 is lived up to!

Do not be making happy sounds about FPC going to accept it and it will go by the south. Make the sounds that will be on behalf of northern Ontario, and the development of northern Ontario, and the building of a line into that part of northern Ontario which does not now have natural gas.

But you are not doing that. You are talking with two voices. In fact, you are talking with a half a dozen different voices.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me get on to one or two specifics.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: May I just follow that with a word?

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, surely.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, I said that the Minister was quite correct, there is going to be, in my opinion, two lines, one south and one through our area. The member talked about the petition, the NDP petition, and the labour petition. I did not sign the NDP petition, I will tell you that, I signed the labour petition. There is a great difference between the two names. That is the one I signed.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us get to this north and south line. The Minister has really shown once again that he is on all sides of this question because in his very benign way, he says: "I agree with the Minister. There is going to be a north and a south loop."

Let us take a look at this proposition that there will be a route built in 1970. The only reason why this is on the table at the moment is because when the government bowed to the dictates of the gas and the oil industry in Canada, as the Victoria *Colonist* said, and reversed its position of last August, and said that they could have a southern route. Then they went through a weaseling sequence of arguments. The argument was that by 1970 more than 50 per cent of the gas—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The member is talking about the federal government.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. More than 50 per cent of the gas would have to be on Canadian soil. This is the commitment that presumably Trans-Canada is going to have to live up to, that if most of the gas goes through a southern route, by the 1970's they will have to build a route through northern Canada to be able to get more than 50 per cent transmitted on Canadian soil. This is the gobbledygook that was entered into by the government in Ottawa.

I will tell you this, there are some people who have studied it, and are as convinced as we are sitting here, that if we get a line throughout the United States, that there will never be another line built in northern Ontario. The Minister of Mines shakes his head affirmatively, and he is right. This is a commitment which, I submit to you, Trans-Canada has no intention of living up to. They will make a thousand and one excuses when the 1970's come and the government made up of Sharps and Winters and so on will listen very attentively to these excuses and they will never have to build in northern Ontario. In other words, if you want a northern Ontario line, you will have to get it now or you will never get it at all. The Minister is shaking his head affirmatively and I think really down in his heart of hearts he knows it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Does he believe it?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the Minister is shaking his head affirmatively, the Minister nods his head. It is like one of these toys they put on the back of cars where the head keeps wobbling regularly all the time with the motion of the car, so I am a little uncertain. It was going this way regularly and that is an affirmative shake. He now confirms it with a yes.

Mr. Chairman, let me come back to a specific question, which is a rather important one. The Minister repeated in the House this afternoon, a few moments ago, that he has been assured that we are going to have enough gas this fall. This is a sort of a vague statement counterposed to the proposition of whether we get a line built or whether we do not get a line built after May 1. I would like to put on the record here, Mr. Chairman, a reply to Mr. Pépin, in the House on March 13, 1967. He was answering a series of questions and this one happened to come from Mr. Olson, a Social Credit member from Alberta. Mr. Olson said:

> A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister been assured by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines that there is still sufficient time to build the additional facilities requred to deliver gas to eastern Canada to meet the anticipated additional requirements for next winter?

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to note this:

> Mr. Speaker, the objective is to make sure that additional quantities of gas will be delivered next winter in eastern Canada. However, it very much depends on whether you are an optimist when you try to assess if the decision of the Federal Power Com-

mission will be in time to realize this objective. As the situation now stands, it is hoped that a decsion will be given in late April or early or late May, depending on the degree of optimism or pessimism.

If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, then the company might have enough time to build the Great Lakes project next summer, if it should not be so Trans-Canada lines has been advised by the government that is should have an alternative route ready in time to be put before the National Energy Board.

Nobody can read the ifs, ands, buts, perhaps, maybes and mights scattered through Mr. Pépin's reply without being impressed with the fact that he has no confidence that you are going to get it by May 1. Indeed he says later in May, and I read in the papers that we will be lucky if we get it by the end of June, and then it is subject to appeal to the court, so heaven knows when we will get a final decision.

But he comes back to the basic point that we have this alternative application that the Minister says has been made, and they must move on that. Why is not the Minister pressing for action on that? I put that question to him.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think the member is talking about one line or the other being finished to supply gas to Ontario this fall. I think when I answered your question two weeks ago, I told you at that time when the line was completed from Woodstock to Hamilton so that we could put additional gas in storage this summer, and with the additional gas that the gas companies can buy from the United States companies, we were assured that we would have enough gas in Ontario for this winter, the winter of 1967-1968. Is that plain enough?

Mr. MacDonald: It is plain enough, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, that is what I am saying, and that is the statement I am standing on. Now, whether they build either one of those lines has no bearing on what is going to happen this winter. But there will be one or the other built before the winter of 1968-1969.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us deal with each of those. The Minister has now said that he has assurance that the surplus gas—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I have said it two or three times.

Mr. MacDonald: The surplus gas coming through the lines in the summertime is going to be adequate and it can be put through into the storage areas in Lambton, it can be supplemented by gas they can get from the United States. I hope what he says is correct.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, have you any reason to doubt it?

Mr. MacDonald: I said, I hope what he says is correct.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is all right.

Mr. MacDonald: All I say, Mr. Chairman, is that it is rather strange that the Minister should now come up with a proposition that we have got alternative sources to meet this fall's needs when the whole of this discussion by the federal government in the recommendations to the National Energy Board has been on the proposition that we would not have enough gas this winter. I am only taking these assertions that have been made by all these various authoritative people. I am putting them on one side and I am now putting the Minister's somewhat belated assurance that we are going to have enough gas. I hope he is right. That is point one.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I doubt that very much.

Mr. MacDonald: He is now doubting my motives, Mr. Chairman. I will not ask him to withdraw. He is a little out of order and a little irregular.

My second point is that the Minister now assures us that we are going to have a line either in the south, or the north, by fall. Well I just quoted from Mr. Pépin.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I did not say this fall.

Mr. MacDonald: What did you say?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I said by the fall of 1968.

Mr. MacDonald: Nineteen hundred and sixty-eight?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes. If you would listen to what I am saying.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I misunderstood.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well I said, not this year but it would be built before the winter of 1968-1969.

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, and I hope the Minister of Mines hears this, what the Minister is saying—

Mr. Bryden: He is trying not to listen.

Mr. MacDonald: —is that he has now been able to work out assurances with the gas companies, who are in cahoots with Trans-Canada to try to get the southern rights. They have been pressuring the federal government, they assisted in the switch of policy between last August and October on the part of the government. But the Minister is now saying that we have our gas needs covered this winter and we will get another pipeline by the fall of 1968.

In other words, he has got the situation so that they can delay without meeting the deadline of May 1 that was fixed by Mr. Pépin, and they can go all throughout this year, next winter and on until the building season of the year 1968. He is going to give them another year to fight the battle before the FPC, in the hope that they can get the southern line.

I hope the Minister of Mines recognizes that the man who is responsible—the Minister of Mines is not responsible on this score, he is the Minister of Mines—the Minister of Energy and Resources Management has in effect spelled out a timetable whereby he is working on behalf of making it possible to get a decision for the southern route, and I suggest he should take that up in the Cabinet at the next meeting.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am not working on either route. I think I have made this quite clear and I have nothing to say to the National Energy Board. This is under their jurisdiction. If they say to Trans-Canada that we want you to start—

Mr. MacDonald: You are not working, period.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh, I am working and I am working at what I am supposed to be working at, to see that we have an ample supply of gas in the province of Ontario. I think I know where my jurisdiction stops and where the federal starts, and that the National Energy Board is not under the Ontario government. Sometimes it is hard for you to believe just where you should start and where you should stop, because you talk federally more in this House than you talk Ontario politics.

Now, if you would spend more time in the province and let the federal people look after their matters it would be much better for everybody.

Mr. Bryden: This is vital to this province.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, what does the hon. Minister mean, if I spend more time in the province?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Than you do in federal politics. You are asking me to go down and tell Mr. Pépin how to run his department. I am not interested in that.

Mr. MacDonald: Well Mr. Chairman, this is a piece of utter nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, that is what you said.

Mr. MacDonald: I am talking about the province of Ontario and responsibilities which are joint responsibilities. My basic case which I reiterate and restand, is that the Minister by his silence is not fighting on behalf of the interests of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: He has just said so.

Mr. MacDonald: He has just said so. He is just sitting there and not raising his voice so he is letting the federal goverment operate with the companies, the giants in the field, to come up with the southern route decision. And what you are doing is risking the seat of the Minister of Mines, because he has now laid it on the line.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You would like that, would you not? You have been working at it.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure we would.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the Minister wants to say something in answer to what the hon. leader of the NDP has just said? I do want to ask him some specific questions about this matter. Are we correct in assuming that he is giving us assurances under vote 601 that the gas supply during the coming winter will be adequate and that he has looked into this carefully, as is his responsibility to the energy board of the province of Ontario? His answer two weeks ago would indicate this, but it has been brought into some doubt by the questions that were asked this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I have met with management of all the gas suppliers in the province of Ontario and they give me this assurance, that they will be able to look after supplies for this coming winter.

Mr. Nixon: Have you, in your capacity in the Ministry, made representations to the National Energy Board on the proposed location of the doubling, or the looping of the line?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, we have not taken a stand that this line should go either way, but we have made representations to this respect, that we wanted additional supplies of gas we would like to be assured of additional supplies of gas for the province of Ontario regardless of which way the line went.

Mr. Nixon: Have you put a time limit on the additional supply? I know that you have indicated to the House that for the immediate extra requirements there will be gas from other sources, which will come in, I presume, at Sarnia and in that area and will meet our fairly immediate requirements. But have you a time limit, or have you a time limit that has been set by your advisers, on when the looping must be completed in order to assure that Ontario will have the needed supplies?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, we have not put any time limit on.

Mr. Nixon: It is not the fall of 1968?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think we are assured by the National Energy Board that one or the other line will proceed this year, although it might not be completed this year.

Mr. Nixon: There is a lot of contention naturally about where the new line should be located and the case is put strongly for a northern location, particularly from the Minister of Mines and others. Have you consulted with your colleague, the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), through the economic council, as to just how the location of this line will affect us economically in the years that lie ahead? Do you consider this a part of your responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I do not consider that my responsibility. I think my responsibility is to assure the people of Ontario that we have a supply, and as cheap as we could get it. I do not think that there is any doubt that the gas that comes in over the southern route will be a cheaper gas for western Ontario than gas brought in by the northern route, because you have got to come round the borders of Ontario, which is some hundreds of miles away, to get it here and the other line is much shorter.

Mr. Nixon: To your knowledge, does The Department of Economics and Development have a position on this? It has not, I presume, put its position to the National Energy Board either?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Nixon: Since the importance of the storage capacity in Dawn township is so closely related to the decision that the doubling of the line be through the southern route —and as a matter of fact the basis of the development of the natural gas system in Ontario relies to such an extent on the Dawn township reservoirs—why is it that the government has not taken more definite action to see that justice is done to the farmers who actually own the land on top of the storage facilities? It has been stated here this afternoon that we as Liberals have not taken any particular part in seeing that the farmers concerned do get the assistance and the support of this Legislature that they should have.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a good question after ten years.

Mr. Nixon: I am sure that all members well know that all of us in all three parties and as individual members have been approached by the farmers concerned, about the statistics associated with the decisions that had been made by the Minister's own advisers, and the fact that they have never been able to work out a satisfactory agreement with those who have expropriated the storage capacity that they themselves feel that they own.

It seems strange that this problem should carry on and on and on and that under this Minister—for three years now, I believe—there has been no resolution to appease the farmers in a situation where they feel very definitely aggrieved.

In this House it has been said time and again that the importance of this storage facility is comparable to, say, the power of Niagara Falls or a large area of the timber of our northland. It is something that was created here and is a natural resource that really cannot be compared with anything else. Why is it that the government has not taken more definite steps in order to resolve this problem? It seems to continue indefinitely.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would think that our problem is not as great in the new storage fields as perhaps it is with some of our old agreements. There are many old storage agreements that have been going on for years and I think, honestly, that they should be reopened. I would hope that this could be arranged, that we could reopen these contracts and that they try to negotiate some new deals. I think a contract 25 or 30

years old is somewhat outdated. I would believe this, that any contract today should, perhaps, have a ten-year limit and then be renegotiated. I think that would be a good idea.

But on this one—it is causing a lot of pain right now. We did try to help negotiate on this, I have explained that—when it went to OMB and as far as it could, I do not know how we could have stepped into it then. They had the chance to appeal and that was thrown out, so this is something that happened in just the last six months and is something that is very unfortunate. Nevertheless, it has happened.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister agrees with all of us, I believe, that it was unfortunate. In fact, the judicial procedures have broken down in this regard. The energy board in 1964, I am told by the submission from the farmers themselves, recommended a figure that was almost three times as large as that permitted by the municipal board in 1966. Where then, do the farmers go for redress? Should they approach the situation through the Minister —who, of course, is bound by the regulations and judicial proceedings, but all the same should have some considerable freedom of action through his Ministerial powers to redress the unfortunate situation that has developed? What would you advise these people, who are so deeply concerned, to do?

It is not enough to say that something unfortunate has happened. Surely, when it is such a valuable natural resource and one that has not been adequately bought and paid for—although it was expropriated—this is a matter that the government and this particular Minister must concern themselves in deeply. What should these people do in order to get justice?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, the leader of the Opposition has posed a question to which I doubt there would be any answer at this time. They had an appeal, as you know, but that was thrown out. They then could have appealed the decision to the Cabinet, but they did not enter that appeal.

Mr. Nixon: They were late, were they not?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is their fault. They were very late; I do not know who advised them, but they did have an appeal and it was thrown out. I do not think that I am in any position at this time to upset a decision that went through the courts as far as it could go, because if that happened then I think all of the decisions for the last many years would be upset and the hearings in our law courts would not mean anything.

Mr. Nixon: I believe the Minister put his finger on the solution in his comments a few moments ago, when he said that he does not believe that any of these agreements should continue after ten years. It may well be that he could introduce legislation that, I believe, would be supported on all sides, and would open these cases up, so that those who sold their rights and even, as in this case, had their rights expropriated, could in a period of time, as the economy of the situation changes, have some means of redress.

It has been indicated to me that it might very well be that these farmers should go to the companies that actually use the storage and begin again with the development of a new contract on the basis of fairness, even though the court decision—and I agree with the Minister's comments on this—had been somewhat unfortunate. So I would urge the Minister to consider legislation that would open this up and set it on a just basis so that the agreements that had been entered into in years gone by, would come up for proper economic review on a regular basis.

Surely, the Minister is the one who must take the lead in this. It would only be the legislation that he would introduce that would become effective.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's statement is most alarming and I do not know whether he really realizes how alarming it is. His statement in essence was this, "the people took the thing through the courts and the courts have made a decision. What can I do about it?" This is precisely the point, Mr. Chairman. This is the reason why the farmers over a 10-year period, starting in 1957, when the first expropriations took place, had to have arbitration which went on until 1962. Then came an appeal to the Ontario municipal board in 1965—the reason was that there was no standard pattern. Indeed, the existing pattern has this contrast that was pointed out in the brief of the Lambton gas storage association—that in the report of the energy board it was $13.88, something proposed per acre in the Payne pool, whereas the municipal board had proposed $5.

Now, is the Minister saying that because the municipal board set $5 and the court threw out an appeal because it had no jurisdiction and the people did not come in time to the Cabinet, that they are in effect stuck with the $5? You see, Mr. Chairman, the

Minister has not yet comprehended or accepted the recommendations of this report. The recommendations of this report on principles 6, 7, 8 and 9 say that you should work out a technique as to how you gauge the measuring in principle 6 and 8, that you should fix a price that would be gauged to the market value and if there is a greater demand for storage those values will go up. Principle 9 says that prices should be renegotiated, as the Minister himself conceded, every 10 years or perhaps every five years. Now all of this means that if the Minister accepts it, he says, "I don't care what happens before the Ontario municipal board".

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh, no.

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute. The Ontario municipal board came up with a decision which is $5 and the report says $13.88. Is the Minister going to hang his hat on the Ontario municipal board decision and sit and do nothing? I submit that because you have this discrepancy between the report of the energy board and the municipal board, you have to step in. You have to regularize the prices now, so that the farmers know what they are going to get, so the farmers do not have to arbitrate through all of the long procedures, including the Ontario municipal board. Five years from now or 10 years from now you can re-negotiate the price.

The Minister, for example, told the hon. leader of the Opposition that this has to do with the old contracts. I submit to the Minister that if he does not move and implement that report it is not only going to do with old contracts—some of which represent expropriation with no compensation paid after 10 years—it is not only going to affect those old contracts, but all the new contracts that are going to come into effect in the fields that are going to be opened up with a greater use of storage. Once again, we are not going to have any pattern and you will have arguments in which the farmers get into these protracted arbitration procedures. You see, Mr. Chairman, I am forced to the point that either the Minister does not comprehend what this report says should be done—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh, I comprehend, I have read it many times.

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute. Either he does not comprehend what this report says should be done; or else he has now said in effect that he refuses to implement it. His excuse is that the municipal board came up with a decision of $5, so his hands are tied. It would be unfair if he, in effect, were to challenge the decision of the court. What we want is for the government to challenge the decision of the court.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What you want.

Mr. MacDonald: No, what this report wants—the Minister's energy board report.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The energy board did not say that.

Mr. MacDonald: You see, Mr. Chairman, obviously the Minister does not comprehend.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, there is no place in that report which says that we upset a decision of the court. The member must have read the report, that is what he is trying to say.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, it does not say—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: These are guidelines. The principle is there, and it was the guideline as far as price. If I go to the courts and a decision is handed down, that report cannot change that decision. I am not a lawyer; I would like to get some legal advice on this. I have never heard of a report changing a decision of the courts. Perhaps I am wrong.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, a few years ago when we started to argue the problem of these old contracts, the government took the opposite kind of stand than the Minister took a moment ago. The Minister said some of these old contracts are 25 or 30 years of age and they should be renegotiated because they are out of date. The government stand used to be these contracts are sacred; they were entered into by grown men and you live with them even though they have become out of date and they are not now fair contracts. So the Minister once again is contradicting the position the government used to take.

I am not asking the Minister to do something that is a direct challenge and affront to the courts. I am asking the Minister to implement principles No. 6, 7, 8 and 9, which will mean that you will come up with a price that will be accepted as a guide by the

companies and you will not need to go through these protracted negotiations.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is there.

Mr. MacDonald: It is there?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There is a guide there.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. May I just complete, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would—it is spelled out here what the prices should be on page—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: But they want 50 per cent more than that guide.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. Because if you accept principle No. 8 you will have to reconsider it in view of the market demands. Principle No. 8 in here, by your own report says that you should consider revising it periodically so that you can keep it in accordance with the market demands. Indeed, they point out that the more recent contracts that they signed with Tecumseh are higher than the contracts with Union for the simple reason that those are more up-to-date contracts.

So what they want you to do is to take that three-year-old set of figures, and their argument is that they should be upgraded 50 per cent. Whether it is 25, 30, 40 or 50 per cent, I am not arguing for the moment, but come up with some figures and present another table and this would be accepted and these would be the bases upon which negotiations would go on and which most of the companies would presumably accept, and so avoid the necessity for protracted arbitration procedures.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make two brief comments before I sit down and leave this issue and as far as I am concerned I feel that I have done all that I can on it and I just hope the government will move. I just want to draw to the attention of the Minister that I am now informed that when the Minister contended that the people of the gas association were sent back to talk to Union, that is simply wrong, the Minister once again is confused. He sent them back to talk to Tecumseh and when they went back and talked to Tecumseh, Tecumseh cut off the negotiations because they were waiting for the OMB decision that came in 1965 or 1966. These are the facts; the Minister is confused on them and I just draw it to his attention.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I was talking to the same group of people. If there was a misunderstanding I think I was talking on a principle, whether it was Tecumseh or Union.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, well these normally very bright people did not get to the Minister and we all have that same kind of difficulty. However, Mr. Chairman, there is one other comment that I want to make. I think it is despicable that every time we get into an argument in this House and there happens to be a lawyer who is a known CCF or NDP lawyer, immediately this lawyer is castigated and derided by Cabinet Ministers. I can recall the day, for example, when Billy Nickle used to get up and refer to Andrew Brewin as a lawyer by day and a CCFer by night because he advised the people who refused to accept some ludicrous price that was offered—I think, in the original Malvern negotiations, if I recall correctly—and got them a much better price. Now we have somewhat the same thing again, snide comments from the Minister with—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They were not snide. I was just telling who was representing these people.

Mr. MacDonald: Snide comments from the Minister who on the record—we can go back and read it—said that he gave bad advice to these farmers.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is what I said.

Mr. MacDonald: "Gave bad advice to the farmers."

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Do you not talk about Tory lawyers representing certain people? You say exactly the same thing.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me come to the nub of the issue, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has said that the farmers refused—the Lambton gas storage association refused—to accept this report back in 1964. In fact they said it was useless. They threw it out; they would not touch it. And it was because of this that he could not come to any solution. This was his excuse through this three-year period. Now, Mr. Chairman, I draw this to your attention.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh no, I did not. I did not say that I could not come to a conclusion.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh yes, you did. This was the reason why they went off; they were un-

happy about the recommendations in this report and they took the bad advice from Mr. Jolliffe and they went to the Ontario municipal board.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They did that.

Mr. MacDonald: Well all right, that was your story.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Right.

Mr. MacDonald: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a submission from the Lambton gas storage association, dated December 1, 1964, which was some seven or eight months after the energy board report came down. The association studied it carefully and made a report in which it dealt with each one of the recommendations. If the Minister goes back into his files he will find his copy of it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I have a copy.

Mr. MacDonald: You have it right there? Well—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, not here.

Mr. MacDonald: It is interesting, Mr. Chairman, to take a look at recommendation No. 6: "Storage rental payments should be based upon the capacity and performance rating of the storage reservoirs. In principle this association agrees."

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Principle No. 7: "There should be a minimum storage rental payment per acre. This association agrees in principle."

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Go through them all now.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But read some of the rest.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Go through them all. You are just reading the ones that they did not agree with.

Mr. MacDonald: Principle No. 8: "In the determination of storage rental payment a count shall be taken of the use and usefulness of storage. We agree in principle with the recommendation."

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Why did you not go through the rest of the ones, where they disagree?

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute now, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are talking like an NDP lawyer.

Mr. MacDonald: Principle No. 9, Mr. Chairman: "Storage lease agreements and arbitration decisions in respect of storage rights to be subject to renegotiation or redetermination of storage rental payments at stated intervals with provision for arbitration in the event of disagreement. The association agrees in principle with this recommendation."

Now true, I say to the hon. Minister without Portfolio, sure they then come up with some other disagreements in detail. But my point is this—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Just on a point of order, you say detail. I have not got the whole report here, but I have a couple of pages from it. These are details. You have left some of these things out: "We agree in principle"—that is where you stop—"but we are glad to note that the board in reaching its conclusions has not actually taken the usefulness of storage into account—"

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —"nor recognized anything approaching its true value." You call that a detail? A little further on: "It has further been explained why this association and all its members were glad the recommendations and suggestions of the Ontario energy board in its report so far as they relate to the scale of compensation to be invalid and remote from economic reality."

Just details?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Minor details.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the principles involved indicate that the prices should be scaled to the capacity, they should be scaled to the market need, they should be renegotiated. Some of the things that are listed in there are obviously out of date still. But I submit, Mr. Chairman, these are matters of detail upon which—if this government wanted to move and give some leadership—it could have sat down and worked some sort of a solution. Not only has it not worked out a solution, but I say this is my final word again as I quote the Minister: He in effect said not more than ten to 15 minutes ago, that "I now cannot do anything".

These people who did not appreciate my efforts and did not come to see me went to the Ontario municipal board and have now got a decision which is a decision of $5

as compared with what even they had considered an inadequate $13.88. It should be up 50 per cent to meet the current market values. The Minister said because the OMB had said $5, "My hands are tied, I cannot challenge the courts." In other words, the Minister will not move. He has, in effect, said again this afternoon he is not going to move. That is the whole burden of my protest and complaint, but I will leave it rest there and come back to it after the election when we can deal with it from that side of the House.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is a little remote from reality too.

Mr. Renwick: I have some remarks on this vote, Mr. Chairman.

It being 6:00 o'clock, p.m. the House took recess.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT (DAILY EDITION)

[illegible]

Tuesday, [illegible]

[illegible]

No. 68

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 18, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 18, 1967

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett, concluded 2333

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 2357

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Before calling the first vote, I would like to say a word of welcome to the Young Progressive Conservatives from Beaches riding.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
(Concluded)

On vote 601:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question—I find it difficult to come to grips with the Minister about this topic; I try to listen as attentively as I can to the problem. I would like the Minister to tell me what part, if any the government took in any consideration of this question of a gas pipeline through northern Ontario?

I would like to know what the position of the government is; whether it took any position at the time when the proposals were before the National Energy Board; whether it has any views and whether they articulated them or not, about the application to the United States Federal Power Commission; whether they have any views as to the desirability of twinning the Trans-Canada pipeline through northern Ontario or providing an alternate route through northern Ontario; whether they have any clearly defined alternatives in front of them and on what basis did they select those alternatives and what is the priority of them?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, I think I have explained the government's position several times. Our first interest was that we get ample supplies of gas. We have taken no stand as far as appearing before any hearings is concerned. We are taking no stand before the FPC. We are interested in getting quantity at a price where we can supply industry in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Renwick: I think the Minister's reply is quite unsatisfactory. You do not have to be a Minister of the government to have that kind of a view about the problem. What I am interested in is—if the Minister wants to say, no, there are no such things, that is fine—has the government seen any feasibility study prepared by themselves, prepared by the Ontario energy board, prepared by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines, prepared by anybody else, about the possibility of an alternate route through northern Ontario?

What would be the costs of construction; what volume of gas would be required in order to provide an economic use, and is there the demand by the industries along any proposed route, either now or prospectively in the next two or three years, about such a line that would give the government an opportunity to make a considered judgment on the question?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, let me say first that this matter is before the National Energy Board; they are making the decisions. There have been studies made, many studies. There have been figures, but I do not think these figures have proven the cost of the south line in comparison with the all-Canada route through the north.

I think that the hon. member's own leader (Mr. MacDonald) mentioned this afternoon that perhaps there have been estimates. I do not think they were actually tied right down to definite figures. But there have been figures mentioned and the figures that I have heard, and I guess anyone else has heard, indicate that it would cost more to build the line all-Canada through the north than the south line.

Mr. Renwick: Is my conclusion correct; in fact, the government has no specific data on which it has exercised any judgment at all? All that they have done is the same as the general public—they have been in a position where they have had to go along with the game that is being played.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What game?

Mr. Renwick: Well, we can come to that in a minute or two, Mr. Chairman. Has this Minister ever laid eyes on any feasibility study for an alternate route through northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have laid eyes on studies, we know we need additional gas. This is the point I am trying to get across: It is not this government who decides which way the pipeline will go; the National Energy Board makes that decision. They have made that decision and now it is before the Federal Power Commission. And that is the south route. Regarding the north route, as I said this afternoon, there is an application today, I understand, for the board to start hearings on the all-Canada north route. I would think that means if they do not proceed with the south route, they will have this hearing and proceed immediately with the all-Canada north route.

Mr. Renwick: The Minister is given to generalizations on this topic. By reading the newspapers we could have the same view that the government has on the topic. I think we all understand, I think everybody in the House perfectly well understands, that the jurisdiction in this matter basically lies with the National Energy Board. What we are trying to get at is whether or not the government of Ontario has indicated any interest whatsoever in the proposal as to the routing of the pipeline; not on the question that we would all like to have adequate gas supplies in Ontario. That is not a problem.

We happen to have in Canada, generally, ample gas supplies. The projections are of such magnitude for the next 25, 30, 40, 50 years, that the decision has been made that on the most conservative basis we can afford to export. Therefore, to get it to Ontario, to have adequate supplies, is not the problem.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What is the problem?

Mr. Renwick: The problem is the choice of the way in which it comes; which would be of the greatest economic advantage to Ontario. What we cannot understand and what we are being driven to conclude is that the government really does not care about the decision that is going to be made. Is that a fair statement, Mr. Chairman, or have the experts and the government studied the question of these alternate routes and what the economics of the construction of these routes would be?

Has there been an economic study of the demand in northern Ontario for these routes? And is it not true that northern Ontario is a high-cost energy area, and that the government should be basically interested in reducing the energy cost in northern Ontario for the economic development of that part of the province?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that northern Ontario is not a high-cost energy area. The gas we are using in this area right now comes through northern Ontario and they take it off before it comes here. I said this before, that we took no active part in the hearings in Ottawa nor are we doing so in Washington. I think that is clear enough. We do know, we have been told, that to get gas in the built-up areas or the areas where we need the large quantities of gas, it would be cheaper to bring it in the south route, to the storage fields in western Ontario, and this is where the large volume of gas is used.

As soon as that happens, there will be ample gas for northern Ontario because they will not have to transmit gas down here to put it in storage to serve this area. They will have gas coming in a different route, so that will leave ample gas up north for the time being, and then—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): So the Minister favours the southern route?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I did not say what route I favoured. The member was asking what was most economical, and by the only figures I have, and the only figures anybody has, it would be more economical to bring gas into the southern part of Ontario and southwestern part of Ontario by the south route.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister tends to go off on tangents on this but the point at which the Minister picked me up was the question of it being a high-cost energy area in northern Ontario, and I am talking about those areas of northern Ontario which do not now have gas—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Which areas?

Mr. Renwick: The area through Terrace Bay and through Marathon and through Wawa, into Sault Ste. Marie, and into the Sudbury area.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Sudbury has gas.

Mr. Renwick: But the area immediately to the west of Sudbury does not have any natural gas. I know that the line which came down into the iron ore basin around Atikokan or in that area, the line that they had to bring down from Ignace, from the Trans-Canada line, spur line, was a very expensive line to construct.

We know that the pulp and paper industries throughout that part of the province

are in severe competitive condition with the tidewater companies in the Maritimes and in British Columbia, and that one of the reasons is because of the high energy costs. Now, it seems perfectly clear to me that in fact the government is not interested in that kind of study of the projects which have been advanced for that area. Is that a fair statement?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we could expect any main transmission line to serve all the industries in north and northwestern Ontario. The first thing we do is get an ample supply of gas some place on the main transmission line and then the spur lines go from there. This has to be that way, because you could not afford to build a main transmission line to serve every industry. The industries that are as far apart as you are talking about, in north and northwestern Ontario, are hundreds of miles apart.

You cannot take a main transmission line and circle it all over that part of the area to get gas down here. So what they do is get an ample supply at a point, and when there is an industry that needs gas it is a very simple matter to get it there for them. It has to be another line, but you can readily understand that you are not going to get a large transmission line and bend it all over northern and northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Renwick: It is quite obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister does not want to join in the argument. We are certainly not thinking of a line which snakes and twists through every place in northern Ontario. What we are talking about is an alternate route which would go through the sand belt which runs north of the general line of Lake Huron, which avoids the Pre-Cambrian Shield further to the south, so that there would be very short spur lines available to come into the pulp and paper industries.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I wonder if I could ask a question? Where do you mean—the sand belt?

Mr. Renwick: Oh, about 50 miles north of Wawa.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Name a place so I will know what you are talking about.

Mr. Renwick: About 50 miles north of Wawa, in that area.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is a sand belt, is it?

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): It is clay, not sand.

Mr. Renwick: Sand. It is a sand belt.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct that statement—a sand belt 50 miles from Wawa!

Now I do not know just where the hon. member is talking about, but I have travelled that country for many years and if he can show me a sand belt 50 miles north from Wawa that you could bring a pipeline down in this part of Ontario, well then I might have to change my thinking; but I have never seen it.

Mr. Renwick: Well perhaps between the time the session is over and the election is called we can go up there—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would go up with you at any time.

Mr. Renwick: —and look at that area.

What we are concerned about and what I think the drift of the argument has obviously shown, both this afternoon and this evening, is that the government of Ontario's position is that they are not interested in the question of the routing of a pipeline into Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what they said.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could say a word here?

That statement about this government not being interested in a pipeline to serve the industries of northern Ontario is simply ridiculous. I told you this afternoon about what would eventually happen in connection with the supply of gas to the northern areas —Sault Ste. Marie and all these other places— and surely to goodness you can believe that.

You do not have to argue, the way you are arguing, about this government leaving the north absolutely vacant of power, because they have not done that in the past.

Here is your big Bruce Lake Mine that is just coming into production: What about them getting gas? They are satisfied with the deal that was made, and every other industry in that area knows that when they need gas or power for production they will get it, and this government will see they do.

Now do not hand out these foolish remarks about us bypassing northern Ontario and going down to the United States, because that is not so.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to put those remarks on the record.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have the Minister of Mines on the record. He is a member of the government of the province of Ontario and he had to sign—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well I am a member up in Port Arthur, do not forget!

Mr. Renwick: He had to sign a citizens' petition in order to get his view expressed as to what should be done by the National Energy Board.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You mean my signing the petition? That was the natural thing to do.

Mr. Renwick: Nobody is going to take the bet of the Minister of Mines because he tosses in the word "eventually". Well should we live so long, there may be a line in the area that we are talking about!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: There will always be!

Mr. Renwick: In the eyes of this government it will always take second place; just the way northern Ontario has traditionally, under this government, taken second place.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well you stay in Toronto where you were brought up and you will be better off.

Mr. Renwick: It will always take second place!

Mr. Chairman: Order! Now I am going to ask the members to avoid the interjections please and let the member for Riverdale continue.

Mr. Renwick: I am enjoying the interjections.

Mr. Chairman: We would like to get into the vote.

Mr. Renwick: Particularly those of the Minister of Mines!

It is most helpful to an elucidation of the problem; because under this government, even though he is a member of it, he realizes that is will be "eventually" before there will be a line to that area of the province to serve the industries there.

Let us just go back, Mr. Chairman, if we want to get into a basic discussion about pipelines in the province of Ontario, let us just go back and review the history of a Liberal government and a Tory government, be they in Ontario or in Ottawa, about pipelines. Now the first pipeline; let us just have a little review of the record for a few minutes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think we debated pipelines this afternoon. There is nothing about pipelines under this vote or in my vote. I think we had a very good debate. I think we are just covering the ground over and over and over and not arriving any place, so I would suggest that we get on the vote.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order!

The Minister dealt, most inadequately I agree, but he dealt with it in his introductory statement.

This is a policy issue. This is the very point we are trying to make: It is a policy. We are having desperate difficulty trying to discover what the policy of this government is. Mr. Chairman, I submit to you it is appropriately discussed on the first vote.

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest to the member for York South that there has been considerable flexibility in the comments and some of them have overlapped into vote 603, in the energy branch, and into vote 604, in the energy board. I agree that under a policy-making decision and arbitration it could, if we restrict our remarks, be conceivably contained within the first vote, number 601.

I would ask the member for Riverdale, if he will, to try to restrict his remarks to vote 601.

Mr. Renwick: I certainly will, Mr. Chairman. I think this is a matter of importance. I view it as a matter of importance. Quite obviously the government does because they continuously interject in the discussion which has taken place about it.

If one just looks back to the late 1940's and the early 1950's, Mr. Chairman, when we talked about the first pipeline, the oil pipeline.

Now the first one was built on the southern route. That was completed early in the 1950's by the Interprovincial Pipeline Company.

Then we came to the question of the transportation of natural gas from western Canada through to central Canada, and that came along about 1956, 1957, in that area. We all know, historically, what took place and the political convulsion that took place in the country in order to get the natural gas pipe-

line through northern Ontario in the first place.

At least out of that convulsion the Ontario government participated with the federal government in building that northern route. Immediately after the Conservative government took office in Ottawa they appointed a commission to study the energy requirements of Canada and the commission reported.

And what did the report recommend? The report recommended a second pipeline through northern Ontario. But immediately that recommendation was out the pressure of the oil companies, exercised in every conceivable way, made the recommendation of that commission a total dead letter. So northern Ontario does not now have the second all-Canada oil pipeline that was recommended by that commission; and in all likelihood, under a Tory government or a Liberal government at Ottawa, we are never going to get that second oil pipeline through northern Ontario to Montreal.

So northern Ontario suffers that disadvantage in this game. Then we come along to the time when a Liberal government is back in office in Ottawa and the question about additional facilities for gas in Ontario comes up. Once again the pressure comes on and the recommendation, without any adequate study by Trans-Canada of the economic feasibility of an alternate line through northern Ontario, the pressure is on that they automatically assume that the line must follow roughly the same route as the interprovincial pipeline originally followed, through the United States and into Canada by that direction.

Now what this government fails to realize, by looking at isolated instances of what has taken place in the development of pipelines in this country, is that first of all we have no all-Canada oil pipeline coming through northern Ontario. A Conservative government was not prepared to take the recommendation of their own commission about the necessity of such a line. We are now faced with a situation where the second alternate gas line which could provide very real impetus and stimulus to northern Ontario is now not going to be built—again it is going to be built through the southern route, and the same pressures are brought to bear.

It is not just the Union Gas Company with the storage facilities at Dawn, it is the combination of Consumers' Gas and Imperial Oil with the storage facilities in the Tecumseh area. These pressures are such that on the basis of studies which they believe are adequate, they suggest that the line must come this way. Well we are insisting, and taking the position, that the government of Ontario has as much responsibility for the alternate route of a gas pipeline through northern Ontario—along the route which is well known to the Minister of Mines and obviously the Minister himself would be aware of it—has as much responsibility to see that that line is constructed now—not four, five, six years from now—as it had originally in the political convulsion of 1956 and 1957 when it joined with the government of Canada in financing that particular part of the Trans-Canada line.

The only difference now is that the speculation has gone out of it. At that time everybody agreed, even though they had very little foresight or very little faith in it, everybody agreed that because it was a speculative proposition the two governments had to build that part of the line. Now in the years which have intervened—and we are talking almost about 10 years—in the years which have intervened it is now perfectly clear that an alternate gas pipeline, not a twinning of the Trans-Canada line but the alternate line which could come through further to the south, could within a maximum period of four to five years, be constructed at a cost which would lay down gas at the most economic price throughout that part of northern Ontario. Any financial study that could possibly be made would show that line would be able to return on its investment, Mr. Chairman, between six and a half and eight per cent, that it would satisfy the customers that are available in the area—and all experience shows that you do not even just count the available customers, it really multiplies so far as the customers are concerned—that it would be able to service them at the same price for which gas is available in other parts of Ontario; that it would be able to pay the carrying charges on the debt which would be incurred to construct the line and it would provide a fair return to the shareholders; that it could be done within four years if this government showed any interest whatsoever in the project which is demanded by the people in northern Ontario.

Now what is the alternate with which the government is going to go along? The government has gone along with this long, laborious process of the applications to the Federal Power Commission. The oral evidence is going to be in by April 21, and at some time afterwards—days or weeks later—the Federal Power Commission is going to make some kind of a decision about the matter.

Now regardless of whether it is in favour or opposed to the southern route the fact of the matter is that precious days and hours are being lost in the construction of a facility which would do an immense amount of good through northern Ontario. Now no one can gainsay that proposition. Nobody can deny, on the information which is available, that the alternate route—not a twinning of the route—would be able to be constructed as a feasible economic project at a cost that would provide gas to northern Ontario, to the industries that are required; and would provide a fair return on the investment and, in due course, retire all the funded debt.

Now, all I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we cannot afford to take and give priority to a southern route. We have to give the priority to that route which would do the most good for that area of the province which is crying for development. There is nothing anti-American about this. Of course we are going to have to share gas across the border one way or the other, whether it goes Sault Ste. Marie or whether it goes through Fort Frances. Wherever it goes, there is going to be a grid system for the sharing of gas the same as there is for the sharing of electric power.

It is not an anti-American operation. It is the demand and the requirement that priority be given to the alternate route and, if there is to be a second route, that it be the southern route. If it becomes necessary to have the southern route, let us give it second place; let us give the prime need for the line the priority which it requires. In that way we can satisfy the needs of northern Ontario for competitive energy costs, especially when we are dependent to such a great degree on the export of the very things which come from the north country. It would provide a tremendous stimulus to the overall development of that part of the country and it would seem to us here that this government, in this vote, has got to give that kind of priority to this alternate gas pipeline.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am saying to the Minister that we just cannot drift along week afer week, after week. It really does not matter to this government which proposal is accepted. As I understand it, this government would say: Well, it does not matter whether they twin the route or whether they put in an alternate route, or whether they come through to the south. But I am saying, and our party is asserting, that it does matter; that the choice has to be made and that this government, even at this late hour, has got to take action in this fluid, unsatisfactory and uncertain state of affairs and assert the dominance of the public interest of the people in northern Ontario on this kind of facility.

The time is now. It can be done. The government can make the statement; it can assert to the National Energy Board that it has gone on too long and that, in the opinion of the government of the province of Ontario, the requirement is the alternate route; and that it be done with the greatest possible expediency and with the greatest possible economy. The government can say we have the know-how and the ability to build that line, and get it into operation in a very nominal period of time.

By getting it into operation in such a nominal period of time we can provide the kind of impetus which is desperately needed in northern Ontario, which does not have gas available to it now and which, for reasons which totally escape me, is not likely in any foreseeable time to have an oil pipeline that would provide and alternate form of energy for the industries in that area and for the people that live in it.

Now this is our view and I think the Minister should respond to it. I do not think he should say: "we have gone over this this afternoon" or, "we have no view about it" or, "oh yes, as long as we have lots of gas, we do not care how it comes." It is very important and we would like the Minister to say either it is not important or it is important, or that the government is going to take a firm stand on this issue. It is a crucial issue for many people in the province and it is a crucial issue for the future development of northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would say the hon. member has made a good political speech, but there is not too much fact in what he is saying.

Let me deal with one thing first. You talked about the stand this government took when the first pipeline was built through northern Ontario. Certainly this government, and I was not a member of the government at that day, but the government of the day wanted natural gas in northern Ontario. We have it.

Mr. MacDonald: You have it?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have it.

Mr. MacDonald: Only half of them.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Now just a minute—we have it. Well, all right, just one minute.

Now if the line goes the other way, the area that you seem to be worrying about is the Sault, Wawa and did I understand you to say Terrace Bay? You talked about Kenora this afternoon. It has it running out of its ears up there. If the line goes the other way and these people want gas, there will be gas in that area. There will be gas in the Soo off this line.

Mr. MacDonald: But that is only through a spur line to meet the Sault's needs.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh, not necessarily the only place. When you get gas at the Soo, it is not hard to take it to Wawa or Terarce Bay.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): It is a long way.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I know it is a long way. But it is a long way to build a transmission line as well. Let us put the long way both ways.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what we are saying.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Let us put the long way both ways; you are talking of building the transmission line; we are talking about a line to serve a local area. Now let us get the cost of those two things and look at them. Which is the cheaper to build, a 36-inch line or a 12-inch line?

Mr. Freeman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Just let me finish. I have not finished with the question the hon. member has asked me.

Now when we look at that, and get the cost, we will find that we could bring gas into the Soo and up in that area cheaper than you could build a transmission line, a large transmission line. Now if you are looking at the Fort Frances area, there is gas at Atikokan now, I believe, or on its way there. If you are looking in the Fort Frances area, there will be gas in there next year, coming in from Winnipeg.

Mr. W. G. Noden (Rainy River): They are negotiating on that now.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They are negotiating it right now and it will be in there, I am told by the gas companies. I looked at a map a short time ago.

We as a government have looked at all those areas up there and we are going to make sure that industry, where industry is, will be supplied. That is our interest and we have taken care of it, regardless of what you say over there. We have looked after the interests of the people in north and northwestern Ontario, whether it be industry or what it be.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, might I say a word here?

Mr. Chairman: Well, the member was on his feet to ask a question.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am going to answer the hon. member, whether it would be worthwhile or not, because I can tell you so many things about how that northern line can be profitable that perhaps you do not know. I know every inch of that territory up there. When you swing down from Manitoba, you hit Kenora, do you not? Then you have the tremendous Red Lake area which is going to need oil. Then you come on down a little further and you hit mines, namely Canfer, Anaconda, and Lake St. Joseph. Wherever you go all through that part of Ontario, south or north, you are going to need gas, and do not think that this government is going to stand idly by and see that it is not supplied.

The Minister has told you that. You have made a story tonight, and a very good one I will admit, about the big voids where the gas company would not have a market. But that is not so today. Then you come down, and Sault Ste. Marie is crying for oil. International Nickel is crying to get it into the east. But on the way down you have got many new complexes that require this gas, all the way from the Manitoba boundary to Toronto.

Do not think that northern Ontario is going to be denied a gas line, because as I told you earlier in the evening, that would not be so. The facilities are all there, and if a gas company bypassed that area they would be bypassing the most profitable area for them in Canada.

If it is a case of dollars and cents, no gas line is going to pass by those areas. Then they will go down to the Soo and if they want to cut down to the United States for a way, that is all right, too.

Then there is Fort Frances and all that area. There are pulp mills there and Steep Rock and Anaconda iron properties, as I said before. They are great users of gas. There is such a big market in that part of Ontario from the Manitoba boundary east through to the Lakehead area that no gas pipeline will

ever pass by it. They are crazy if they do and we will not let them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Fort William.

Mr. Freeman: Mr. Chairman, I think that probably some of the areas that have not had too much attention with regard to this tremendous problem should have some words said about them at this time. We had the original Trans-Canada gas line which comes down through Manitoba to the Lakehead and down through Nipigon and so on. I am sure the hon. Minister of Mines would know that it is true that just within the last 12 months, or about that time, this gas line was bypassed from Upsala, about 90 miles northwest of Fort William, into the Atikokan property. Prior to that time they had no gas supply available.

I would also call to your attention, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, and I am sure the Minister of Mines again knows this full well, that the right of way for the Trans-Canada northern line has been cleared. It has been agreed by experts that the present clearing area can be used for another line, and where twinning is necessary, it can be carried out.

Another problem that I would call to your attention Mr. Chairman, and to this House is that it has been reliably estimated by well informed people in this area that the second Trans-Canada pipeline coming down through the Lakehead area and servicing Terrace, Marathon, and down through to Wawa and Sault Ste. Marie, and those intervening points, means an additional investment in Canadian pipe and in Canadian labour and in the other things that go towards the construction of this additional line, costing $700 million. This money can be kept in Canada, and most of it can be kept in northwestern Ontario.

I would call to your attention also, Mr. Chairman, that people who are knowledgeable in the area of energy supplies in northwestern Ontario, and this goes for all of the operations that the Minister of Mines just mentioned, are facing the future with a great deal of fear with regard to sufficient gas supplies. At present the control is situated in North Bay, Ontario, I believe, I will not make that a statement of fact, but I believe this to be true. I have been in contact with engineers who operate the various huge plants at the Lakehead and I have been told reliably that there are times every day in the week, from Monday on through to the following Monday, when they have to cut down their consumption of gas in certain areas because the supply is presently insufficient.

I have a suggestion for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, that he and his people take a real look at this problem. This is something that is going to affect northwestern Ontario, and indeed the province of Ontario, for the next two or three decades. This is an opportunity for the people up in the northwest and the people of the province to benefit from a Canadian resource and to expand our industries in a much more rapid way than we would ordinarily be able to do. If we do not do it because of inefficiency or the fact that we failed to take a good strong look at this very important problem, then we are failing the people of this country and this province.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, if I might clear up one statement. I am sure the hon. member would not want it on the record that there is $700 million worth of pipe going in that line.

Mr. MacDonald: He said all of the money to be spent through the generation of economic activity.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have got a figure of $240 million, so there seems to be a discrepancy in the figures there. I do not know where he got his figures, but they are way out someplace.

Mr. Freeman: They came from the people in Ottawa when depositions were made to them down there.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think you had better check with them again, because—

Mr. Freeman: I can get the figures and give them to the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would like to say this to the hon. member; regardless—and I do not know which way the line is going to go, but regardless of whether it is the south or the north; and I think we all know what the increase in the use of natural gas is in the province of Ontario per year; there will be gas in all areas. The line, whichever way it goes this time, is not going to serve Ontario for very long, before another line must be built. I think we have the assurance now through the federal government and Trans-Canada Pipe Lines that if the south route goes first, the north must follow. If for some reason this south line is turned down in Washington, and it is at Washington now, then the north line will go and we will have to

look to another source for more gas in Ontario to serve our customers in the very near future.

Mr. Freeman: Mr. Chairman, there is another problem. I am sure the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management does not realize that the federal energy board in the United States may turn thumbs down on the southern route. Also there is still the problem of the Texas Panhandle Gas Corporation who are not satisfied with the present approach being made to the federal energy board, and they are going to fight, I think, pretty seriously and strongly against the idea of a southern line as well, so that pressure is being exerted upon the federal energy board from more than one direction. And the problem that we have to consider, I say to you in all seriousness, is retaining this natural resource of Canada, insofar as it is humanly possible, within the confines of the borders of this country.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The people in Alberta would not agree with that statement, because they have natural gas and plenty of it. They can furnish most of the United States and still look after Ontario's gas pipelines if they tell me the truth, and I think that they do. I do not think you would win an election in Alberta on that statement, because they have lots of gas. We are interested in getting a supply in here at a price that will appeal to industry—and we have large industries using large quantities of gas. If you noted what I said yesterday—that 1 per cent of industry in this country is using 48 per cent of all the gas coming in here, you can see that it does not take a very large industry to use a lot of gas, and this costs a lot of money.

I cannot prove these figures but a man showed me figures given to him on the two lines—which have not been proven—estimating that one industry moving into western Ontario would cost them $15,000 more a month for natural gas—on the figures your own leader used this afternoon. That is how large the quantities are that they use. Fifteen thousand dollars a month multiplied by 12 for a year, and by 10 years, is a lot of money to an industry. I think we must look after our industries and attract as many of them as we can to this province.

Mr. Freeman: These are fearful problems, Mr. Chairman. I would ask that the hon. Minister of Mines set me right on this. I believe that in acting as a member of the select committee on mines for a two-year period I was shown very briefly, an operation which was at the stage of exploration. They were trying to find out whether or not this could be brought to a successful conclusion in The Department of Mines. And I believe I am correct when I make this statement that the idea of the use of gas to reduce iron ores was one of the very important things that they had in mind.

This being the case, Mr. Chairman, with the huge iron ore developments that we all know about in northwestern Ontario, I suggest that if this process proves successful, that they could probably use as much in the iron ore industry in northwestern Ontario in the foreseeable future as most of northwestern Ontario itself could use. This being the case, they are going to need vast amounts of gas as energy to reduce the iron ore. And with the pelletizing processes now in operation and envisaged, we have a future, possibly, in northwestern Ontario for the establishment of steel mills and other like industries coming out of the iron ore industry.

These are things to which a good sound look should be given, because if we make this mistake here, as the federal government has done in the past 10 years and was in the process of doing again just a few months ago, if we continue to make this mistake in the province of Ontario where these vast resources exist, we are going to be blamed for all time—and I think very justly so.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, one of the responsibilities of any government is to develop the resources of the province and to make it possible economically for those resources to be developed.

Already we have heard a great deal about the possibilities of northern Ontario, and the vast wealth is there waiting to be developed. If what seems to be the policy that this government is carried through and if the gas line comes up from the southern route and into Sault Ste. Marie and then the 12-inch lines fan out from Wawa and east, those 12-inch lines are going to determine the scope of development. If there is any shortage of gas in those lines to the south, then the United States is going to get the priority for the gas before we are allowed to use it. So if there is expansion to be had south of the line, the expansion to the north will be held up, because once those spur lines are put in through the Soo then the pattern is set for the development of northern Ontario and that part just north of the lakes.

If, on the other hand, the second line is put in across the northern part of the lakes south of the present line then we have the generating power there for the opening up of that part of the north. The trunk lines are there; the potential is there, and the economic basis laid. But, Mr. Chairman, unless this government is prepared to move, is prepared to see the potential and is prepared to lay the economic power base now while the whole situation is fluid, then I am afraid that we are going to miss an opportunity for generations to come.

So I say to this government and to this Minister: Let us be serious about this matter of developing the resources of this province, of building in northern Ontario the kind of development that is possible there, of building the new industries and the new cities and towns and complexes that can come to pass.

This is the responsibility of this Minister at this time and he should accept it and move forward to that challenge.

Mr. Chairman: Is section 1 carried?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, on this vote, I have another policy question to ask of the Minister and it relates back to an order-in-council of December, 1965, I believe, whereby the Cabinet relieved the gas companies and/or the pipeline companies of the responsibility of paying taxes on their transmission lines. I believe this is correct, and I have approached—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I believe that this question should be asked of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, perhaps under his estimates. We have nothing to do with the taxation part of these lines; that comes under his department.

Mr. Paterson: This deals specifically with gas and oil transmission and I know it has cost the counties in southwestern and southern Ontario millions of dollars in assessment. My own county, in particular, is over $750,000 in assessed value.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to the member that this does not properly come before us now. If the Minister of Municipal Affairs wishes to answer at this time—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, it might be advisable if we were to answer the question that the hon. member has raised. All that we did in the amendments to The Assessment Act dealing with the municipal assessment of pipelines was to provide that there should be equalization, because remember that the assessment rate for pipelines is a statutory rate; it is contained in The Assessment Act.

And what we found upon investigating this matter on a complaint from some of the pipeline companies, was that municipalities were assessing the pipelines at the very high statutory rate, but they were assessing the other properties—in one case, at something like 18 per cent of the value. The result of that, of course, was that the pipeline company was forced to pay much more in municipal taxes than they should have been paying. All we did was to provide for equalization; that is all that the amendment provided.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I hate to thresh old straw, but I listened with great interest all afternoon with regard to this debate on natural gas and I do not want to refer back, but it is hard for me to understand the results of the debate this afternoon. I must say that I have been approached many times by these farmers in Lambton county with regard to gas storage.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton East): You just stay over in Kent county.

Mr. Spence: I will, but they come over to see me. Why do you not stand up on your feet and say something?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Spence: They came to me; I did not go to them. Mr. Chairman, after listening to this debate, I feel that gas storage has made this a great feud. And I think the report of the municipal board recommending compensation to these property owners of $5 an acre is not sufficient in order to compensate these people for what gas storage has done for gas in this province of Ontario.

It is hard for me to understand, Mr. Chairman, what consideration you give, after the Ontario energy board had made a two-year study and came up with $13.88 per acre to the property owners and also when they went to arbitration and appealed to the municipal board and they recommended $5 an acre. There is a very wide scope here, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to know if you are going to give some consideration where there is such a wide difference in these two reports.

I do not want to open this all up, but I think these property owners should receive more compensation than what they are now receiving.

Mr. Chairman, I bring this up because there will be gas storage in my own riding, if I am elected next time, and—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): You will be back.

Mr. Spence: My constituents are greatly concerned and watch what is taking place in Lambton county. I certainly do not want to interfere in the riding of the hon. member for Lambton East, but we will be in the gas storage area, too, in the very near future, I believe.

Mr. Henderson: The hon. member is in it now.

Mr. Spence: Why, sure. Why did the hon. member interrupt, then?

Mr. Noden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question. If the southern route is set up to bring gas into southern Ontario, would it not be possible for the northern route to supply in the immediate future, and for the future, all the gas that will be required by the industry so that it will generate at a competitive price, and make the price of gas competitive for the industry in the north in relation to the rest of the area?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, there would be ample gas to supply their needs for a few years, as far as we can see now. But as the north develops—and there is no doubt more mines will come in and there will be more being used in the paper mills—I think it would be only a short time until it would be necessary to build another line to serve all Ontario. It would come down and hook up with some other lines and you would need additional gas in that area.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, in the Minister's opening remarks, he mentioned that the department was now taking steps to deal with the protection of customers who have appliances and furnaces in regard to safety standards. The one thing that has been a concern of mine is back when Union Gas came into our municipality some 10 or 12 years ago, they undertook to replace many of the old pipelines, and we have been fortunate in that we have never had any difficulty in regard to explosions.

But I am wondering, sir, if in the department the Minister has any control over the—what shall I say—description of old existing lines? Does the department undertake to make sure that old existing lines are in good condition, does it have some control over that?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes we do; our inspectors are inspecting these at all times.

Mr. Worton: There have been several explosions, and of course there has been a major one in New York some months ago, and I am wondering if we are just going by good luck rather than good management and if we could be guaranteed that there is sufficient protection against this happening? I think this has been the result of several major accidents in Ottawa and Windsor brought about by old lines, and I am wondering if we are on top of it here in this province.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we hope we are on top of it. Dealing with a very high explosive commodity, you could have an explosion at any time!

I think you will find that the last explosion in Ottawa was in new equipment, it was faulty installation, or we think that is what it was. I believe the one in Windsor, I knew something about that, and I think that was somebody tampering with the line again, if I am not mistaken.

But as far as old lines are concerned and new lines, they are under our inspection and we watch these pretty carefully. I know right in the city of Kingston they have an old gas system that has been in for some 100 years and two years ago we had to send our inspectors in there and we had to clean up a lot of places because they were very old lines and had been moved and pushed around and there were many leaks.

Although we do not have enough inspectors to perhaps inspect every block, or keep every block inspected, we are constantly inspecting and checking for leaks in natural gas.

Mr. Worton: Does the Minister feel we are now adequately protected?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have been very fortunate in the past year, I hope it stays that way.

Votes 601 and 602 agreed to.

On vote 603:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on vote 603, is the fourth vote, "utilization inspection," is that the appropriate place for the discussion of safety?

Mr. Chairman: I think perhaps it would come under that. Shall we just check in advance of that? Is there anything under administration, energy study and then utilization inspection?

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): I have a question: What studies are planned during the coming year under this part of the vote? Are there any particular studies or is it just on projected use; or what does it cover?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I can go over this list with the member: Public education and information, $5,000; field office rental, $12,000; field maintenance $2,740; hall rentals $2,000; engineering supplies $1,000; photographic art and drafting supplies, $350; moving costs, $2,000; meetings, $750; telephone and telegraph, $6,000; maps and reproductions, $9,000; computer programmes, University of Western Ontario, $5,000; Department of Highways of Ontario, $3,000; auto rentals, $2,000; cotton sample bags, Department of Mines, $1,500; gas and oil, $500; and other items, $160—for a total of $55,000.

Mr. Smith: That was not my question, Mr. Chairman. What studies are being done under energy study? That is what I would like to know, not where the money was particularly spent.

I think this is a new part in this vote this year, it was not in the votes of last year under this heading. I think the Minister must be looking at last year's estimates.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I am sorry, I am not. Just one minute.

Mr. Chairman: While the Minister is getting the information, members might be interested in knowing that the score is one-one at the end of the second period!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question, I understand there is a three-man group in our department on development of nuclear energy and forecasts of all energy requirements, gas, oil, propane, electric and otherwise.

Mr. Smith: Under this then, I would presume they are going to study the energy requirements and particularly of natural gas, over the next 20 or 30 years; is this what I am to understand?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We make some studies, but in cooperation with other departments of government—for example Economics and Development—and these studies are coordinated with that department.

Mr. Chairman: Anything else under energy studies?

Mr. Renwick: Before we leave that vote, do I understand that so far as this Minister's department is concerned, the only studies being made are within this $27,000 salary figure, and that that encompasses three people? Is that the only study part of this Minister's department related to this whole question of energy sources and needs in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right!

Mr. Renwick: Well Mr. Chairman, it is almost incomprehensible. Did the Minister say there were three men employed in that department for all the studies that are required to make projections as to energy needs and supplies in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I said just a minute ago that there are other departments in government making studies of the needs for industry for gas and oil and our men work with them. If we are talking about electric power, Hydro have their own staff that make those studies. But we seem to have the information on hand. I might say that industry itself makes studies. When you are dealing with private industry as against public industry, which you people seem to think would work better, they continually make studies—

Mr. Renwick: We like the Hydro.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: —because they are in the business of providing a commodity to the customers.

Mr. Renwick: Perhaps the Minister could let me know whether or not these three men are in consultation with any other department at any time? Where are they located, these three men?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They are in Toronto, at 880 Bay, at our office.

Mr. Renwick: Could the Minister let us know what their qualifications are for this kind of study work?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Do you mean are they engineers or what?

Mr. Renwick: Yes, what qualifications do they have to carry out these energy studies?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we have one engineer, one economist and one statistician.

Mr. Chairman: Studies—next item, utilization inspection.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make some general comments first and then raise some questions with the Minister with regard to the whole question of safety in relation to gas transmission lines.

The Minister is no doubt aware that in the United States recently there is blowing up quite a storm, quite a great deal of public concern, in part provoked by Ralph Nader, who seems to have moved from safety in cars. But before one tends to dismiss the efforts of Mr. Nader, he started out as the subject of some derision and he ended up by backing the mighty giants of the automobile industry into the corner and forcing some pretty significant changes in terms of greater safety for car drivers. I think his case ultimately was very substantially confirmed.

I repeat, he has moved into the gas industry and apparently has been making considerable studies for the last year or two. On February 18 of this year, the CBC carried an interview with Mr. Nader. I happen to have a copy of the script dialogue here and in it he made a number of points which I would like to draw to the attention of the House by way of background.

He first reviewed the investigations that were made into the situation in New York where there was an explosion which might have resulted in very serious loss of life, except that the company noticed there had been a radical drop in pressure and cleared the whole area just in advance of the actual explosion. The gist of his interview is that distribution systems are being overloaded; some are obsolescent, regulations are inadequate.

Municipal officials responsible for safety do not even know where the pipes are; only the gas companies do. The long distance transmission lines have inadequate safety standards. The pipe is too thin, poor welding quality, internal and external corrosion; not set deeply enough in the ground to prevent puncture by bulldozers and other surface machines. There is inadequate inspection by companies to detect deterioration. There is inadequate reporting to government of accidents and rotations. There is virtually no meaningful public relations of safety of pipelines; the pipelines installed under industry are not of government standards; the risks in the future, though there have been few spectacular accidents so far, are greater because of some of these older pipelines.

And he noted that in the United States, President Johnson has asked for legislation regulating safety of natural gas pipelines and that this is provoking quite a battle with the various lobbies focusing in on Washington.

Indeed, a month or so later, on March 27, the Toronto *Daily Star* carried a story, again two or three paragraphs, rather significant of the kind of situation that is developing.

The *Star* carried the following account:

> Ralph Nader said that industry lobbyists in Washington supported by local utilities are seeking to sabotage United States Senate Bill 1166 which would impose construction standards on pipeline companies for the first time. He says that much of the gas transmission line network is unsafe. The metal walls of some pipelines are thin as beer cans and hollowed logs installed in 1870 are still in use. The industry, he asserted, is risking the lives of thousands of people by shoddy maintenance of corroding pipes, which pass under meadows, children's playgrounds and even porches from coast to coast.
>
> Nader, who had been studying gas and oil pipelines for about a year, said he based his criticisms on Federal Power Commission data and the investigation of consultant engineers who have studied the transmission system. Moreover, Nader said he had observed the fantastic campaign by lobbyists for both the gas and oil industry to pull enforcement teeth of a fairly tough Senate bill which would impose criminal penalties on wilful violators of the safety code.

Now there is a broad general picture with some application to the Canadian scene, and it is interesting that in the broadcast on the CBC on February 18, the companies were invited to participate in this campaign and refused to do so.

It is against the background of that kind of growing concern, which I do not think can be laughed off, that I draw to the Minister's attention a letter I received earlier this year from the plumbers and steamfitters, local 46, in which they raise the question of whether or not we are doing enough investigation and whether or not we have rigid enough inspection with regard to conditions right here in the city of Toronto, under the jurisdiction of Consumers' Gas. I quote:

> We understand that Consumers' Gas have considerable mileage of cast iron gas main laid in Metro Toronto which requires constant maintenance due to leakage. This gas

main was originally laid to carry manufactured gas but is now carrying natural gas. Due to the "dryness" of natural gas as compared to manufactured gas, the material used in the joints of the hubs of the cast iron pipe has dried out, causing leakage. Consumers' Gas are installing a pipe of mechanical joint at these hubs, but without detracting from the ability and knowledge of Consumers' Gas engineers we question whether this seal offers sufficient protection in such aged and corroded pipes or whether their programme will be completed before a major catastrophe of the type that took place in New York recently, occurs.

We have no desire to cause any undue alarm but we do feel inquiries should be made to The Department of Energy and Natural Resources. May we add that cast iron pipe is no longer used in gas mains. Steel pipe has been in use for a number of years.

I have two questions that I would like to ask the Minister. What is his view on the broad problem of safety? I recall some years ago when the main pipeline was laid, after some explosions had taken place with some loss of life in the various incidents, that there were spot checks made. And it was rather appalling, the inadequacy that was discovered in joints and connections where apparently there had not been adequate safety in the laying of their pipe. This was recently-laid pipe. Have the spot checks really caught the safety problem in recently-laid pipe, to say nothing of this old pipe that was originally laid for manufactured gas? So my first question is with regard ot the general problem.

My second question is a more specific one, in relation to the kind of problem that local 46 of the plumbers and steamfitters raises with regard to this programme of changing joints that are drying out through the use of natural gas, rather than manufactured gas, in the system in Metro Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, to answer the first question, the pipeline code came into effect in Ontario in 1960. This code detailed construction, operation and all maintenance requirements.

In regard to the second question, I doubt if we have heard of that one before. This problem seems to be something that our people had not heard about. I have a note here that says cast iron pipe has proved to be entirely satisfactory for natural gas distribution. Pressure regulation is very important. The mechanical joints are also quite satisfactory when properly installed. There has been a programme of rehabilitation of old cast iron lines—in other words you are replacing a lot of them or you are updating a lot of them. You are updating the joints.

Mr. MacDonald: Is this in the Consumers' lines in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would think this would apply in Consumers' and in other areas where the old cast lines were down. All the new construction, as you said, is steel so we do not have that problem there. But in the cities such as Toronto I know we have cast iron lines in many places, I suppose. This is where they are working on the old cast iron lines.

Mr. MacDonald: I am interested that the Minister says he is not aware of the problem locally that was raised in this letter from local 46 of the plumbers and steamfitters.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What date was that letter?

Mr. MacDonalld: Earlier this year. January 26.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is surprising we had never heard about it in our department and I—

Mr. MacDonald: Gas leakage? Have you never heard of gas leakage?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh, yes we hear of gas leakage. But on this particular problem, I think where there is such a problem it would be helpful if the word could get through to our department, because we cannot check on everything all the time.

Mr. MacDonald: I draw it to the Minister's attention now and, indeed, one of the comments in the letter is that inquiries should be made by The Department of Energy and Natural Resources and I would presume after this exchange that inquiries will be made.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, we will get it through quicker after this so we can do something about it.

Mr. MacDonald: So we have made some progress.

However Mr. Chairman, I am a little intrigued at the Minister's mere quoting of the fact that in 1960 standards were established and that presumably meets all the problem that is emerging because of the studies and

the focus of public attention on it in the United States by Ralph Nader.

I do not want to pose as an alarmist in face of conditions that might develop. All I am saying is that we have people who have looked into the old pipeline situations; we have some of them in Ontario the same as in the United States because in some areas of Ontario we have been using gas for generations. I find it difficult to come to any conclusions, but essentially the same condition exists here.

It is almost like the automobile industry—it is identical on both sides of the border. Therefore what they are doing over there is going to have some application and some guidance for us here. I do not think it can be just dismissed, as the Minister said, by saying that we came up with new regulations in 1960. I think those new regulations he is referring to, in 1960, were regulations with regard to the laying of pipelines.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, maintenance as well.

Mr. MacDonald: I recall some pretty heated debates in this House following one or two disasters.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I can recall some of them too.

Mr. MacDonald: Robert Macaulay was in control of the situation, or at least on top of the situation, Mr. Chairman, and it was at that time that they went out and spot checked. It was then reported, as a result of the investigations, that in many instances the pipe had been laid with only company inspectors and not government inspectors there at all. So here was this pipe all laid and all they did was spot check. I am only speaking from memory now, but the number of instances in which there were conditions which had to be changed and other conditions that had to be repaired, at least in terms of figures, were a little terrifying in the area from Hamilton through and east along the northern shore of Lake Ontario.

Now by definition a spot check is no guarantee that you have caught everything; a spot check means that there are spots that you will not have hit. I just say this to underline that this condition may exist in the province of Ontario. I would think that your department might well follow the kind of studies and public pronouncements that are being made in the United States as some guidance and some indication of the further investigations that might be made in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the hon. member that regardless of how careful you are and how many spot checks you made, you could have an accident when dealing with natural gas.

I think it would be impossible to get enough inspectors to inspect every time a joint is opened or every time a pipe is laid, or every time they link a piece of pipe in the province of Ontario; but we have found that the gas companies are being very careful about this, because as you know today if they have an explosion and it is their fault I think it is a problem that they worry a great deal about.

Now where there are the old cast iron lines, and of course we know where they are, we are checking constantly to see if there are leaks. You cannot see underground. All that you can hope to do is detect it through a manhole or some other way, these are being checked constantly.

We do check on most of the new installations, I think that perhaps we check on all of them if we can. Where a new installation comes above ground and we can see it, these are all checked. It is surprising the problems we run into there, because sometimes these installations are let to contractors and we do find things out of the way occasionally, but they are corrected and corrected immediately.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the Minister if his department checks on heating units carried in trailer units? Is that a responsibility of the department or is that a responsibility of the municipality in which the trailer happens to be located at a time?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Do you mean installation?

Mr. Newman: Home trailers; house trailers.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You mean the installation of the units?

Mr. Newman: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Are you talking about propane installations? Yes, they must be inspected; the installation must be inspected by our department.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Are you doing anything concerning the recommendation of the city of Windsor made early this year concerning the improving of

safety regulations covering these heating units?

We had an unfortunate accident where a man living in a trailer home died from gas fumes. It was a result of faulty installation or something that could have been overcome had inspection been a little more stringent than it was.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier we do inspect the installations, but we are not constantly checking to see if these are operating all right. I would think that anyone in a trailer with propane—I do not know whether the hon. member has ever lived in a trailer with propane heat, I have stayed in one a few nights and there was one unit that I made sure, or I thought was sure, to be working right and that was the heater, because they are very dangerous. If for some reason they are not adjusted right an accident can happen, and I understand this is what happened in that case.

I think you could see that it would be impossible for us to have any inspector to go and inspect every propane unit to make sure that they were keeping up the service which they require, because there are many thousands in cottages throughout Ontario. They are using propane for heat; they are using propane for refrigeration; they are using propane for light. If you go on some of our northern lakes you will find units in every cottage. We are inspecting as closely as we can, but it would be impossible to check them daily.

Mr. Newman: Is the Minister improving the regulations that govern the installation of units such as I have mentioned, in mobile homes; and summer cottages? The request of the city of Windsor was actually for more stringent regulations, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes. The new propane code establishes equipment standards and it is all checked. Now all these installers today must be licensed. This is something that has happened in the past two years. We have started licensing propane installers.

At one time it used to be somebody that ran a marina or something; he would install a tank or a stove, a heater or refrigerator. Perhaps it was a pipe fitter, he might not even have been that, but he installed it and said everything would be fine. I do not think he realized that he was handling dangerous materials, but now they must be licensed and they must work under the code. I think it is working out very well.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, when were the last changes made in the code?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand there is to be a revised code out within two months.

Mr. Newman: Well this is the whole question, Mr. Chairman. What you contemplate doing is what the city had requested, because they did not think that the code, as it stood, was stringent enough. The revision of the code, I would assume, would overcome the problem and satisfy them in their request for better safety regulations on such types of installations on the manufacturers' level.

Mr. Chairman: The last item under 603—drilling and production.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I have another question—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, how many charges were laid in the province during the past year in regard to misuse of propane equipment? I know that there were some charges laid in North Bay after the death of a worker at a construction site. I would like to know how many charges were laid and who acts for the energy branch when these charges are laid—a lawyer within the branch or does another person do the prosecuting?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that we do not have any lawyers in our branch. Our legal work is done by The Department of the Attorney General. I understand that there was only one charge laid and that was in the hon. member's area; and we did not get a conviction on that one.

Mr. Smith: Was the prosecutor an employee of the government or was he retained by the government specifically for this one case?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: He was from The Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Smith: There was some question during the trial, Mr. Chairman, that it would have been more efficient if a local lawyer had been used to prosecute in this case. The trial would have proceeded at a much better rate and would have perhaps reached a different conclusion.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, as I stated before, we have no legal officers in our department and the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) is responsible for all of our legal work, so it would be up to his depart-

ment if they wanted a local man to represent them.

Mr. Smith: It is not the choice of the Minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister who is responsible for the checking of the size of the moat around the storage tanks on these tank farms? Is that the responsibility of the Minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What type of storage?

Mr. Newman: Oil, gasoline—any type of fuel at these storage depots, say, at Oakville. There is a moat around each tank in case of an overflow or some other manner in which oil would be spilled and retained in the moat around the tank.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is the responsibility of this department. There are standards and the depots are inspected.

Mr. Newman: Are they inspected throughout the province, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Newman: One of the comments that I recall reading in the press was that the size of the moat was generally not large enough to contain all of the fluids that may be in the storage tank. In areas that are fairly heavily built up, where some type of unfortunate accident could happen, this combustible material would overflow the moat and would be a hazard to residents within the vicinity of the storage tank area.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, these moats are inspected and come up to our standards. I think it would be impossible to build a moat large enough to hold the complete contents of some of those large tanks, but I doubt if there would be a leak that would spill the entire contents at one time. If there is a small leak, it can be detected and the contents can be pumped out into another tank.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I bring this up because I recall reading in an editorial that the moats generally are not big enough and that there was a real hazard. There was a case in New Jersey—if I am not mistaken—where there was an overflow because of the moat not being large enough and the damage to property in the vicinity was quite sizeable.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I must retract that last statement because I understand that all of these moats will take more than 110 per cent of the capacity of the tank.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, in the next section of this vote dealing with drilling and production, I assume that this would also cover the plugging of old wells, so I can take them in succession—plugging, drilling and production.

With regard to the plugging of old wells, I recall that the Minister in his introductory statement made some comment with regard to the on-going programme to cope with the accumulation of old wells that had not been plugged. May I ask the Minister how much money was spent plugging old wells last year, and how many of them there were?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The money expended was $150,000.

Mr. MacDonald: $150,000 for the plugging of wells for the whole year?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: I am told that the cost ranges anywhere from $2,000 to $10,000 to plug a well. How many were plugged?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am getting this information now. The costs vary for plugging.

Mr. MacDonald: As I understand it, a request is made of the owner of a well to plug it, or of the owner of a property on which the well is situated, and if it is not done then the department will step in and do the job and charge it back. Am I correct in this?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the number of wells that were plugged amounted to 96. Most of these unplugged wells are found and we are the ones who have to go ahead with the actual order to plug them. A company that has been working in an area, and if it is still in existence, is charged with the plugging costs after the department has completed the job.

Now if one should appear on a property—and this has happened occasionally, I believe—which is being subdivided and there is no surface leak and the present owner has no idea that there is a well there, because they were not recorded at one time—they were drilled and then plugged—then it is our

responsibility to plug these wells at our expense, but a fair number are being charged to individuals.

Mr. MacDonald: Some are charged to the individual and some are, in effect, charged to the public treasury. Does that money come out of the consolidated revenue?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, it does; there is a vote here for it.

Mr. MacDonald: What rather puzzles me, Mr. Chairman, is that The Energy Act, 1964, which I understand is the current Energy Act, section 40, "abandoned works funds", reads:

> Five dollars out of every fee paid to bore or drill a well shall be paid into the fund. Where a work is not in compliance with the Act and the regulations and, if after notice thereof is given to the operator, and where the name and address of the operator—

and so on, and so on,

> —the owner of the lands on which the well is situated, the non-compliance is not forthwith corrected, the Minister may take possession and do work.

Where does this fit into the picture if the public treasury is used, the consolidated revenue is used, for the payment of plugging wells for which you cannot find any owner?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, this money is still collected but it goes as revenue; it is in as revenue.

Mr. MacDonald: I am a bit curious, because my information is that Mr. Brittain, the chief inspector, used a figure—and perhaps there is a misunderstanding or misquotation along the way here—as much as three to four million dollars in speaking at a meeting of the OPI at Port Dover within the past year; exactly when I am not certain.

Maybe the three to four million was the total cost of this programme since it was initiated. Perhaps the Minister would not be in a position to indicate how much of this has been covered by this continuing charge on licences for the drilling of new wells; how much of it comes out of the general revenue.

I will tell you quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, why I am raising it. I am wondering if the public treasury or alternatively licences for drillers are not being charged, or land owners who can be found to assume the cost, to be fixed with the cost, are not being charged for what in effect is, for example, the interest and responsibilities of the Provincial Gas Company, a subsidiary of Consumers' Gas.

For example, I am told that in the Niagara peninsula, where they are exploring the possibility of new storage basins—I do not think they are as good as Lambton county, everything down in Lambton county is better I am told. We even had from Zeb Janes the argument that the peaches were better down there than in the Niagara Peninsula a few years ago, but I have never had that settled.

They want new storage basins that they can have close at hand, so what they have done in some areas is they have started pumping gas in. When they start pumping gas in it pops here and it pops somewhere else. Indeed, I understand that suddenly on some occasion you find you have an old well in your front yard. There is one man, I am told, who even had to move his house because he discovered there was an old well under it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I guess that is the first one we paid for.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that the first one you paid for? Well what I am getting at is that if we are creating a new asset—we are in the process of creating a new asset for a subsidiary of Consumers' Gas, the Provincial Gas Company—by pumping gas in and popping these old wells, is this not a legitimate charge to the company that is ultimately going to benefit?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, this is where our problem exists. These old wells, years ago, were pumping a small amount of gas. As I said earlier, they got covered up. There are many of them in the Niagara peninsula. This is one of those we are talking about when we say there are a thousand wells we know of at this time that require plugging.

Now with the wells that are being abandoned today we will not have that problem because they are plugged under our supervision. The problem the member is talking about is where when they are exerting pressure down there, they find that they are blowing the old caps off wells that existed years ago.

The question has not been posed to me before. I think if the member would let me take that under advisement perhaps I had better give him an answer after we make some study of the situation.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, I know Okah Jones will love me all the more when he hears about

it, but I think quite frankly it is an unequitable distribution of charges if they are going to end up with a storage basin and pay no assessment on it; no sharing of municipal costs on all the other fringe benefits they have; maybe we should consider this.

Mr. Chairman, there is a second point in connection with drilling and/or production that has been drawn to my attention and I wanted to query the Minister on it. It has been argued with me that the changes which have been made in bonding arrangements in the last three or four years, now as compared with 1962, are actually a very serious deterrent in terms of encouraging more drilling.

Prior to 1962—I think I am correct in that date—the arrangement was that a driller, in getting a licence, had to have a safety bond and he could get an adequate safety bond of up to $1,000 which was what was required, for some $10 from the appropriate company. But this was wiped out and now you have an arrangement whereby they must have a bond of $500.

This bond—I can hardly believe this to be the case, but I am told it is—that this bond rests there as long as the well is in production.

Now I understand—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Am I correct?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: My understanding is that the well could be in production for literally a generation, if there happens to be a sizeable gas pocket down below. It seems to me if this $500 bond is going to be tied up all during that time, why do you revert to that procedure rather than the original procedure of $1,000 safety bond—presumably safety was your objective—that could be gotten for only $10?

I am told, for example, that in many instances the drilling of a shallow well, test drilling for a shallow well, costs only $300 or $400, but they have to get a $500 bond in order to be able to do this.

If all these arguments are valid—and I put them to the Minister for confirmation or correction or denial—then I can quite understand the contention that this is going to be a deterrent on drilling in the province of Ontario, when past history suggests that independent drillers have often been the people responsible for finding new natural resources that have been picked up by a company for development.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the statement the hon. member made is correct. Bonding is $500 per well or up to a maximum of $5,000 for any one company. This money is held to ensure proper plugging when a well is abandoned.

Now I might say this was never brought to my attention before. I had never heard any complaints about it.

Perhaps the member has, but I have never from an individual. But not knowing about it I did not realize—I knew we had some bond but I did not realize this was it. I would like to perhaps study this a little bit. Perhaps I could drop the member a line as to why we think this is necessary. It is news to me.

Mr. MacDonald: I invite the Minister to take a look at it because some of these wells can be in operation for 20, 30 or 40 years. You in effect have the person's money for that period. Are you paying interest on it, for example?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I cannot answer that.

Mr. MacDonald: This is like some other problems we have had of not paying interest, like long-term security payments to apartment owners, and things of that nature.

Again, I just reiterate this one point, if the cost of drilling a shallow well is only $300 or $400 and you have to put up a bond for $500 and you hold it for 25 years, I am certainly not going to get into that kind of a racket if I were interested in a new enterprise.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, I understand there are very few, in fact there are no cash bonds. They are usually a government bond, held by The Treasury Department, and the bond holder collects the interest, he can clip the coupons.

Mr. MacDonald: But you might hold it for 25 years?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, definitely, yes, but he is still getting interest on his money.

Mr. MacDonald: If the Minister is going to look into it, I would like to hear the results.

My final question, Mr. Chairman, is that I was most intrigued to read on March 20, a story in the Toronto *Telegram*: Woman to Drill for Oil on Farm. Here was Mrs. Rose

Sylvester, who came down and got in your hair. You certainly invited it, and she stayed in it for some time.

As I understand the situation, for quite some time she and her neighbours had been trying to get the right to drill, to satisfy themselves because they had become persuaded there was oil in the area.

Only now, after all of that battling, has she got a licence and she is proposing to drill. And Mr. Brittain has said it will be drilled on the site selected by Mrs. Sylvester.

Now my question is: They contended at the time that they could not get a drilling permit. What has puzzled me since, and puzzles me even more after this story, is that if a person comes to get a drilling permit from the department, is there an arbitrary judgment exercised as to whether or not they should have a drilling permit, therefore second guessing as to whether or not they think they have oil?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has been misinformed. He is right that I had one meeting, I believe, with Mrs. Sylvester. She had dealt for some months with the personnel in our department. At no time did we refuse her a drilling permit or did she ask for one; until the day she asked for it and she got it.

She came down and met with me last fall with a group of farmers. I tried to talk to her and for some reason she did not want me to tell the rest of the farmers my story. This was a part of my story, that we had even tried to make an appointment for drillers to discuss this drilling with her. She seemed to have a problem getting a drilling rig, I do not know why, but at no time did we refuse to issue a drilling permit. When she requested a drilling permit, I believe we issued it within 24 hours.

Mr. MacDonald: With Mrs. Rose Sylvester on the attack, I would not blame you for it, because she is a pretty tenacious woman.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I said her request—

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister leaves me a little nonplussed. Somebody is fibbing and I cannot afford, within this House, to suggest the Minister is fibbing.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I hope you do not think that we are fibbing, because there never was an application for a permit until after her visit to my office.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the point I was going to make is that certainly it is my recollection from these people that they had been trying to get a drilling permit. There were many farmers—I think many others spoke with them as they congregated in the winter conditions out in front of the Parliament buildings here, and certainly the papers indicated that they had been frustrated. Indeed, my recollection is that the considered view of the department was that there was not oil up there. Is this still the case and are you just in effect giving them an opportunity to prove it to their own satisfaction and cost?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we are the ones to say whether there is oil or not oil. If somebody wants to get a permit and comes within our regulations, they can go ahead and drill. It is not up to this department to say whether there is oil or whether there is not oil.

They might come for information; I suppose we have people in the department that would advise them if they thought there was oil or there was not. I can think of a well that was drilled last year on Fawn Island. No doubt you read about that, where a young lady was sure she was going to get oil. Some many hundreds of feet later she found out there was no oil there, to her sorrow, and the rig moved off.

Now we at no time told people up in that area that there was not oil. We at no time refused them a permit. When I talked to some of these farmers up there they seemed to be of the opinion that we should get a drilling rig. I tried to explain to them that this government had no money to spend for oil exploration where we pay directly for drilling a hole. This seemed to be the misunderstanding, but at no time did we refuse a permit, nor will we refuse permits providing it comes within our regulations—and hers did.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to pursue the matter much further. We had an happy solution and they are now going to do the drilling. Perhaps we can leave it there. But certainly it was contended by these people, in very unqualified terms, that they had been trying for literally years to get a rig. Now it was not that you had necessarily refused them, but they had gotten the impression that drillers were not willing to come because of pressure, either from the government or oil companies or both. However, it is a case of matching two stories, and I have not got both sides here to get the other side of the story and try to sort it out; so perhaps we will leave it there.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. member is not trying to impress us with the story that came out of that; that we were in cahoots with the big oil companies and would not allow any small operator to drill a well. I hope you are not trying to insinuate that.

Mr. MacDonald: This is what was said.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This is what was said to me too; but I do not think, in all fairness, it should be said in this House. We do not care who it is, if they want to drill a well, we will issue the permits. We are not working for any oil company. We are trying to get exploration for gas and oil in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I might ask of the Minister, concerning the abandoned works, a great number of these are in my particular riding. I was involved in several of these. I wonder just how many of these wells were plugged or capped in Essex county this past year?

While his officials are looking up that information; I would ask of the Minister, after the press and so forth concerning the drilling on Fawn Island or the St. Clair River, has the position of the department or the government changed as to drilling in the Great Lakes, or is it the same as a year ago?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, this was within our policy of drilling in the Great Lakes at that time. I want to get that one cleared up.

There was some opposition to this and our department officials met—in fact I met with officials from the state of Michigan—and we discussed this matter. I understand it is not finalized yet, but we are drafting up a regulation, and this will apply to the province of Ontario, where we will not drill within a certain number of feet off the Great Lakes.

Mr. Paterson: I might ask the Minister if he is aware of a contentious issue between the states of Ohio and Michigan concerning drilling in that area and the possibility of an oil or gas well in either the mouth of the Detroit River or part of Lake Erie? Is the Minister or his department aware of this situation?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I understand we are aware that they are going to drill on the American side of Lake Erie and we are in touch with the authorities.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under this vote, the Minister mentioned something about the number of barrels of oil in his opening remarks.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Spence: Was that the number of barrels of oil produced in the province of Ontario last year?

And I would like to ask the Minister: In Dunwich township, Elgin county, they have located a number of oil wells; is this an oil field? Have you any report on this oil well find in that area?

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): They are good.

Mr. Spence: Are they? Thanks.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's question, I was talking about refining capacity yesterday, at 322,400 barrels. That was refining capacity. Now you want to know the number of barrels of crude produced in Ontario? We will get you that answer.

In answer to the question of the member for Essex South. There were five wells plugged in Essex county last year.

Production of oil in 1966 was 1,319,400 barrels.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Minister, have you had information in regard to that oil field in Dunwich township, Elgin county?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I understand the name of it—is this the field—the Willey field? It constitutes ten per cent of all Ontario's production.

Vote 603 agreed to.

On vote 604:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on 604, I want to raise with the Minister some aspects of this disagreement and trouble that has blown up in North Dumfries township in Waterloo county as a result of the diversion, the looped line from Dawn to the Hamilton-Toronto area by Union Gas.

Perhaps I can begin by setting my case in an unimpeachable Tory product; I have here a news report in the Wednesday, January 25 copy of the Galt *Evening Reporter* under the heading: MPP Will Support Land Owner's Appeal. I will read two or three paragraphs:

> The individual rights of 22 North Dumfries land owners have been disregarded, Allan Reuter, MPP for Waterloo South, said today. Land owners are appealing the

> Union Gas proposal to place a pipeline across their property. Mr. Reuter said they had not received fair consideration. It is my intention to support the appeal of the land owners in every way possible by communicating my views to the government.

Now I presume the hon. gentleman has faced the usual problem of a government backbencher; he has communicated his views, they have been batted down, and that is the end of the story; so he cannot serve the interests of his consituents any further.

I shall take up the battle. Let me do it in the context of his own observations at that time as to the nature of the problem. I quote again:

> The Ontario energy board's decision seems to be based on legal technicalities regarding the legal propriety of the original order and the legal compliance with requirements of proper notice, said Mr. Reuter.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, if I may elaborate on that, what in effect happened was that the board contended that the original granting of a licence for the laying of this pipeline back in 1964 automatically carried with it the privilege of diverting from the easement that they originally held.

Throughout most of the route, the company did follow the original easement, but they contended in the North Dumfries township that they had run into construction difficulties on the first line and they were now going to divert into another area. The land owners involved presented to the board the study of a qualified engineer, namely E. L. Matyas, professional engineer; the conclusions of which, I will not go into the details, were that there were no problems involved from any assessment of information that was available, plus his own study.

However, what puzzled me even more about the way the board handled this—I want to come to some pretty harsh conclusions with regard to the operations of this board and a growing belief that the board has a bias in the direction of the company—in a subsequent Galt *Evening Reporter* of December 1, there are a couple of paragraphs describing this problem in relation to the company's decision to take their line off from the original easement. I quote:

> Counsel for the land owners said that the board has made its decision without the company showing any evidence to substantiate the need for a diversion from the present 60-foot right-of-way expropriated in 1958 for the first line of a 26-inch natural gas transmission line.

This is the incredible part, Mr. Chairman, and you are a lawyer; I trust you would appreciate it and be on my side in this, or have a reaction similar to mine. I continue the quote:

> Speaking on behalf of the company was L. G. O'Connor, a solicitor, of Chatham. He said that the onus was on the counsel for the farmers who had made the application, to appeal the decision of the board in 1964 to show why the line should not be where it is proposed.

Now, the farmers had been arguing the opposite way; they had been arguing that if the company was going to divert from their original easement, surely the onus was on the company as to why they needed to do this. But, no, the company's lawyer argued, and the board apparently accepted the argument that the onus is on the farmers to show why the company should not go where they were.

Well, the farmers did that. They hired an engineer, here is the engineer's report, and yet the board goes along with the decision which was in favour of the company; and the consequences, incidentally, raised a fair little storm. I have here, for example, a copy of a letter that was sent by the clerk and treasurer of the township of North Dumfries to the Minister, November 21, and I quote a couple of paragraphs.

They note in their first paragraph that representations have been made by these people whose land was being carved up, with a lot of inconvenience, and then they go on to say:

> The route that the Union Gas Company is interested in establishing across some of the best farmland in the township, and also at its crossing of the Grand River south of Galt, presents an obstacle to residential developmnt on sites of potential value, should the growth of the city of Galt require such.
>
> Past experience with the installation of pipelines has indicated it requires several years to restore farmland to productive capacity after it has been disturbed by laying a pipeline through it. Compensation paid to owners for such damage is seldom sufficient to cover such long-term damage. The township council was in agreement with the case presented by the delegation to the extent that it has approved this communication to your office with the object of having the company's plans reviewed. It has been suggested that the company should consider instead the installation of the pipeline on the existing route over land on

which it already holds easements in the township.

So there you have a situation in which the company makes it decision and the onus is on the farmers to prove why they should not go where they want to go, and the board apparently goes along with it. That was point one and the major point in which they finally got no resolution of what the company was able to do.

The second point is something in the nature of a technicality and I quote from the hon. member for Waterloo South as he spelled it out in his statement back on January 25:

> Notice of the original hearing in January 1964 was published in Woodstock, Brantford and the Hamilton daily press, but did not appear in the *Evening Reporter* or the Kitchener *Record*. This omission placed the North Dumfries people in the position whereby they could not present their case at the original hearing.

Now, there was a strange contradiction once again here. The farmers contended they simply did not know. They perhaps knew that a hearing was being held but they did not know the purpose of the hearing and they had not so been informed by the two papers that circulated in that particular area, because the papers used had been in Woodstock, Brantford and Hamilton. But that is all a little distance away and those papers do not circulate in the North Dumfries township in any great number.

Mr. Chairman, I come to a conclusion and I do it not without some justification. There is a growing belief in this province, and I assert it, that the Ontario energy board is not a public body which is operating on behalf of the public of the province, that it is unduly influenced by the companies who are involved.

An hon. member. Man the barricades.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not man the barricades, just get out and defend the public. I have here, for example, a comment from a leading farmer in the province of Ontario who is familiar with the problem of pipelines and the difficulties that farmers have had to contend with. And his neat summation of it was, "the board is there in the defence of the companies."

I have in my hand, for example, a copy of a resolution that has been presented by the Norfolk federation of agriculture over the signature of Roger Clarysse, president of the Norfolk federation of agriculture, which reads as follows:

> Whereas there appears to be some doubt that the energy board is serving the public interest, therefore be it resolved that its activity be investigated.

Mr. Chairman, I do not assert this as a new idea; I have had these suspicions myself for years and not without some grounds. The Ontario energy board or its predecessor, the fuel board, was in effect an instrument of this government working with Northern Ontario Natural Gas in the accumulation of its franchises in northern Ontario with the assistance of top Tories—some of whom made $250,000 through stock deals; Alex MacKenzie and a Mr. McCarthy, bagmen for the Tory party—and this is in the record. I am not asserting something that is not solidly documented.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, when he was mayor of Timmins, was chairman of a meeting which unanimously passed a resolution in favour of having public ownership in the area. And then he and the Tory party and everybody else sewed it all up and handed it over in subtle and not too subtle fashion to Northern Ontario Natural Gas. And some of the reverberations we are still hearing about in the province of Ontario, particularly in relation to one former mayor of a well known city.

The energy board, or the fuel board back then, played a role—and I am sure they were acting as an agent of the government. They are not a free judicial body in the genuine sense of it, any more than the marketing board of the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), is an idependent judicial body. It is an agency of this government, fulfilling government policy. And I think it is about time we cut out the pretence of it being an independent judicial body. Let us face it for what it is—for the most part an agency of this government. And the latest illustration of it, so far as I am concerned, is what has happened to the North Dumfries farmers.

I find it incredible—a fatuous proposition—that the Union Gas Company, with all of the trouble that it produces for the farmers and for the municipalities, should be able to argue that if we want to divert from the original easement, the farmers have to prove to us why we should not go off; rather than the company coming to the board and proving why there is justification in it going from the original easement and causing inconvenience.

I do not know what we can do about it because this is an old story; it has been going on for 10 years and they have raised it in other contexts over the 10 year period. But

this is the latest illustration of it and I invite the Minister's comments.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think this particular problem has been dealt with by this government and decision has been made that they are continuing along on the line of the decision that the energy board made. You have made several statements and, of course, I only know and I can only say what has been told to me. And the information I have, I think, is accurate, or as accurate as the information you have. Again you are insinuating that the energy board are working in the interest of the oil companies. Of course, they cannot get up and say anything in this House and I doubt if there is any truth—I know there is not any truth in that statement and I do not think you should make it in this House.

Mr. MacDonald: I am quoting a well known farm leader of this province when he says he was there for the defence of the company.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I know that because a farmer writes a letter and says he thinks such and such does not mean that is so. You have said a lot of things over the years too and I know you did not believe it at the time.

Mr. MacDonald: Many of them have been proven since, even though I could not get a hearing in this House at the time.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand that the application for the location of this line was served on North Dumfries township in 1964 and they appeared at a hearing in London and asked for a change. Now you were trying to imply to the House that they knew nothing about this change in the location of this line. They were at London and asked for a change at that time, so they must have been informed.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the member for Waterloo South off his hat, does he not know what he is talking about?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I did not say the member for Waterloo South was off his hat—

Mr. MacDonald: When was the London hearing?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The member for Waterloo South will speak for himself.

Mr. MacDonald: When was the London hearing, may I ask?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: In 1964.

Mr. MacDonald: What date?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I will have to get that—January 6, 1964.

Mr. MacDonald: That is right, and the statement of the member for Waterloo South is in the January 25 paper, so if I am off my hat so is he.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I did not say he was off his hat, but you are bringing the facts here. I discussed this with the member for Waterloo South and I do not know—it was after that statement was made—whether I thought he got wrong information or not. Nevertheless he and I are not quarrelling over it at this time. I might say that a decision was made, and the reason the decision was made to change was to get around Beverley swamp and to get a better crossing of the Grand River at Galt.

Now the decision was made and at the time this decision had to be made there were agreements made at both ends from these 22 land owners. I understand there were a couple of settlements within this area.

I realize that many farmers do not care for gas lines going across their properties or hydro lines, and I can understand this. Nevertheless in order to get services that we need in the province of Ontario they must go on somebody's property, is that right? It is the only way we can get it, we cannot hang it up to a skyhook, it must cross somebody's property.

Mr. MacDonald: This is very true. If you have an existing easement you use it rather than divert the line.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am telling you why they could not use it—and again I cannot prove this, but I am told that the reason they could not use it was that it was very expensive or very hard to get through this swamp. They wanted to get a better crossing of the Grand River and this is why they asked for this diversion.

Mr. MacDonald: The land owners presented a professional engineer's view that this necessarily did not add up.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They had their day in court and a decision was made; and today the hearings are being held. They are being held, this thing is going on and we hope, I hope and I think, the energy board will con-

sider the farmers when the decision is made. In fact I know they will.

The decision, I know, will not be just what the oil or gas company wants.

We will try to protect the farmer, but it is felt by the energy board that this was the route the line should follow. I went along with that and I hope, and I am sure, that at the hearings the line will be built, the farmers will be looked after and it will be forgotten about or be finished within the next six months.

Votes 604 to 611, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I do not have the agenda for tomorrow's business, but I presume that it will be as usual.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): No; I think I can assist.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I was a little surprised, Mr. Speaker, at the speed with which these estimates were completed tonight. The Minister of Health is here to present his estimates but he informs me that he is not ready to make his introductory remarks this evening.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The Prime Minister means we can go home.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Perhaps we might adjourn and tomorrow we will proceed with a resolution which is to be debated. Next will come the estimates of The Department of Health, and I believe The Department of Social and Family Services.

Mr. MacDonald: Mines and then Social and Family Services.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mines and then Social and Family Services. Is that the order in which they were given? Well, I will arrange for several others after that and will announce this tomorrow.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the validity of the rumour about a Budget Debate on Thursday or Friday?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I understand there are some members who wish to take part in the Budget Debate, and we will schedule that for Friday morning.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:15 o'clock p.m.

No. 69

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, April 19, 1967

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 19, 1967

Presenting reports, Mr. Welch 2361

Mining Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wardrope, first reading 2361

Law regarding security interests in personal property and fixtures, bill to reform and make uniform, Mr. Wishart, first reading 2361

Sale of Goods Act, bill to amend and to repeal, Mr. Wishart, first reading 2361

Assignment of Book Debts Act, bill to amend and to repeal, Mr. Wishart, first reading 2361

Conditional Sales Act, bill to amend and to repeal, Mr. Wishart, first reading 2361

Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act, bill to amend and to repeal, Mr. Wishart, first reading 2362

Bills of sale, bill respecting, Mr. Wishart, first reading 2362

Tile Drainage Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 2362

Questions to Mr. Connell re property in Loughborough township, Mr. MacDonald 2362

Questions to Mr. Randall re housing project at Ear Falls, Mr. MacDonald 2362

Questions to Mr. MacNaughton re mediation of institutional classes in the public service, Mr. Gisborn 2364

Question to Mr. Robarts re rezoning referrals back to the OMB, Mr. Young 2364

Debate on the amendment to the motion that the House resolve itself into committee of supply, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Stewart, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Root, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Wishart, Mr. Singer, Mr. Robarts 2364

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 2398

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, St. Raphael separate school, Toronto, St. Wilfred separate school, Toronto and the eastern high school of commerce, Toronto; in the west gallery, Burnhamthorpe collegiate institute, Islington, and St. Mildred's college, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave the present to the House the following reports:

1. The annual report of the teachers' superannuation commission, 1966.

2. The 1966 annual report of the workmen's compensation board for Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE MINING ACT

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SECURITY INTERESTS

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to reform and make uniform the law regarding security interests in personal property and fixtures.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the hon. Attorney General about this bill?

Mr. Speaker: I think it would be better if you would let the Minister explain his bill first.

Mr. Singer: All right.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this is the bill which arises from the report of the Ontario law reform commission and I think that hon. members will recall that I gave it first reading last year. The bill presently introduced is substantially the same but is, I think, a perfected result as a consequence of the conferences which have been carried on since the bill was introduced and given publicity last year.

I would be glad to answer the question of the hon. member, but I would just like to say while I am speaking that, associated with this bill—and I would hope to be able to introduce them now—would be four other bills: The Sale of Goods Act; The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act; The Conditional Sales Act; and The Assignment of Book Debts Act. These are associated and complementary bills which have brief amendments.

Mr. Singer: Well my question, Mr. Speaker, is this. Is it the government's intention to enact these bills into law in this session? In addition, will there be a possibility of having these bills reviewed by the legal bills committee, so that the members of the committee can get the advantage of additional public discussion if there is any?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, it would be my intention to get on with this legislation as quickly as possible. Certainly this bill, and these associated bills, should definitely go to the committee on legal bills.

One bill is there now, the condominium Act, and I am hoping this committee will meet soon so we may get on with that; and I am hopeful we can get on with these.

THE SALE OF GOODS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Sale of Goods Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE ASSIGNMENT OF BOOK DEBTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend and to repeal The Assignment of Book Debts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CONDITIONAL SALES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend and to repeal The Conditional Sales Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend and to repeal The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BILLS OF SALE

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting bills of sale.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE TILE DRAINAGE ACT

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Tile Drainage Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the cost of tile drainage work has nearly doubled so that loans for this purpose are now much larger than they used to be. The amount that may be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund to purchase debentures issued under this Act is therefore increased from $10 million to $20 million and brought into line with present-day needs.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the present item, I would like to draw to your attention that, search as I will, I can find no notice from the Attorney General for any bill other than an Act respecting trading stamps on the order paper. I do not suppose it is of any great importance, that we will have ample opportunity to peruse this legislation but I thought, sir, this should be brought to your attention.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite right, but there was considerable urgency upon me by virtue of requests made from my friends in the Opposition parties.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree). He has advised me he will be somewhat late in arriving in the House, but I would like to put it on the record.

What action does the government propose to take in view of the stated intention of the Royal Insurance group of companies to increase automobile insurance rates again on January 1, 1968, as reported in this morning's press—having regard to the already certain 15 to 20 per cent increase on that date because of the inclusion of accident insurance coverage in the standard automobile insurance policy?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Could I, Mr. Speaker, address three related questions to the hon. Minister of Health?

1. Would the Minister clarify the nature of his current negotiations with Ottawa re health insurance?

2. Could he outline to the House the areas of disagreement?

3. What precisely is the Minister's view of the role of a private insurance carrier in the scheme which he envisages?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have to take this question as notice. I have not yet had an opportunity to discuss my recent visit to Ottawa with my colleagues in Ottawa and since this involves government policy I think it is only right that I report first to them; therefore I will take the hon. member's question as notice.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have one question today and one that has been hanging fire, I discover, for a week or so.

My question to the Minister of Public Works is in four parts:

Was any offer made by Mr. Bentley of The Department of Public Works in August, 1965, for $75,000 to Kenneth Keller for 605 acres and 20,000 feet of lake shore in Loughborough township?

Why was the price cut to $20,000 following an expropriation order in December, 1965?

Why were the independent appraisers, who had originally submitted appraisals varying by approximately $60,000, brought in and asked to submit second appraisals which turned out to be identical?

What was the price paid in 1966 for property purchased from Mr. Miller in Bedford township for the same park?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the answers to the hon. member's questions are as follows, and I will repeat the questions also:

1. Was any offer made by Mr. Bentley of The Public Works Department in August, 1965, for $75,000 to Ken Keller for 605 acres and 20,000 feet of lake shore in Loughborough township? The answer is: No offer was made in August, 1965.

2. Why was the price cut to $20,000 following an expropriation order in December, 1965? The answer is: The $20,000 offer was made in June, 1966, on the basis of an appraisal by the fee appraiser retained by the department.

3. Why were the independent appraisers who had originally submitted appraisals varying by approximately $60,000 brought back in and asked to submit second appraisals which turned out to be identical? And the answer: Appraisals did not vary by $60,000 but one of the two appraisers was asked to reconsider his appraisal, which he did. The two appraisals now in hand are not identical.

4. What was the price paid in 1966 for property purchased from Mr. Miller in Bedford township for the same park? The answer is: $90,000 for 2,000 acres.

Mr. Speaker: Would the Minister of Economics and Development have an answer to the question of the member for York South?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. I am delighted to provide the information. I I am sorry I was not here the last couple of days when the question period was on, otherwise I would have been glad to provide the information to the hon. member for York South.

The first question was: Has the Ontario housing corporation decided to proceed with the construction of 100 homes at Ear Falls for the employees of Griffiths Mine at Bruce Lake?

The second was: When will the houses be built?

Third: Under what arrangement is it proposed that they will be made available to the employees?

The answer to the first question is: The Ontario housing corporation has received a request to provide housing accommodation at Ear Falls for employees at Griffiths Mine. The company has not asked for a specific number of units but has given an indication of the maximum number of permanent employees it is estimated will be employed at the mine by 1971, and the approximate indication of the flow of such employees into the Bruce Lake area during the period of 1967-1971. The Ontario housing corporation has not yet formally advised the company that it will develop these homes as negotiations with the company are still in progress.

The answer to question 2 is: At the present time the Ontario housing corporation in collaboration with The Department of Municipal Affairs and the Ontario water resources commission is preparing an area at Ear Falls for the proposed development. A draft plan of subdivision has been prepared, engineering designs are under way, and the clearing of undergrowth is in progress. Phase one of the area will accommodate approximately 300 dwellings. Essential services such as water intake and supply mains, waste stabilization ponds and trunk sewers will be installed in addition to all normal street services.

It is expected that within three weeks a proposal call will be issued by the Ontario housing corporation for approximately 100 single detached homes. Until the response to this proposal call is known it is not possible to give an accurate indication as to when the houses will be constructed. However, it is anticipated that in addition to the housing of a traditional type, proposals will be received for factory built homes. If this is the case it will be possible to give occupation of a substantial number of homes during the latter part of 1967.

The answer to question 3 is: This application for housing for industry was made under the terms of the HOME plan. Any housing developed in Ear Falls for rental to Griffiths Mine employees will be on a fixed rental basis not related to income of the tenant family. In addition, lots in the area will be made available on a sale or lease basis under the HOME plan. The company will be required to provide guarantees acceptable to the corporation to protect the corporation's investment in this area.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister has a copy of his reply that I might have? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I discover that I asked a question of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) on April 10. He is not with us again. The question was rather a simple one: Can the Minister clarify details in connection with the proposed location of the four-lane highway through the Niagara parks commission territory?

Hon. Mr. Randall: He answered that.

Mr. MacDonald: Did he answer that?

An hon. member: You were not here.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I was not here. I shall attempt to find it in *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to a question asked a few days ago by the hon. member for Wentworth East (Mr. Gisborn) following a statement regarding a settlement by mediation of certain institutional classes in the public service.

In the case of the negotiation which has just been concluded for these institutional classes, the new salaries were to be effective on January 1, 1967, and the demands of the civil service association of Ontario were received on January 30. These were discussed at a meeting of the Ontario joint council held on February 7 and the council was unable to reach agreement.

In accordance with The Public Service Act, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales), was asked to appoint a mediator by the chairman of the joint council. The appointment of a mediator was advised by the Minister of Labour on February 22, and between March 6 and March 23 a number of meetings took place which resulted in an interim report endorsed by the representatives of the association and of the government as a basis for settlement. As I stated a few days ago, the basis was subsequently ratified by the association after a poll of its membership and by the government.

The policy of reviewing salaries every two years has been in effect now for approximately five years. It is not immediately possible on the announcement of this policy to place every group on a two-year cycle but the two-year cycle has been in effect for all groups since 1965. In the case of the institutional classes this is the second revision. The previous one, aside from an interim settlement reached last year, was negotiated in 1965 and was effective on April 1 of that year.

In reply to a supplementary question from the hon. member, I said that I would stand corrected; I stated to him in the House that there was a retroactive basis of settlement. But I find on pursuing that matter that the effective date for the increases relates to public servants who were employed on the date of the order-in-council.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which came from the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) some time ago. His question was: How many applications have been made to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council during the past ten years to have decisions made in respect to rezoning referred back to the Ontario municipal board?

There were 16 applications over a ten-year period; 12 of the orders were confirmed and four were referred back to the Ontario municipal board.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee of supply.

ON COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Downsview, that the motion of the Prime Minister be amended by the addition of the following words:

> That the present government no longer has the confidence of the people of Ontario because of:
>
> 1. The dismissal of Dr. Morton Shulman; the refusal of an open public enquiry into the collapse of Prudential Finance Corporation and the unexplained resignation of members of the Niagara parks commission, all of which show that it has a meagre understanding of the democratic principle that a government must report fully to the people; and
>
> 2. Its inefficient management in failing to encourage regional development, in failing to combat pollution and in failing to support the farm economy and in failing to provide adequate housing reveals that this government reacts to crisis, instead of anticipating and meeting the future needs of the province with planned action.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Before the leader of the Opposition proceeds with the motion before the House, I must draw to his attention and to the attention of the House, that the first part of his notice of motion was deleted by the Clerk at the table under the instructions of the Speaker because I found it *sub judice* and therefore out of order.

I do not know whether it is necessary for me to read the reasons I gave to the leader of the Opposition for deleting this part of his notice of motion, which were given to him on Monday of this week, other than to say that I could not countenance a debate proceeding along the lines of this particular subject without it becoming prejudicial to the Royal commission that is now under way under Mr. Justice Parker.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I would like to bring to your attention that I do not agree with your position that you can amend my notice of motion, and I would further like to bring to your attention that we asked to discuss the dismissal of Dr. Shulman—not Dr. Shulman's allegations against the government or any public official. I feel that these latter concerns are *sub judice*, but not the dismissal itself.

Further, I would bring to your attention, sir, that the notice of motion that I put on the table was simply what it states to be, a notice of motion which I have now brought before the House, and I strenuously object to your amendment of that motion.

Mr. Speaker: I would draw to the member's attention that in our book of rules—"Parliamentary Procedure in Ontario" by Lewis, at page 35, one of the rules of the House reads:

> A notice of motion or a question submitted to the House which contains unbecoming expressions, infringes the rules, or is otherwise irregular, may, by authority of the Speaker, be corrected by the clerks at the table.

Therefore, that action was taken by notifying the Clerk that that part of the motion, in my opinion, was out of order, and it was subsequently corrected. It is within the competence of the chair under the rules of this House.

Mr. Nixon: With respect, sir, I find myself at variance with your decision and I have no recourse, other than with regret, to appeal it.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I understand that the—

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment! I have ruled that portion of the notice of motion of the leader of the Opposition out of order, and it is not debatable.

Mr. Bryden: I do not wish to debate it, sir. There is another phase of the matter that I would like to put before you for your consideration. I understand that you have ruled that phrase out of order and I understand that the leader of the Opposition has appealed your ruling. Am I correct?

Mr. Speaker: That is correct.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would say that this group would vote against the ruling, because we do not think that it is well taken, but that is not the point I wish to make to you, sir. I wish to call to your attention—

Mr. Speaker: In making the point, the member must not discuss or debate the ruling.

Mr. Bryden: I would call to your attention, sir, that this motion that was before you, and to which you made an amendment—using your powers as Speaker—was a motion that was agreed to by all the parties of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I must correct the member in that respect. This motion was not agreed to by all the parties. They submitted it to me on Friday of last week for my consideration, because they were not in agreement. That was my understanding.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, this is the point I would like clarified, because our understanding was that they were in agreement and, indeed, that the motion could not even go to you for your consideration unless they were in agreement. If the government is taking the position where it says one thing to us and another thing to you, we should know about it.

Mr. Speaker: That was my understanding of it, but even if they were in agreement, it is still within the competence of the chair to rule even the whole motion out of order, if I so believe it is out of order. However, I took occasion to rule on only one portion of it which I thought was out of order and made certain reservations on the second part, that part concerning Prudential Finance Corporation, which I also want to put before the House before the member starts the debate.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there has been a point taken by

the hon. member for Woodbine. As far as the government is concerned, we would never agree to do anything that the Speaker had ruled was contrary to the rules of this House. In other words, if the Speaker rules this, we accept his ruling without any debate on the merit of the matter—

Mr. Bryden: You would!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —without any debate on the matter. I can only say this to the hon. member: There are very often times when I do not agree with the Speaker's ruling, but if this is to be an orderly House, I accept it.

We have an arrangement whereby the parties get together—the three parties of the House—for certain procedural matters; but I do not think that if we are to preserve the rules of this House that it is within our competence—and I would say that I cannot think of any faster way of reducing order in the House to chaos, if we are just simply going to decide whenever we choose to do so.

It is one matter to have unanimous consent of this House with all members sitting here—and I think perhaps it is something else again to reach an agreement which the Speaker would find out of order—therefore without addressing myself to the merits of this in any way, shape or form, I would simply say that we support the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, if I may say this again, I am not debating your ruling. But I would submit to you, sir, that it is always possible for this House to do a thing by unanimous consent, and I submit to you that there was unanimous consent that this matter be debated. The government has flatly refused to permit the Shulman matter to be debated in this House at all, even though in any other jurisdiction the government would have facilitated a debate. They agreed, and they are welching on their agreement!

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must say to the member that I did not take it that the motion had unanimous consent even if there was agreement among the Whips—this is the way the rule reads. I do not accept agreement between the three Whips as ruling on the validity of a motion coming before the House, whether it be in order or not. I reserve that decision for the chair.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: There is an appeal before the chair and I have to call in the members at this time in order to decide this issue.

Mr. Singer: But surely we are allowed to have a few words, and—

Mr. Speaker: No, I am not going to allow this matter to get into a debate.

Mr. Singer: Surely in a democratic House we are allowed, and should be allowed to speak.

Mr. Speaker: There is an appeal before the chair and we have to deal with that now.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I would ask to call in the members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, there is one matter. We have not heard your reasons. I wonder if we could be advised of your reasons? We have not seen them and know nothing of them.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I shall be pleased to give them.

Mr. Singer: Who instructed that the bells ring before this is over?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Why did the bell ring before—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What are your reasons?

Mr. Singer: Closure, absolute closure. Worse than anything that ever happened in the House. Terrible.

Mr. Bryden: The rule of the gag. You are afraid to have this matter discussed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: This is about the fourth time you have blocked us.

Mr. Bryden: You are afraid to have it debated on the floor. And there is good reason why you should be afraid too.

Mr. MacDonald: It will be debated on the hustings.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Before putting the question, the member for Woodbine has quite properly asked if I would re-give the reasons to the House

that I gave to the leader of the Opposition for refusing this portion of his notice of motion and I read, therefore, from a copy of a memorandum submitted to Robert Nixon, leader of the Opposition, dated April 17, as follows:

> I wish to acknowledge receipt of the motion which you proposed moving this week in the Legislature for debate, and would advise as follows:
>
> 1. That any debate regarding the dismissal of Dr. Morton Shulman would be *sub judice* and therefore out of order. It is well recognized that matters awaiting the adjudication of a court of law should not be brought forward in debate. In this respect, I refer you to May's "Parliamentary Practice", seventeenth edition, at page 454, where a general description is given of the way in which matters pending judicial decision should be dealt with by legislators. At the middle of page 454, it is stated: "The ban also applies in the case of any judicial body to which the House has expressly referred a specific matter for decision and report, from the time when the resolution of the House is passed, but ceases to have effect as soon as the report is laid before the House".

and then I go ahead to say:

> I would suggest that the government has adopted the classical constitutional process to provide the fullest possible public inquiry into the allegations which have arisen respecting Dr. Shulman. The Public Inquiries Act of Ontario is the statutory expression by the Legislature of the Royal prerogative to direct this kind of inquiry. It has been inherent in our laws throughout the history of Parliament that the Crown has this right to direct an inquiry into matters relating to the government of the country and the conduct of the public business of the administration of justice.
>
> If the allegation is that the government has not acted, then it would seem that by the appointment of the Royal commission it has now taken the proper step to provide an impartial and objective inquiry of the allegations made and that any such discussion in a debate in the Legislature on the same point would be redundant and contemptuous of the Royal commission.

And then I closed on this point by saying:

> In passing, I may say that had the proposed debate taken place before the appointment of the commissioner had been made, along with the terms of reference, I no doubt would have had a different view as to the propriety of the member's motion.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. S. Lewis: How can you possibly ignore a point of order?

Mr. Speaker: There is not any point of order.

Mr. S. Lewis: There is a valid point of order. You promised a debate.

Mr. Speaker: The member cannot rise on a point of order at this time. I understand if you had a hat or if you put your hat on that you might.

The House divided on the ruling of the Speaker and the ruling was sustained on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Ben
Bales	Braithwaite
Bernier	Bryden
Boyer	Davison
Brunelle	Farquhar
Butler	Gaunt
Carruthers	Gisborn
Carton	Gordon
Connell	Lewis (Scarborough West)
Cowling	MacDonald
Davis	Newman
Demers	Nixon
Downer	Racine
Dunlop	Reaume
Dymond	Renwick
Eagleson	Singer
Edwards	Smith
Ewen	Spence
Grossman	Taylor
Guindon	Worton
Harris	Young—21.
Haskett	
Henderson	
Hodgson (Scarborough East)	
Hodgson (Victoria)	
Johnston (Carleton)	
Kerr	
Knox	
Lawrence (Russell)	
Lawrence (St. George)	
Lewis (Humber)	
Mackenzie	

AYES	NAYS
MacNaughton	
Morningstar	
McNeil	
Noden	
Peck	
Pittock	
Price	
Randall	
Reuter	
Robarts	
Root	
Rowe	
Sandercock	
Simonett	
Spooner	
Stewart	
Thrasher	
Villeneuve	
Walker	
Wardrope	
Welch	
Wells	
White	
Whitney	
Wishart	
Yakabuski	
Yaremko—59.	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 59, the "nays" 21.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the appeal lost and the Speaker's ruling upheld.

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There are no points of order at this time.

Before proceeding further with this debate, I would like to relate for the benefit of the other parties of the House other than the Liberal Party which proposed the motion, that the second point in the notice of motion is the refusal of an open public inquiry into the collapse of Prudential Finance Corporation. And I had this to say to the leader of the Opposition in his notice of motion. I think quite properly, as the member for Woodbine brought out, I should also tell the other parties how I reserve the right to intervene in this discussion should I find certain matters being dealt with which I might conside *sub judice.* I read as follows:

> The debate on the refusal of an open public inquiry into the collapse of Prudential Finance Corporation would be in order providing certain aspects of this matter were not debated, because an investigation is presently being carried out by the securities commission pursuant to the provisions of The Securities Act.
>
> As a result of this investigation, certain individuals have already been charged on various counts under The Criminal Code of Canada, and have been committed for trial on those charges. It is entirely possible that there may be other criminal charges laid as the investigation continues. I would consider it absolutely imperative that no debate should take place in the Legislature which would relate to the matters upon which these individuals have been charged.

And then I mention their names, which I will not mention in the House.

> The House should be aware that the rights of these individuals could very well be materially prejudiced by the publicity which might surround the debate on this very controversial subject.
>
> It should also be borne in mind that there are many other persons involved in this financial scheme who may be charged as a result of the investigation and whose rights ultimately might be affected by undue publicity of a debate in the Legislature, even though these matters may not at this point in time be considered as being *sub judice.*
>
> I would, therefore, advise that the chair reserves the right to intervene in this debate should any specific fact, circumstances, and the relationships of individuals to these be raised, for fear of the unintentional prejudice of the fair trial of the individuals. Otherwise, the alleged fault of the government in not taking action with respect to financial institutions, may quite properly be discussed in its broader terms.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member for Woodbine referred to certain conversations which accompanied the notice of motion and I would like the record to show that he was in no way incorrect. This is the first time that we have had any kind of dispute concerning the practice being followed in censure motions and I think it wise that the matter be clarified at this time.

The memorandum of agreement concerning procedure, date April 27, 1966, shows under section 5: "Not less than three days before the motion is moved, the day of such motion and the terms of the amendment will be decided by agreement."

Now sir we made it very clear to each party that we felt we had the right to object

to the terms, but that we did not in fact make any such objection and we did not stand in the way of this debate. We made it very clear also that we felt no responsibility for whatever ruling Mr. Speaker made. We thought it was not the prerogative of our caucus representative to express a view on whatever ruling you might eventually provide to the House.

The third point I would like to make was made privately to the leader of the Opposition and to the leader of the NDP. We did waive the waiting period provided under section 6: "Not less than two days before the date so decided, notice of the amendment will be delivered to the clerk to be placed on the notice paper."

We did waive the regular notice period, but in so doing we made it clear that we did not expect that to set a precedent for future debates of censure amendments.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order just raised, I would like to make it clear to you, sir, that the notice of motion with the approval of all three parties was laid on the table Friday last. This is Wednesday, and I feel that the notice requirements have been fulfilled. It did not appear on the order paper for reasons beyond our control.

Mr. Speaker: I understand from the clerk that he had the full two days' notice.

Mr. Singer: Right!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, may I make a comment, since a previous comment of mine has been called into question. I would say to you, sir, that the government Whip at no time indicated anything but agreement, as far as we are concerned, with the motion as submitted. He did raise the point of notice and suggested that they would not be technical about it if there was a point; I agreed for our party that we did not see any point in being technical. The only discussion we had as to the content of the motion was something to this effect: I said to him, "Well that is okay with us, how is it with you?" And he said, "It is fine."

Now, I would call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that under the memorandum on procedure as we have it before us, it is provided in clause 3: "When the day upon which the motion is to be moved and the proposed amendment has been agreed upon, between the government and Opposition parties, and so on." I submit to you sir it is quite clear that the motion cannot go to you until it has been agreed upon as to its content by all parties. And I say to you, sir, that the sequence of events made it quite clear that all parties had agreed to this motion; and I would say that with unanimous agreement it still should be possible to debate it.

Again I do not question your ruling. Whether I agree with it or not is beside the point, all I am saying is that the House can proceed by unanimous consent; and I think the government ought to be prepared to proceed by unanimous consent. It has gagged this House as far as this vital matter is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bryden: And it should now be willing to permit it to be discussed.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member is getting out of order.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The member breaks every rule in this House.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Is the member speaking to this point of order?

Mr. Ben: No, not to this one!

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid I cannot give you—

Mr. Ben: But it is a very important point of order, Mr. Speaker:

Mr. Speaker: I would say to the member, I cannot see how he can properly raise another point of order at this time.

Mr. Ben: It is a very serious point of order, Mr. Speaker. You have heard the government's side.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the member.

Mr. Ben: Fine!

On page 2196 of *Hansard* is recorded a statement made by the hon. Prime Minister of this province, which statement sets forth the terms of reference as given to the judge who was chosen to head up the inquiry with reference to certain allegations made. The Prime Minister's statement specifically enumerates these points of reference. Within the terms of reference there is no mention whatsoever of the dismissal of Dr. Shulman, yet in the statement which you read to the House, Mr. Speaker, which was a letter given to the hon. leader of the Opposition which

you read to this House, you implied very clearly and distinctly that the reason you were ruling this point out of order was that the terms of reference encompassed the dismissal of Dr. Shulman.

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that was misleading the House, intentionally or otherwise. It was misleading because there was a direct implication in your statement that you were denying the amendment of the leader of the Opposition because Dr. Shulman's dismissal was contained in the terms of reference given to the judge, and it was not.

Mr. Speaker: Well I might say that I did not say it was contained in the terms of reference.

Quite true, the words "the dismissal of Dr. Shulman" is not within the terms of reference; but I did say to the leader of the Opposition that I did not see how this subject matter could be discussed without infringing the rules of the House and getting into the terms of reference. Those are the reasons, I would submit, that the member missed. I just cannot see how a debate could take place without involving the terms of reference, and therefore it would be *sub judice.*

Would the member proceed?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order I feel I am really entitled to make. The hon. member for Woodbine cannot really discuss any of these matters without casting allegations, and his allegation that this government gagged this House in this debate I really must challenge on a point of order, and simply say this:

Apparently, I was not here and was not party to these agreements, but apparently the notice of motion in the form in which the hon. leader of the Opposition wanted it was presented to you and you refused to accept it in that form. Apparently the government Whip agreed to it, and you ruled it out of order.

Now I said that I was going to support your motion, not on any question of the merits of the case at all. Obviously this party had agreed to the debate and you ruled it out of order. I am not going to go against your ruling. If you rule that it is out of order and offends the rules of this House, then of course I am going to support your ruling; because we must have rules and they must be obeyed and your rulings must be obeyed.

Now you are perfectly within your rights, as you pointed out, to make this ruling when the order came before you. I think it does not lie in the mouth of the hon. member to say that the government has gagged it. You are the one who has made the ruling, we did not. We presented it; we agreed with it in the way it was presented.

Mr. Bryden: You can agree to it now.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just be quiet for a moment. I never heard such eternal interruptions in my life.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the usual degree of courtesy shown by this hon. member, who is a compulsive talker. He just cannot keep his mouth shut, on your order or anybody else's order. I reject completely his position that this party or this government had anything to do with gagging the House in this matter.

An hon. member: He should be made to withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest that the leader of the Opposition had better get forward, or we will have no time left to discuss this motion.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to interfere—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the point of order which the Prime Minister raised. On April 11, in this Legislature, I asked the Speaker of the House whether or not, at a subsequent occasion, we would have an opportunity—and this was at the end of a sequence of events which are not now reviewable, but which are on the record—to debate the dismissal of Dr. Shulman.

Mr. Speaker, you replied at that time quite clearly that you anticipated that there would be another occasion when this matter could be debated. The day following, the leader of our party asked you if you would elucidate on your remarks, and you then referred to the fact that you anticipated the occasion would arise when the leader of the Opposition introduced a motion of non-confidence. This was, apparently, going to be the only opportunity that we would ever have to debate this matter.

Now that the motion has come before the Legislature, you have ruled that part of it out. Mr. Speaker, I am simply saying, sir, that the supervening act that prevented a debate in this Legislature was the action of the Prime Minister in announcing the terms of reference —totally inadequate as they were—which has

effectively gagged for the fifth time in this Legislature any debate about this.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Yes, but I would suggest to the member that my position was quite clear on the matter; that I had read in the press where the leader of the Opposition had intended to raise this in his censor motion which would have been quite properly dealt with, as I pointed out to him, had not in the interval the Royal commission been appointed. Then, of course, circumstances changed.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: No, I am going to proceed with the debate at this time. You can only speak once to a point of order.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well I would like to make a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: No, the member for Brant has the floor.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member stood on a point of order—

Mr. S. Lewis: If I am entitled to one point of order, as a separate point of order I would appreciate the Speaker explaining to the House, sir, the provision of May which you read into the record. It says that the House by resolution expressly conveys—the ban also applies in the case of any judicial body to which the House has expressly referred a specific matter for decision and report from the time when the resolution of the House is passed—that, when the resolution of the House is passed, it ceases to have effect as soon as the report is laid before the House. Mr. Speaker, I defy you, sir, to inform the House when this House, by resolution, passed such—

Mr. Speaker: I accepted the announcement by the Prime Minister, which has the Royal prerogative of appointing this judicial inquiry under The Public Inquiries Act. I took that as being synonymous with a resolution. The member for Brant should proceed now.

Mr. S. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's action in bringing it into the House was not in accordance with the rules of the House. He could do it only by a resolution, and you accept it without a resolution. Therefore, the way is open for a debate. We have had no resolution before this House.

Mr. Speaker: I am not prepared to accept that particular point at all. I think the debate should proceed and I would ask the member to continue.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from what has been said already this afternoon that the members on this side of the House are deeply concerned that the government has not fulfilled its public function; either to fully inform the electorate in this province, nor to provide a reasonable forum in which the facts can be brought out on the basis of the difficulties that have come before us in recent months on the item which you have now ruled out of order, and the others which we are now permitted to discuss.

I would like to draw to your attention, sir, that in the days immediately prior to the Easter recess the report from the Ontario securities commissoner, which had been obtained through their auspices with regard to Prudential Finance, was laid on the table here and made available to the people of the province. Now this indicated very clearly that even before 1963—that magic date that sticks in our mind as the previous time this government went to the electorate for their support—that there is evidence that this company was fleecing the individual citizens of this province. Surely a full and public inquiry into this matter is the only way in which those people who have lost their savings, and more than that have lost confidence in the ability of this government and the Ontario securities commission to oversee their responsibility, can have that confidence restored.

It has become apparent that down through the weeks and years the responsible Minister has been receiving and accepting reports from this company, and who knows how many others, which in fact were faulty in their conception and misleading in their content. The difficult part to conceive of is the number of individual citizens who have approached us in our capacities as members of the Legislature with stories of the personal losses they have suffered under the misdirection of this one company, in the misleading attributes of its advertising.

Now it is clear to all of us that people in high places and with extremely powerful government connections have been associated with this matter and I would say to you, sir, that the government is not fulfilling its firm and important obligation and responsibility to be sure that a full and public inquiry will be granted in this regard. This is a matter that is of continuing concern. We know that the Minister who has this responsibility now, and who is absent from the House,

was called upon to move an emergency enactment calling for deposit insurance which is now become redundant with the proclamation of the federal legislation that will give similar coverage in this province if we but ask for it.

It appears, then, that this statute which was put on the law books of this province under emergency circumstances just a few weeks ago, and which circumstances as an emergency were denied by the government, has now been shown up to be precisely what it is—a stop-gap piece of legislation to save the deteriorating financial situation in this province. It appears more than ever that it is necessary for the investigation that we now call for to be much more complete and broad than simply an inquiry into the Prudential Finance difficulties. There have been too many of these situations come to our public attention in recent months and years, and this investigation must have the breadth that will encompass the whole gambit of this part of our economy. Surely it must be undertaken forthwith if the confidence in the investment community, which has flagged and failed under the direction and the action of this government, is to be restored.

Now further to my first point, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to continue with this matter. The debate is ordered, as you know, with speakers from all sides and surely the representative of the government will be able to put their position in a few moments.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would be glad to give up some of my time, but I just wondered if the hon. member is associating deposit insurance with the finance companies?

Mr. Speaker: I think each speaker should complete his speech without any interruptions; then any other member may answer matters on his own time.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say in answer to the comment by the hon. Attorney General, that my remarks based on that part of the resolution this afternoon have been broadened obviously to include the other financial failures; including acceptance companies and these particular trust companies that were the subject of the legislation that was brought before us in the past few weeks.

Mr. Singer: The government tried to create the impression that it did.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to say further, in support of my contention, Mr. Speaker, that the government is not accepting its responsibility to see that the public is informed and adequately served, in a democratic sense; that the resignation of the six commissioners of the Niagara parks commission is another case in point. We are familiar with the course of events that this embarrassing situation took. We read in the press that these commissioners, one of them an hon. member of this House who is not presently in his place, have indicated through communication with the Prime Minister of Ontario that they could no longer carry out their functions as members of the Niagara parks commission.

As you know, sir, through direct questioning we tried to find out in a public way, a reasonable and orderly way, what the reasons were for these resignations. The Prime Minister, relying on a reason that I still feel to be completely inadequate, said that since these communications were marked "personal and confidential" even though they referred to public business on the order of $9 million a year, the contents of these letters as they refer to the public responsibility, could not be revealed. And he was adamant in his refusal.

Although many people in this province are concerned about the Niagara parks commission, I would say here that we are proud of the development of these parks down through the years. But, it is interesting to note that the commissioners, although they themselves, I suppose put the notation personal and confidential on their letters of resignation, were the ones who eventually had to go to the public press and indicate that their reasons were associated with their fear that the new administration of the commission and it was the chairman, the former Provincial Treasurer and present member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), was designated as high-handed and arrogant by those people concerned and that the new chairman was simply going to insist on a four lane highway that was planned by the government to go through Queen Victoria park and destroy the beauty of these parks that all of us hold to be of such great value.

Now, I would say in all candour that it has never been our experience that the former Provincial Treasurer could ever be characterized by the phrases high-handed and arrogant. Nevertheless, it appears that he was given orders by the administration to carry

out a policy with regard to these parks that simply could not be jammed down the throats of the old commissioners, and their response was the only one open to them. And that was resignation.

Now surely if these resignations were going to have the appropriate effect, and apparently they did have this effect, to stop the building of this highway, then it was necessary that the contents of these letters be made public. I have on the order paper a motion for the return of this correspondence in the public interest.

We now know that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) has indicated that he has no plans for the building of the road that is under consideration. So if that is a fact, then the public still does not know why these six commissioners resigned, even though the chairman of the commission is present in the House, and is now in his seat, and one of the commissioners who resigned is a supporter of the government and has the right, and I say to you, sir, the responsibility to rise in his place and clear the clouds away from this difficult position.

It is evident that the government is going to sweep this difficulty under the rug through the enactment of a new bill that has been put before us in recent days. I believe that the new statute, the bill that is going to amend The Niagara Parks Commission Act, is a good one and we supported it. But as the representatives of the public, we should know what was the matter with the old plan. What was the matter with the commissioners that they could not carry on under the new chairman, and what was the government policy that they objected to so strenuously that they had to offer their resignations, even if it were in a confidential way?

As I said a moment ago, there are $9 million of public funds involved and more than that the deep concern of the people of this province that the Niagara parks continue and expand as a centre of pride in this province. There is even the suggestion, and a good one it is, that their jurisdiction be expanded to include the whole Niagara escarpment. We should clear away this dirt that is associated in a secret way with the deliberations of the commission in recent weeks if we are going to proceed with the development of this park in an open and democratic manner.

Now Mr. Chairman, the other parts of my resolution that you have permitted to be discussed this afternoon have to do with the actions of the government in responding to public pressures and not giving the leadership in a variety of areas of responsibility that must be theirs. They have been characterized by many people, politicians and otherwise, as a government that goes around papering over the cracks in public difficulties, going around with a pail of sand putting out little fires, and perhaps before elections, going around with a bag of lollipops. This assures those people in municipal areas of responsibility, on the farm, and in other areas that if they just stick with the old tried and true gang from London they can count on good things in the future. I would say to you, sir, that it is going to take more than these last minute efforts to put out the brush fires. It is going to take more than these last minute announcements that we have been treated to in this House in recent weeks to convince not only these people with special difficulties, but the electorate of the province of Ontario that they can continue to trust these Conservatives in the carrying out of their public duties.

I submit to you, sir, that the confidence of this House and of the people of Ontario has been shaken by actions of this government and their lack of action in recent weeks. It will take the test that all of us look forward to in the weeks that lie immediately ahead, to return prosperity to this province and responsible government to the people of Ontario.

The first matter that I want to deal with in the time that is at my disposal has to do with regional development. It is true we discussed this matter in the recent estimates of The Department of Economics and Development, and I know you will recall that it was our duty as members of the Legislature to discuss and finally approve an expenditure of $250,000 in support of the regional development councils, of which there are ten in the province of Ontario.

Our contention at that time was, and it still is, that this is an indication that the present government does not believe in regional development. They believe in the Tory policies from centuries ago, of *laissez-faire* and let the economic pressures come as they will. It is obvious to all of us whether we live in the big metropolitan centres or elsewhere, that the development of the community of Ontario, and surely it is time that we can regard it in this way, has been held back by the policies of the present government.

I ask you to compare this $250,000 with the $500,000—

Mr. White: You are missing "the happening."

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): You cannot even build a courthouse.

Mr. Singer: You just stick to building courthouses and you will be fine.

Mr. Nixon: —that the Prime Minister of the province has no doubt okayed for the new advertising programme taking the place of the moose and the hippopotamus that he used to such good effect before 1963. They will spend money on their own behalf, their own partisan purposes, but they will not spend the money for the regional development that came in the same vote.

Here is where there is a real area of difference. The Conservative Party in Ontario follows the leader of the Conservative Party in Canada with a serious unwillingness and abhorrence of setting up a situation where incentives are given for the regional development of those areas of our country and our province which have not shared in our expanding economy.

There have been many people on the Tory benches who have been quick to criticize the difficult political decisions taken after 1963 by the government of Canada which resulted in the designation of certain areas for special economic assistance. I would be quick to say that these designations in every respect were something less than perfect, but it is obvious, Mr. Speaker—and I know you would be aware of these changes—that recent developments have indicated that these designations are going to continue on a broader basis and under federal leadership we are getting the regional assistance that is going to help these backward areas of our country go ahead economically.

The Conservative Party in the Ontario jurisdiction is unwilling to do this. They are proud of the fact that they treat every economic region with equality. This sounds good until you see the basis of any quality that these economic regions are standing on for a beginning of their development. Many of you are very much more familiar with the difficulties in northern Ontario than I am, and you know of the dependence of many northern towns on a single industry. It is a serious matter when this government will not take the steps to encourage more secondary industrial development in these northern and eastern areas of the province itself.

My view is that northern and eastern Ontario must be provided with special incentives in many ways. Put them in competition with other areas of Ontario so that they can partake in the economic development of our country. If the opportunity is there for the young people to stay in their own regions and take part in a growing economy, rather than being forced to come to some of the big Metro centres and often right across the border, to opportunities in the United States.

Now here is a serious failing of the present administration, and one that I submit to you, sir, is another important issue in the campaign that lies directly ahead.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the next thing I want to draw to your specific attention is something that I know the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) is going to comment on—and I see by the list of speakers, that he is going to speak for the government at an early opportunity this afternoon.

I referred to the need for an entirely new deal for the farm economy. The phrase "new deal" is an old one, but believe me there are new solutions which can do much to remove the oppressive economic difficulties from the farm economy with which the Minister of this government, backed by his Cabinet colleagues, had absolutely refused to deal. He has been much too quick to direct the citizens of this province who are concerned with agriculture to the federal administration.

It is not for us to defend what has gone on in Ottawa, but it is for us to point out to the Minister and those who intend to support him that the milk situation that is presently facing the province of Ontario is one of increasing difficulty. The federal government has made the difficult decision to offer the subsidies that will permit those farmers in this province and across Canada who make their living from selling milk for manufacturing purposes to at least meet their economic requirements for the foreseeable future. They have set up a commission which can deal with this on a long-term basis; it remains for Ontario to accept her responsibilities in this area.

The Minister is quite aware that where the area of emergent difficulty lies at the present time is with those citizens in the province of Ontario who produce milk in the area of fluid consumption and who, under the Ontario milk marketing board, have not been given the right to expand their place in the market, even though as he knows some important members of the Ontario milk marketing board have taken unto themselves a very large and

important share of this market which has enlarged tremendously just in the past few weeks.

I would bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the difficult problem these farmers face. It is true that under the direction of the Ontario milk marketing board the price for fluid milk has gone up, and so has the price to the housewife who must buy this at the corner store or from the delivery man that calls at her back door. The price for milk to the farmers at this level is now in excess of $6 a hundred, but there is no subsidy associated with this. The housewife has to pay for every cent of these increases and the objections associated with this are well taken. We do have a cheap food policy in this country and in this province; and if we are not going to find the money at the consumers' level it is necessary that the taxpayers in general, through the direction of the Minister of Agriculture and Food, provide the assistance that is needed.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: A good many of these fluid producers find themselves, since the removal of the provincial subsidy as of April 1, 1967 and the declaration of the new federal policy, in the peculiar situation where even though they have small fluid milk contracts they would be far better off to give them up and simply go on the federal subsidy that would send all their milk for manufacturing purposes.

Now there is a gap here, a gap in responsibility that the Minister of Agriculture and Food has adamantly refused to fill. He was against provincial subsidies but was forced to accede to a subsidy programme some months ago. He has cut this off now with the resulting dislocation, of which he must be as aware of as I.

This situation can be remedied. I believe there is no plant in the province of Ontario that should be permitted to receive grade A milk at less than $4 a hundred. I believe that it is necessary for a continuation of the subsidy programme of which, up until recently, we did have advantage in this province. It may be well and good for the Minister to say that the milk marketing board has this responsibility, but he knows as well as I that it is in the policy area that his responsibility lies. He knows as well that the milk marketing board may feel that the solution to the problem may be in their plans to pool this milk in the future. But we have heard from the board itself that it has to postpone its plans to pool the various types of milk in the foreseeable future; we hope for not more than a year, although there are still some severe problems related to it.

Surely in the gap in time and the gap in responsibility that presently exists, the Minister must recommend to his colleagues in the government that a subsidy programme be embarked upon so that this dislocating pressure can be relieved for the limited period of time until the plans of the milk marketing board come to fruition.

I would say to you, sir, that the discussion of all the items in the amendment that I have before you would be impossible in the time at my disposal. I would say, however, that it is necessary for us to look carefully at the whole ambit of programmes that the government has enacted over the past four years—and beyond that 24 years—not to see just what they are prepared to do in their statements in recent days. Death bed repentances, in many cases; lollipops to the electors in others.

It is strange that the leader of the government who stands in a position of responsibility in all of these matters, in his own view, and is so quick to accuse his political opponents of their responsibility, can go to the electors with these things that have been in the works, I suppose, for many months—proclamations that are proclamations of legislation passed by this Legislature a full year ago—all in the need, in his view, I suppose, to fool the electorate and to pull the wool over their eyes once again. But I say to you, sir, that this is not any easy thing to do and he attempts it at his peril.

In my view the press, television and radio are now in a position to put the facts, as put by politicians and others to the people of Ontario with perhaps more objectivity in a very realistic way. I would submit to you, sir, that his attempts to mislead the province are going to end in disaster for himself and for his party and that the people of Ontario are going to turn to the reasonable alternative, which is the Liberal Party in this province.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: Now there is no doubt in our minds that when we talk about the issues in the election and the points that we want to put before you, sir, this afternoon, it would be strange indeed if we did not come down to those two points—one associated with housing, the other associated with real anti-pollution measures; both of which come back on

the municipalities as part of their responsibilities.

There is no doubt in our minds that real reform in the tax situation in the province of Ontario is the only solution. It is necessary for us to do much more than simply vote an increase in the unconditional grants as we did a day or two ago. It is necessary for us to undertake a logical and reasonable programme which will permit the municipalities to carry out their responsibilities, particularly their responsibilities as to the servicing of property that have been beyond their financial ability in recent years.

Now, the Minister of Agriculture and Food and the Prime Minister have been quick to turn to editorial comment in metropolitan and other papers with regard to this issue. It must become clear even to them, in the views that have been expressed in press, radio and television, that this is a problem that must be solved immediately. We have waited for years for a report of the tax committee and whatever these experts say to us in the days or months or even years that lie ahead, it is obvious to us as the representatives of the people that reform is needed.

The basis of this reform is the transfer of the financial responsibility for the cost of education to the province of Ontario to the extent of 80 per cent. Now, this is a viable alternative to the standfast attitude of the present government. This is an issue of importance; it is the issue that contains the solution to the municipal difficulties, the difficulties in housing, the difficulties in agriculture, with our young people and with our people of more mature years, and it is becoming much more apparent as the days go by. The solution to these problems is obviously in supporting a vote of non-confidence that is presently before the House, Mr. Speaker, and I solicit the support of every member in that connection.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with some interest to the leader of the Opposition promoting his vote of non-confidence in this government. The fact crossed my mind, through his remarks, as to where he has been during the years that this government has been in office. Has he been out apologizing for his colleagues at Ottawa—mouthing platitudes on a political basis for them and for no one else?

Mr. Nixon: I have not been apologizing—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that a few days ago I took the liberty of sitting down and drafting a short report of the activities of The Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food since this government took office—1961 to 1967. And here for the information of the members of this House, and through you, Mr. Speaker, the people of the province of Ontario, is a record that is not to be compared with any jurisdiction in America. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that I am ready to send this record to our friends in the Opposition for their edification, because obviously they have missed the progress that has taken place across this province in every aspect, not only in agriculture.

My hon. friend in his resolution talks about us failing to support the farm economy. I had a report recently of many of the activities we have going on in this province. I refer for a moment to the Ontario junior farmers' establishment loan corporation. Since this was re-instituted by this government in 1963, there have been 3,031 loans made for a total of $57,460,000. Does that sound as though we are not supporting the young people of this province in establishing themselves in agriculture in this country?

I refer as well to the programmes that we have in operation, such as the capital grants programme, $129 million earmarked for the farm people of this province on a basis whereby a farmer can qualify for $2,500 providing he has a gross income from farming of $3,000 and owns the land on which the grant is to be spent.

Mr. Nixon: And providing he can find $2,500 extra himself.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Very true, very true. Is the leader of the Opposition suggesting we should do everything for farmers? I would think that the philosophy on which—

Mr. Nixon: Is the Minister asking a question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I am not asking a question, I am simply telling the leader—

Mr. Nixon: The Minister sounds like the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), he is getting rhetorical.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am simply saying, as a good many others should know, that the farm people of this province want to have a measure of independence and they do not want to depend on government hand-outs for everything they want.

Mr. Nixon: Hear, hear! Just give them a chance.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Very true. Recognizing that 70 per cent of the agricultural income of this province depends on the livestock industry, we have promoted and given a $1,000 per year grant to every veterinary student who stays in large animal practice for four years after his graduation. That is $1,000 for every year.

In 1961-1962, we provided $4.4 million for agriculture research. In 1967, the Legislature has approved $8.4 million for agricultural research, the finding of things to help farm people solve problems they are confronted with on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Nixon: What about milk subsidy?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will come to milk in a little while. We refer to marketing: 20 marketing plans in operation in this province with 40 agricultural commodities under control of those plans. These farm people, through the control of their marketing plans, can either set the price for the product that they have jurisdiction over or they can do it any way they like; but they have to recognize that they must work within the limiting factors of interprovincial and international trade.

Mr. Nixon: And under the direction of the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Sure, under the direction of the Minister, but let me say this to both the leader of the Opposition and to the leader of the socialist party who referred to me yesterday as dominating the farm products marketing board. The farm people of this province, the people who are representative of every commodity board by democratic vote in their own organization, said: "We won't change one iota of The Farm Products Marketing Act insofar as its administration is concerned in this Minister." That is the kind of support we have. And I might say that the members of the bean board were in that group who voted.

Now then, we come to the things we are doing—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, surely I have a right to say a few things here without being interrupted so rudely.

Mr. Speaker: If we are to have an orderly debate and finish at six o'clock, I am afraid we will have to have fewer interruptions.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I refer to The Agricultural Rehabilitation Development Act, 104 projects completed, under way or approved, amounting to $43 million. Does that sound as though we are not supporting agricultural economy? We talk about agricultural education, with four associate courses operating in this province today, and the degree course at Guelph, and a degree course at Macdonald institute—all designed for rural people. We offer short courses and have adult education programmes across the province. I ask my hon. friend if he took the time to even read of the success of the schools that were held in Belgium, Alexandria, Palmer Rapids and many other places, for adult education for farm people this year. There were 650 people participating and more wanting to get in.

These are the things that are going on today through extension services, the agricultural representatives, the home economists, the fruit and vegetable specialists; the engineering specialists; the farm management specialists, working with farm people through the use of farm record books—helping farmers to make decisions on farm management that have enabled many to succeed in a very admirable way.

The introduction of central milk testing; the first jurisdiction in the world to introduce centralized milk testing through the use of this new infra-red milk analyzer. The DHIA programme that we have going on in this province today, with 46,500 cows now on test and several more DHIA groups to be set up immediately.

The project of artificial insemination in cattle, the greatest forward step in the improvement in animal breeding that has ever been made in this country—

Mr. Nixon: The cows do not think so.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Just recently a bull sold for $140,000; his dam sold for $42,000. This is just an illustration of the demand for Ontario cattle across the world. They have come to be admired and in demand everywhere we go.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, I am at a complete loss to know what the Opposition would have this government do as far as the farming industry is concerned. Because, as a farmer myself, Mr. Speaker, and a member of this government, I believe it is the responsibility of government to provide the statutory authority for the individual farmer to pursue success on his own initiative, and I know of no better way for him to do it. This government believes in the historic independence of the farm community in directing the development of the Ontario agricultural economy.

Farm families are dedicated to the principles of democratic freedom and they want this opportunity to make their own decisions. I refer to, as the leader of the Opposition mentioned, the milk situation. Here we have county milk committees in every county and district of this province and, in every one of those counties and districts, meetings have been held to discuss this whole matter of milk pooling which my hon. friend has objected to today as not being implemented as quickly as he thinks it should be. Every one of those county and district groups have agreed with the principles the milk marketing board is now carrying out.

Mr. Nixon: Why has the Minister not brought in pooling?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Why have we not brought in pooling? Would my hon. friend suggest that I override the considered opinion of the milk marketing board, which suggests that milk pooling is not now ready to come into operation in this province?

Mr. Nixon: You supported it. What are the reasons?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This milk board appeared before the standing committee on agriculture, Mr. Speaker, at which my hon. friend attended but left. However, the members of his party were there and listened to the reasons why they did not feel that milk pooling could be implemented at this moment; but they said that it would be implemented just as soon as they could get the necessary administrative machinery set up to do this.

Mr. Nixon: What are you going to do in this gap?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now this is what they are proposing to do. My hon. friend castigated me a year ago for interfering, as he said, in a marketing plan. This year he says step in and interfere—override these people. Do not let them do the things that they want to do.

Mr. MacDonald: You were wrong in both instances.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh sure, this is the thing they say—for political opportunity they say do not do it this time but do it in another instance. It just depends which horse is the best political advantage to ride under this individual circumstance. My hon. friend suggests that the province of Ontario should step into the field. He suggests this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, that the province of Ontario should step into the field of subsidizing fluid milk producers in this province. He referred to the withdrawal on April 1, of the subsidy that was paid by this province for surplus fluid milk produced, but he failed to mention the fact that the federal government withdrew a subsidy that was paid to fluid milk producers. This was withdrawn without notice or discussion on the 1st day of April. At least the producers of this province knew ours was to be withdrawn. They had every right to know. They had every right to believe that the federal government would continue to pay that subsidy on fluid and industrial milk surplus. They had every reason to believe it, but it was withdrawn just like that, and I asked some of the people who were supposed to be in the know, Mr. Speaker, I asked some of those people if they knew this was to be done and there had not been a word of discussion with any of them. It was withdrawn like that.

Mr. Nixon: Nonsense, nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is the case. If my hon. friend suggests we should subsidize these people, this is something that can be taken under consideration.

Mr. Nixon: They will starve to death while you consider.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The Vineland conference that was called last year was called for the specific purpose of dealing with this whole matter of farm income today, and I refer my hon. friend to suggestions that we have not been able to accomplish anything in these few years. I would suggest to him that he should look, and take the trouble to examine farm cash receipts. Since 1961—he would see a rise from $874,110,000 to $1,261,000,000 in 1966, or an increase of 45 per cent in cash income. I would be the first to admit as a farmer, and as one associated with the agricultural industry, that costs have escalated, no question about it. This is the reason why we called the Vineland conference.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I think that I am entitled to some courtesy in what I have to say. Obviously what we are saying is hurting the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: It is misleading.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is not misleading at all, it is the truth; it is the whole truth. At the Vineland conference to which my hon. friends were all invited, not one person in the Opposition, save the member for York South, got on the floor and said one thing about how this problem should be corrected. Not one.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you for the compliment.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The main thing that came out of it was this matter of low farm income in comparison with costs—no question at all, we recognize this. We introduced this programme of capital grants as a result of the committee that I was asked to establish after the Vineland conference. That committee started to meet the Monday after the conference which ended on the last Friday of October, and they have been meeting ever since. The committee is not yet in a position to recommend to this government what should be done, but one of the things was that we should implement capital grants. This we have done.

They came back and asked us if we would appoint a committee, or a group of agricultural economists from outside the province of Ontario and completely removed from either the federal or provincial government. It would examine this whole matter of farm income, and study in particular the proposal that was made at the Vineland conference for income transfers for farm economy. This is what is being done today and we look forward to whatever that committee may be prepared to report.

I would say that we are as interested in finding the solutions to these matters as can be, but when my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition goes about this province, and words flow from his lips suggesting that we are trying to put out brush fires by flying by the seat of our pants and doing things then I think he should be cognizant of what we are actually trying to do on a long-term basis, and on the success with which we have been met. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I beg of my friends in this House to support us when we vote to defeat this resolution that has been put before us today.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution that is in general terms with a few specifics and I want to try to translate those general terms into my own specifics. The first one is that the resolution is a challenge of this government and a vote of non-confidence because of its arbitrary approach to things. As a matter of fact this is nothing new Mr. Speaker. Of recent years this government has been rocked by reactions to arbitrary approaches that were so insensitive to the basic needs of our people that Cabinet Ministers were blown completely out of office some three years ago and the government had to rush to put that fire out through a Royal commission. We had evidence a year and a half ago of the kind of arbitrary approach of the government in Ministerial dictates which they were going to ram down the throats of management and labour decisions with regard to pensions which have been subject to collective decisions for years. In other words this is a running thread, a common characteristic, of so much of the government's activity. What makes it even more distressing, Mr. Speaker, if I may just say in passing, is that when we see that arbitrary approach brought in to the handling of the business of the House where they manoeuvre and manipulate the situation so as to gag the House on important issues, then I think it is getting to the—

Mr. White: That is not true and you know it.

Mr. MacDonald: It is true—I said it, and I will repeat it if the hon. member did not grasp it in the first instance, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: The problem as is pointed out, Mr. Speaker, is that this government has a meagre understanding of the democratic principle. The resolution cites two specific cases. One is the specific case of the Prudential collapse. The incredible thing about the Prudential collapse is that there was only one body of people in this province who knew what was going on in that company, and that was the government. They knew the company was in difficulties from 1961 and the Attorney General has agreed that they were facing bankruptcy and financial difficulty by 1963. They recognized that the company was willing to cut corners, certain of its chief officers, so that the government was changing the law to catch the efforts at illegal activity. Yet in spite of that, Mr. Speaker, they did nothing to protect the public who were entitled to believe that a company which the government permitted to operate in this fashion was a company that they could deal with, and with some degree of confidence. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the most incredible thing about their arbitrary and incompetent action is that they so failed to fulfil their duty that they even

lulled the business world into a sense of false security. The better business bureau and Metropolitan Trust Company and bank managers—in fact everybody—was led to believe that this was a company with which people could deal with confidence, until some $20 million had gone down the drain.

Now you see, Mr. Speaker, what this government has done arbitrarily, deliberately, in a calculated fashion, is that while it investigates through the securities commission, and by bringing in Clarkson, Gordon, and others, it has deliberately forbidden the kind of investigation which would be broad ranging enough to examine their role, their culpability, in the whole picture.

Here we have the classic—well I should not say the classic because we have so many classics in this government's experience and conduct, but one of the classic examples of arbitrary action on the part of this government. We have another one which is so mixed as to be almost amusing—in the Niagara parks commission. My friend the leader of the Opposition refers to the fact that the government acted rather arbitrarily with regard to the people who were the commissioners and in effect sent the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk down as the new chairman to cope with the situation and he apparently acted arbitrarily.

The interesting thing here, Mr. Speaker, is that the tradition of arbitrary action within the Tory party ran head on into each other, because the astounding thing about the Niagara parks commission is that it has always acted arbitrarily. It acted so arbitrarily and so much in violation of the basic principles of the operation of a public institution, a public organization, that some five or six years ago, when some of those violations of principles were brought out, the government then moved in and through a Royal commission and through committees of this Legislature, whitewashed the whole thing. In his inimitable phraseology, the former Prime Minister said: "Let us not get too excited about breaches of some of the basic principles of public administration." The people in the Niagara peninsula regard the Niagara parks commission as sort of a family business and they ran it as they pleased.

The only thing that can be said in defence of the government is that it knew the situation was indefensible and in the fullness of time decided to clean it up. But one of their own fledglings, one of their own creations, this little group of commissioners that had acted arbitrarily for so long, thought that they could defy even the arbitrary action of this government. Well, they found that they could not, because obviously the power resided here.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is a magnificent example of the arbitrary operation of this government in some of its own appointees and creations; and in this instance it is a little ironical that they should become the victims of some of their own past conduct.

But the same characteristic, Mr. Speaker, can be illustrated in so many other instances. For example, the attitude of this government towards the farmer. The Minister of Agriculture and Food has already left the House—but so often it is an arbitrary action. Arbitrary action such as a few years ago when they did not like one group of producers and moved, in effect, to destroy the whole basis of a producer-controlled marketing plan so that they could cope with that group of producers. A year or so ago, they did not like another group of producers and what they were doing, so in a sort of Latin American coup fashion threw them out. The irony of it was that, in the fullness of time, the producers put virtually the same group back and now the government has to decide to live with them.

Here you have this arbitrary kind of action. You had it also with labour. A group of people attempt to participate in a peaceful demonstration—and nobody suggested that it was not peaceful—and this government moves to charge these people and to have them, the Attorney General assured us, as a test case, before the courts. When they got the kind of conviction they were seeking, how much of a test case was it? The counsel of the Attorney General demanded that they should have the kind of penalty that sent honest working folk who had been exercising their freedom of speech to spend two weeks or two months in jail.

We have arbitrary action *vis-à-vis* our municipalities. No matter how much pleading is made. No matter how many times the municipalities come in with cap in hand to try to persuade this government to do something basic in coping with the municipal problem, the government arbitrarily says: "We will do it as we see fit, and do not go around exaggerating the problem." It is well that you live with problems, the Prime Minister adds: In coping with problems those Victorian virtues of strengthening the moral fibre are developed. And now, having created something of a storm, the government is going to ap-

pease it with its $1.50 increase in unconditional grants that have been given on the eve of an election. Without an election, it would not have been made. An effort to appease the storm created by the arbitrary approach of the whole situation.

Now Mr. Chairman, the second part of the motion is moving not so much away from the arbitrary action as on to another characteristic of this government. It is not only arbitrary, but it is incompetent in its coping with these problems. One does not have time to go into the detail of it, but regional planning has been talked about. We have had lip service to needs of regional planning for 10 years and we have no real regional planning in this province as yet, because the government has not got the intestinal fortitude to come to grips with the basics required to have an effective regional planning. Indeed, yesterday we debated for hours in this House with regard to a project in northern Ontario, the looping of the pipeline which would have the basis for some genuine regional planning and we got from the Minister the kind of double talk that I defy anybody to come to a rational conclusion as to what he was saying.

On the important issue of pollution, this government has been for 25 years a "paper tiger", pretending to do something about the issue but not really coming to grips with it. What we have now is the shell of a legislative approach to it that gives no real assurance that the government is yet going to come to grips with the situation seriously.

On the farm economy, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has gone through what this government usually does. In the instance of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), he dazzles the public with a plethora of figures of increases in grants. The Minister of Agriculture and Food comes in and he dazzles the public with the increases here, what is being done there, what is being done somewhere else. The significant point, Mr. Speaker, is that all of this so-called help that we have from the Minister has not coped with the basic farm problem. The basic farm problem is an income problem and it reached the proportions that it drove the farmers onto the highways in protest last spring, and the Minister's only solution, Mr. Speaker, was to hold a conference, out of which came the establishment of a committee to study the proposition of "income incentives".

Now Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention once again to the fact that we have had the Minister of Agriculture and Food talking about agricultural problems, even making passing reference to agricultural income, and once again today he did not commit this government to the basic principle of an income incentive policy. All the spokesmen, whether they be the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hamilton), whether it be the member for Northumberland (Mr. Rowe), who spoke on agricultural revolutions, not one spokesman from the government has endorsed the basic principle of income incentives.

What the government is doing is going through some calculated deception to suggest that they are coping with the problem; when they have deliberately, after being provoked and challenged, not indicated their basic support of the principles of income incentives. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Minister said he was at a loss to know what they would have to do, what the Opposition thought he should do.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You have not made a suggestion and—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may just say to the hon. Minister, we support the principle of income incentives and the Minister is going through the motion of studying this; without indicating that he supports the principle of an income incentive programme because his comments today—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I will answer that.

Mr. MacDonald: No, I have got the floor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! A little bit of decorum please.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you very much. He went through his estimates, he has gone through a half a dozen speeches and now he wants to take my time to say something he has not said during all this period.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The effrontery, the arbitrary nature of this government could not be more magnificently illustrated, because Mr. Speaker, I just want to emphasize this. The Minister went into a mouthing of the 19th century slogans about the farmer "pursuing his own initiative." The basic problem is in pursuing his own initiative, farm income has been going from bad to worse. I will tell you that it is going to continue to go from bad to worse, as long as they have to live under the problem of Bill and Joe,

who pass the buck back and forward, each of them playing politics over the deteriorating body of the agricultural industry in the province of Ontario.

What this government does, Mr. Speaker, as the resolution indicated, is to react to crises. But my great objection, Mr. Speaker, is that if they reacted to crises, even belatedly—if they at least reacted effectively, then we might achieve something. But you can go down through the record, whether it be housing, whether it be the problem of mental health or whether it be the oft-repeated promises about centres to cope with the problem of emotionally disturbed children; they react to crises slowly over the years, but not effectively. You cannot get the satisfaction of some sort of an achievement even when events have driven them into action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously we are going to support this motion. This motion is calling for a want of confidence in this government and I can assure you I will seize every occasion I can to vote no confidence in this government, and I look forward to the people of this province having an opportunity to do the same thing.

I have only this final little comment to make, Mr. Speaker. I wish the motivations in the resolution put forward by the Liberal Party left me with the conviction, Mr. Speaker, that they really had some fundamental differences with the government and they would do it differently if they were in there. The fact of the matter is historically, the evidence is clear, tweedledum and tweedledee.

Mr. Nixon: Nuts!

Mr. MacDonald: The only difference is that the one is out and he wants to get in. If you want further evidence of it, Mr. Speaker, today, in this afternoon's paper, the *Telegram*, there is an article called: Liberals' Landslide Strategy to Voters.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Did the hon. member hear Gordon Sinclair yesterday?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes I did, and we will get votes as a result of what he said.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I will ask him to repeat it because we will get votes every time he has that kind of drivel.

Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to draw to your attention is the approach of the Liberals, in seeking this landslide of votes. In an institutional pamphlet advising their candidates, there is this wonderful paragraph:

> Headquarters concedes frankly: Many firms support both the PC's and ourselves, 60 per cent to the party in power and 40 per cent to the Opposition. This should be accepted without question.

There it is, directly from the headquarters of the Liberal Party! So what really would they do differently from the Tories? A very good question, I leave it there.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Forest Hill.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, perforce my remarks will be rather brief because a good deal of the time provided for this debate was consumed in the procedural difficulties at the outset.

The Prime Minister has made it very clear that this is probably a session preceding a general election and thus the last session of this Parliament. It is a very good time to take the measure of the quality of the Opposition, the gentlemen on the benches across from us, and to see whether in fact they present any kind of credible alternative.

In listening to day's debate and listening to debates earlier in this session, one hears routinely repetitive remarks. One very rarely hears a constructive suggestion and one hears very many irresponsible statements.

The resolution is very peculiarly drafted, Mr. Speaker. It says that the people of Ontario have lost confidence in this government. The peculiarity about that is not the arrogance, I think, of the man who drafted it, because he is not an arrogant man for good reason. I think it was careless drafting. He knows perfectly well that this House can only speak as to the confidence of this House in the Ministry. The opportunity for the people of Ontario to speak about their confidence in this government will come at the general election at the ballot boxes, and at that time the hon. leader of the Opposition will find that he is dead wrong. He was kind enough to send me a note to say he was going up to get a cup of coffee and I think even the leader of the Opposition should be able to get a cup of coffee.

Mr. Singer: That is nice.

Mr. Dunlop: Where the others are, we did not hear.

Mr. MacDonald: Look at your benches before you start—you could shoot a cannon down the Cabinet benches without hitting anybody.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): What does the hon. member mean, are we nobody?

Mr. Dunlop: In the motion, Mr. Speaker, there is a suggestion that this government operates by reaction to crises. Now, there is nothing wrong with reacting to crises. I was very interested to hear the leader of the Opposition again bring forth his proposal that 80 per cent of the cost of education should be borne by the provincial government. I suggest that he brought that forth as a result of a crisis, a crisis not entirely of his own making the fact that he was catapulted into the leadership of his party and suddenly he felt he had to say something. What he would say he thought should be something that would be attractive. Even the members of the socialist party have rejected his thesis in the absence of any responsible statement as to how he proposes to finance that change.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the member talking about?

Mr. Dunlop: The 80 per cent of which I heard the hon. member for Woodbine talk. He remarked to the leader of the Opposition that he has to show how he would finance that.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, agreed! I thought the member said we had advocated that.

Mr. Dunlop: I said even the socialists criticized the leader of the Opposition for that statement. I think it is irresponsible to make such a proposal without suggesting any way it would be financed. I have seen estimates that for the province to take over 80 per cent of the cost of education would require an increase of 5 cents in the sales tax or about 14 points of income tax or whatever palatable combination of those his genius might suggest. Instead, this government proceeds to concern itself with such matters as municipal financing in a responsible way by planning four years ago to establish a committee of experts staffed by experts who can assemble and will present us with all the statistical and other data upon which it will be necesary to base decisions. That will probably not reach us I gather until some time after this session. But there will be another session of another Parliament and no one would be wise to start tinkering in any substantial way with inter-governmental financial relations at this time without more facts.

I was very interested in listening to the debate a few days ago on second reading of Bill 80, where a number of people in the kind of way that one has learned to expect of many members of the Opposition, were rather suggesting that the $1.50 change in the municipal unconditional grants legislation was all that the government was doing for municipalities. In 1965, the last year for which there are complete figures available, total municipal expenditure was $1,230 million in this province. If we can inflate that by 10 per cent for each of two years, about the rate of change of municipal taxation, we will find that in 1967 a reasonable estimate of total municipal expenditure will be somewhere in the neighbourhood of $1,500 million. Those who will remember the Provincial Treasurer's excellent budget of not very many weeks ago, will recall that he stated that through 13 different departments the subventions being made available to municipalities and municipal institutions, including school boards, would be $880 million, or about 44 per cent of the budget of this government. From the figures I have just given you, you can see it will be somewhat in excess of 50 per cent of the total expenditures of municipalities. This is a point which I fear is not really clearly made or as well understood as it should be. Do not be misled by the further references by the member for York South about the municipal unconditional grants and the $1.50 about which he seeks to make so much. More than half the cost of municipal government and municipal institutions are borne by the provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few, very brief words, about the Ontario housing corporation and the housing programme of this government. We are concerned primarily with housing in the public sector, or public housing. In the public housing sector—and the Minister has made this very, very clear—there are about 17,000 starts being made. The Opposition has complained about completions. One must remember that there are no completions until after there are starts, and with 17,000 starts, that represents more public housing than all the rest of Canada put together.

The Opposition complained that the Ontario housing corporation has not increased the stock of housing and certainly, in its early operations, it did not increase the aggregate stock of housing. But, Mr. Speaker, it increased the stock of housing available to low income persons, which is the primary or first concern of the government. We have every reason to be proud of the activity of the Ontario housing corporation, and with the passage of a reasonable amount of time, we will

find that the operations of the HOME programme will also be ones of which we will be proud.

The problems of housing in the private sector are not to be solved by any one simple method, or panacea. It relates to a number of factors which I shall not deal with at this moment. I will say that housing in the private sector must continue to be a matter that will engage the interest of all three levels of government, and cannot be solved by the single action of any one level of government.

Mr. Speaker, because I am unable to find a credible alternative among the gentlemen sitting opposite me, I could only think that it would be an irresponsible act of members of this House to vote in favour of this resolution, and I would urge them not to do so.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a brief reference to the speaker who preceded me, the hon. member for Forest Hill. He mentioned the fact that the Liberal Party has said that it will assume 80 per cent of the cost of education if elected to office. The member for Forest Hill indicated that this was a very irresponsible position. I say to you, sir, that we in this party say that it is not an irresponsible position, and we intend to implement it after we are elected.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Gaunt: My friend, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, reviewed a number of things that The Department of Agriculture and Food in this province is engaged in. I do want to make reference to some of those comments. I suggest to him that all of those things, being what they are, and all of the activities in which the Department of Agriculture and Food is presently engaged have not really corrected the basic ills in the farming community, that is, lack of net income. The Minister quoted the gross figures and, of course, they are quite accurate. However, the point I make is that we continue to talk about gross figures which do not really mean very much when you consider the fact that the farmers' costs have gone up even more than the gross figures, so that he is in a worse position today than he has ever been in before. As a matter of fact, the farmer's position today, in a good many cases, is worse than during the depression years of the thirties.

I say that this government has to give leadership in those areas, leadership that it has not been giving up to this point.

There are two things that I want to speak about this afternoon. One of the issues that I want to touch on has been dealt with—that is the milk issue—and I just want to make reference to it to underline and underscore some of the basic points.

There are a number of issues here in connection with the federal dairy policy. There are a number of things and a number of areas in which we could spend quite a number of moments discussing, but I do want to separate these things. I think it would be prudent to separate them for the sake of discussion this afternoon.

The first issue deals with the matter of the price for industrial milk. The question here is: Will the farmer get $5 for his industrial milk? I need not relate to you the tremendous financial pressures that have closed in around the farming community in the last few years. It is very interesting to note—and I say to the House that it is not easy to compete in a continental market where 37 per cent of the net income of the United States farmers comes from their public treasury, as compared with three per cent in Canada and 70 per cent in the United Kingdom; and in a market where the tariffs on several of the products moving into the United States are higher than for the same products coming from the United States into Canada.

We have talked about costs and we have talked about the cost-price squeeze in the House a number of times. I feel that these things are fairly well known to all of us. The fact is, the new dairy programme means that the off-farm price for manufactured milk has risen from $2.66 in 1963, to $4.75 this year and just points up the fact that we have a lot of catching up to do.

Negotiations, I understand, are taking place and have been taking place between the government at Ottawa and farm leaders and I hope that the results are satisfactory to all concerned. I say, without any hesitation, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I am concerned, the farmers deserve and should have $5 for their industrial milk on the farm. I say that without any hesitation.

However, there is another aspect of this matter with which I would like to deal. That is the status of the fluid shipper—and reference has been made to this this afternoon—and what he gets for his surplus milk. Mr. Greene in Ottawa has said that he is willing to accept the responsibility for the industrial

milk shippers of this country. The government of the province of Ontario has said that it is willing to accept the responsibility for the fluid milk shippers in this province. Indeed, the Ontario milk marketing board has taken the initiative in this connection and has announced a 35-cent increase in the price of milk used for the bottle trade, effective—as I understand it—on May 1. This will bring the price to the farmer up to $6.10 per hundred. This action was justified because fluid milk is the responsibility of the province. No one denies this.

I understand also, that the milk marketing board intends to raise the price of surplus fluid milk to $3.54, as of May 1, and this brings me to the point that I want to make.

There are approximately, as I understand it, 1,200 what may be termed "swift shippers" who market both fluid and industrial milk. As well, of course, is quite a large number who produce the surplus over and above what the dairies can use. All of these people, in my opinion, are fluid shippers and are the responsibility of the province. Many of the split milk shippers who have small fluid quotas are considering reverting to industrial shippers. This is because, as it presently stands, it is a financial sacrifice to have a small fluid quota because they are not eligible for the federal subsidy for the balance.

Many seem prepared to give up their opportunity to participate in the expanding fluid market in this province, simply because at the moment they would be much better off to do so—particularly if they are involved in any quota situation which may resemble anything under a 60-40 quota. In other words, what I am saying is that if you have anything less than a 60-40 quota the farmer involved would be far better to revert to becoming solely an industrial shipper in order to qualify for the subsidy. In other words, it makes it very attractive for the farmer, in that situation, to go on to a solely industrial market.

We in this party feel that any producer who ships fluid milk, even though the quota is small, is a fluid shipper and is the responsibility of the province. In our opinion, such a shipper should be guaranteed by the province on any production over and above what is allocated to him on his fluid quota $4 per hundredweight for that milk as my leader has said. That is for grade A milk. This in our opinion, is the responsibility of the province. Frankly—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member suggest that it would be better if the man were to desist from the small quota fluid processor and ship to an industrial plant? Would this be better for him?

Mr. Gaunt: Well, in some cases, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that if the person involved has a quota that is under a 60-40, that is to say, 70-30 or 80-20 something of that nature, then, financially that person would be better to revert to a strictly industrial market because he would be money in pocket under the present conditions.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, if that is the case why would the men not do this?

Mr. Gaunt: In order to answer my friend, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that many of our people across this province had viewed the fluid quota as a very attractive thing. They have attempted over the years to become involved in that situation. As a matter of fact a friend of mine was talking to me the other day and mentioned that he had just a few months ago obtained a partial fluid quota and this was very important to him. He tried for years to get this quota and now he has got it and he is financially worse off than previously. The situation has been that this was a very lucrative market, and now the situation has reversed itself and it is not nearly so attractive. Having gotten into it, a lot of these people are unwilling to give up, but they have been working for years and so in some cases I am sure they will sacrifice financially in order to eventually take part in the expanded fluid milk market in this province.

Frankly, I was afraid the Minister would indulge in this jurisdictional hassle again this year. This in my opinion is most unfortunate because the farmers are the ones who eventually suffer. Ottawa says it is your problem. Toronto says it is Ottawa's problem and there we sit. Perhaps we will never overcome this problem until we have a national pooling for both industrial and fluid milk. The fact of the matter is that this is a long way off, at least it seems so at the present time. Steps must therefore be taken to preserve the industry in the interim.

There are other problems with the dairy policy. Hopefully they can be worked out. I have set out this afternoon to outline where the province in my opinion has a responsibility in this whole question. It has not assumed it and the sooner the Minister does the better for all of us. There is another matter which I want to touch on, which is not so widespread in nature, but it is nevertheless very important. This concerns the

Minister's statement about assistance to the areas struck by the tornado on Monday. It now appears that the damage was much more extensive than was originally thought. My reports indicate that it was the worst tornado to hit the area since 1953. In May of that year, millions of dollars in property damage was caused by a twister that ripped through southwestern Ontario. As a matter of fact there have been, I believe, six tornados in western Ontario since 1953.

This time there are four townships involved: Logan township, Hibbert township, Tuckersmith township and Hay township. The damage, I understand, is already placed in the millions of dollars. The Minister of Agriculture and Food made a statement yesterday that the province would match dollar for dollar any moneys that were raised locally. Let us look at that for a moment. This type of thing was done 20 years ago. The cost of replacing buildings has gone up tremendously since that time. Added to this, it is impossible for a farmer to get anything over 70 per cent of the value of these buildings which were insured against wind damage with a mutual insurance company. They simply will not insure them for their full value. For supposition's sake, let us say that $25,000 will be raised locally. Frankly, I think that figure is high. I doubt very much, I am guessing, but I doubt very much if the people will be able to raise much more money than that. So let us presume that they do raise $25,000. That means that the province will match this which will give them a total of $50,000.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What about the federal government?

Mr. Gaunt: Hopefully they will come in and if they do that is $75,000. The figures that I am going to use still stand. Well the figures, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to use I am sure will stand whether the federal government participates or not. But the point I wish to make is that when one considers that in Logan township alone there were eight barns and one house destroyed within a two and a half mile stretch, it is obvious that this type of assistance is totally inadequate.

I am told that there may very well be 35 or 40 barns destroyed in the area. Well, in the light of this $50,000 what would be the picture in terms of replacing these buildings? I suggest to you that $50,000 just would not go anywhere in replacing the buildings that have been destroyed by the tornado.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): I wonder if the member would permit a question.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I only have two more minutes and—

Mr. Speaker: Your time is up!

Mr. Gaunt: I just want to say, sir, that as far as I am concerned I feel that the basis for the assistance should have been at least five to one. That is $5.00 from the province for every dollar that was raised locally.

In addition a permanent disaster fund should be established so that this type of thing may be dealt with on a regular basis rather than on an *ad hoc* basis.

Finally, the province must make efforts to facilitate the cleaning up of the debris. This is a terrific problem and may very well delay the seeding operations for some time. Many people are needed to undertake this job—

Mr. Speaker: Time is up!

Mr. Gaunt: I have until five o'clock, Mr. Speaker, 15 minutes.

An hon. member: The Minister interrupted him.

Mr. Speaker: It is three minutes to five, according to me.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, does each speaker not have 15 minutes?

Mr. Speaker: You went on at 4.42.

Mr. Gaunt: Well in summation, Mr. Speaker, I would just say that I urge my hon. friend to negotiate with the Guelph reformatory at Guelph, in order to get people up to that area to clean up the debris. I think also that the radar station, or the air force station at Clinton could provide personnel to clean up the area, because people are needed to do that. The farmers will supply the tractors, and I am sure that if those people would go up there it would be a tremendous help to the area.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Why do you not ask the high school to provide help and make bees to clean up, and ask them for a few days off? I think it would be a great idea.

Mr. Gaunt: All I am saying is that I hope we can get the people into that area to clean up the debris. I feel I have outlined in very brief terms, and in a limited way, that this government has failed to support the economy and I therefore support this motion proposed by my leader.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to make some comments regarding the hon. leader of the Opposition's criticism of the government, saying the government was failing to combat pollution and suggesting that it failed to anticipate and meet the future needs of the province with planned action.

Mr. Speaker, I am in complete disagreement, as I am sure all hon. members of this House are, with this suggestion. Eleven years ago the government brought in legislation to establish the Ontario water resources commission, with broad authority to assist municipalities and persons in the provision of suitable water and in bringing pollution under control wherever pollution may exist.

With these terms of reference the commission has developed a broadly-based programme to achieve these objectives. Somewhere between $1.25 billion and $1.5 billion of sewage and water works have been approved by the commission in this short period of time.

Last evening in this House, the commission received a tremendous vote of confidence in its programme when, without a question asked, and the unanimous consent of all parties the Legislature voted $72,691,000 to carry forward our planned programme to meet the future needs of the province and to combat pollution. I realize that the hon. leader of the Opposition was not in the House when these matters were up for discussion, and in view of what happened last night it is quite apparent that his motion does not reflect the thinking of his own party, as well as of members of this House who were no doubt reflecting the thinking of the people of Ontario when they gave unanimous approval to our programme.

I am sure that the members of this House and the municipalities appreciate the fact that the OWRC programme, while firm in its objectives to bring pollution under control wherever pollution may exist, reflects the basic Conservative policy of free enterprise. Let me enlarge by saying that we require that any sewage works and water works developed in the province must have approval of our divisions of sanitary engineering and industrial wastes. With that approval municipalities have three choices:

1. They may wish to finance, construct and operate their own works, and we accept that;

2. They may wish to enter into an agreement with the commission and we will finance, construct and operate the works until the debt has been retired;

3. We are prepared to construct, own and operate works and sell water at cost to municipalities or receive sewage from municipalities and charge on a unit basis for treatment, this will be at cost.

To give hon. members some appreciation of the tremendous programme that has been carried forward by municipalities and by industry, in many cases with financial assistance and guidance from OWRC, I have asked our staff to provide me with information which I propose to put into the records at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members would like to have the facts regarding the ability of our municipalities and industry in Ontario to treat municipal wastes, industrial wastes and water supplies. I have asked our staff to prepare information regarding what has been accomplished to date. I have asked our staff to break this down into the various drainage basins in the province, namely the rivers that flow into Manitoba, into Lake Superior, Lake Huron and Georgian Bay, Lake St. Clair, Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, the St. Lawrence River, Hudson and James Bays, and the Ottawa River. Let me put into the record the capacity that has been built in these areas to provide adequate supplies of good water, and to bring pollution under control.

In river systems draining into Manitoba we can treat 9.35 million gallons of water a day. We can treat 2.75 million gallons of municipal waste water; 41 million gallons of industrial waste water. Of these works the commission has financed $1,957,000.

Draining into Lake Superior we can treat 95 million gallons of water per day; 11 million gallons of municipal waste water; 151 million gallons of industrial waste water—and the commission has financed $14,275,000.

In Lake Huron and Georgian Bay we can treat 120 million gallons of water per day; 48 million gallons of municipal waste water; 164 million gallons of industrial waste water; and the commission has financed $23,900,000 of these works.

Draining into Lake St. Clair we can treat 34 million gallons of water; 48 million gallons of municipal waste water; 383 million gallons of industrial waste water; and the commission has financed $11,865,000 of these works.

On the Lake Erie watershed, we can treat 148 million gallons of water per day; 65

million gallons of municipal waste; 55 million gallons of industrial waste; and the commission has financed $26,924,000 of these works.

On the Lake Ontario watershed we can treat 652 million gallons of water per day; 399 million gallons of municipal waste water; 693 million gallons of industrial waste water; and the commission has financed $29,431,000 worth of these works.

On the St. Lawrence River watershed we can treat 28.75 million gallons of water per day; 15.5 million gallons of municipal waste water; 14.5 million gallons of industrial waste water; and the commission has financed $5,570,000 worth of these works.

On the Ottawa River we can treat 118 million gallons of water per day; 55 million gallons of municipal waste water; 21 million gallons of industrial waste water; and the commission has financed $6,109,000 worth of works.

On the Hudson and James Bay watershed we can treat 28 million gallons of water per day; 4 million gallons of municipal waste; 14.5 million gallons of industrial waste water; and the commission has financed $631,000 worth of these works.

Perhaps I should remind hon. members that many of the municipal systems are also accepting industrial wastes.

The figures I have given add up to a total capacity in Ontario today where we have ability to treat 1,208 million gallons of water every day; 649 million gallons of municipal wastes; 1,538 million gallons of industrial wastes; and the commission has financed $120,662,000 worth of these works.

In other words, we can treat a total of 2,187,550,000 gallons of municipal and industrial wastes every day in the province; and 1,208,250,000 gallons of water, for a grand total of 3,395,700,000 gallons of water and waste can be treated by the present facilities that have been construced in the province. All of this has been done without provincial subsidy, and I would suggest that Ontario can be proud of its achievement to date.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to put these figures in *Hansard* so that hon. members will know that Ontario has a tremendous programme under way to protect its water supplies, to provide adequate quantities of suitable water for our people, and to bring pollution under control wherever it may exist.

In the limited time that is left to me, let me go into greater detail regarding the location of the works I have mentioned, and I will start under the following headings:

1. Municipal waste treatment.

2. Where commission projects are presently under development.

3. Where provincial area projects are under discussion or development.

4. Municipal water supply, and

5. Industrial wastes.

I realize with the tremendous programme that we have under way in the province that I probably will not be able to finish my review in the short time at my disposal, I know that there are other hon. members who want to take part in this debate.

Let us deal first with municipal waste water treatment facilities. I will tell you where they are located:

Draining into Manitoba, Atikokan township has settling; Fort Frances has primary treatment; Rainy River has settling; Sioux Lookout has trickling filters.

Draining into Lake Superior, Fort William has primary treatment; Long Lac has settling; Manitouwadge, settling; Marathon, primary treatment; Michipicoten, a lagoon; Nipigon, primary treatment, and Port Arthur, primary treatment.

Draining into Lake Huron, Alliston has activated sludge treatment; Aurora has activated sludge treatment, as has Barrie; Bosanquet township, a lagoon; Bracebridge, a lagoon and Bradford, a lagoon; Capreol, a lagoon; Chapleau, primary treatment; Chelmsford, a lagoon; Chesley, a lagoon; Clinton, activated sludge; Collingwood, primary treatment; Coniston, activated sludge; Copper Cliff, activated sludge; Elliot Lake, activated sludge and some primary treatment; Elmvale, a lagoon; Espanola, primary treatment; Exeter, a lagoon; Goderich, activated sludge; Gravenhurst, trickling filters; Hanover, activated sludge; Harriston, a lagoon; Huntsville, activated sludge; Kincardine, a lagoon; Laura township, activated sludge; Levack, activated sludge; Listowel, a lagoon; Little Current, a lagoon; Lively, activated sludge; Long township, a lagoon; Lucan, a lagoon; Midland, primary treatment; Neelon and Garson, a lagoon; Newmarket, activated sludge; North Bay, activated sludge; Onaping, activated sludge; Orillia, activated sludge; Owen Sound, primary treatment; Palmerston, activated sludge; Parry Sound, primary sedimentation; Powassan, a lagoon; Port Elgin, primary treatment; Sault Ste Marie, primary treatment; Seaforth, primary; Stanley township, activated sludge; Stephen township, activated

sludge; Shelburne, a lagoon; Sudbury and Algoma sanatorium, activated sludge; Frood Mine, activated sludge; Stobie Mine, activated sludge; Murray mine, activated sludge; Teeswater, activated sludge; Uxbridge, trickling filters; Wingham, a lagoon; Wiarton, a lagoon.

Draining into Lake St. Clair: Ingersoll, activated sludge; Chatham, activated sludge; London, six activated sludge plants; Milverton, a lagoon; Mitchell, a lagoon; Moore township, extended aeration; Sarnia, primary treatment; Stratford, activated sludge; Tavistock, a lagoon; Tilbury, a lagoon; Westminster township, extended aeration.

Draining into Lake Erie, there is Aylmer with a lagoon; Brantford, activated sludge; Caledonia, activated sludge; Crystal Beach, modified activated sludge; Delhi, trickling filters; Elmira, activated sludge; Elora, activated sludge; Fergus, activated sludge; Galt, activated sludge; Guelph, activated sludge; Hagersville, activated sludge; Hespeler, primary sedimentation and sand filters; Jarvis, a lagoon; Kitchener, activated sludge; Leamington, primary treatment; New Hamburg, a lagoon; Paris, extended aeration; Port Dover, primary treatment; Preston, activated sludge; Raleigh township, activated sludge; St. Thomas, activated sludge; Simcoe, activated sludge; Tillsonburg, activated sludge; Waterford, a lagoon; Waterloo, activated sludge; Windsor, activated sludge and Hayes process; Woodstock, activated sludge.

Now let us look at Lake Ontario: Acton, activated sludge; Ajax, activated sludge; Batawa, activated sludge; Beamsville, sedimentation and trickling filters; Belleville, primary treatment; Bolton, trickling filters; Bowmanville, trickling filters; Brampton, new plant activated sludge and old plant activated sludge; Brighton, a lagoon; Burlington, activated sludge; Chinguacousy, activated sludge; Chippawa, activated sludge; Cobourg, trickling filters; Dundas, activated sludge; Ernestown, a lagoon; Fort Erie, primary treatment; Frankford, trickling filters; Georgetown, activated sludge; Grimsby, activated sludge; Grimsby Beach, trickling filters; west end Grimsby township, a lagoon; Hamilton, primary treatment; Kingston township, activated sludge; Lindsay, a lagoon; Madoc, primary treatment; Markham township, activated sludge; Markham, activated sludge; Milton, activated sludge; Niagara Falls, primary treatment; Niagara-on-the-Lake, a lagoon; Oakville, activated sludge; Trafalgar, activated sludge.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my time is up and I have really only covered a very small part of the report that I have here. In fact, I have 94 pages and if time permitted I could read them all into the record, but in conclusion let me say I am sure that when the Legislature realizes that we have a tremendous programme under way, that we had unanimous consent for a $72 million budget last night from all sides of the House, that the hon. leader of the Opposition should withdraw his motion.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I received a few minutes ago a note from the member for London South which could now only be termed ludicrous. It is a request that I cut down my speaking time by 10 minutes. We have just had an example of the kind of debate that the Tory government entertains in this Legislature in debating matters of urgent public importance. And the member for Wellington-Dufferin, of course, epitomizes that particular viewpoint of the Tories as to how you enter into a public debate on matters of importance. We either rule them out of public debate or we have to put up with a dirge-like recital of the "activated sludge" of the Tory party across the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, if one were called upon, even with the lack of artistic ability, to draw a word picture of the Tory government in disarray in the province of Ontario today, it would remind one of a vast earthenware dam —of a vast dam of earthworks which over a period of time had backed up the water across the country with unresolved problems. And in front of that dam are little men running back and forth, trying desperately to patch up with a little mud here and a little mud there the cracks as they appear in the framework of that dam as it is about to collapse.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 10 days of this Parliament—perhaps it will collapse tonight on the vote which is going to be presented in a very short time; we do not know. But certainly in the next 10 days it is going to collapse and is going to call and go through the charade of a general election in this province.

Before we get to that particular time when we all go back to the country and we all either end up as MPPs or as ex-MPPs—depending on the will of the people of the province—I would like to select at random, out

of the last month or so, eight or 10 of the cracks that have appeared.

There are many more; and the Tory reaction is always identical. As the crack appears you introduce a bill for first reading; this is one technique. It gets no further.

Another technique is for the hon. Minister to make a statement before the orders of the day and that is the end of that particular matter. The third alternative, Mr. Speaker, is to deny that there is a problem; and if there is a problem to simply suggest to the House that everything is going along well and in the due course of time the problem will be solved.

We had yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in the first of my random items, we had this strange debate about northern Ontario and the alternate gas pipeline that could be built if this government had any interest whatsoever in the problems in that part of the country. There is no need to repeat that debate. It is now recorded in *Hansard*; the total disinterest of the government of the province of Ontario in that problem.

A little bit further to the east in the province of Ontario we have the Ontario northland transportation commission, Mr. Speaker, and here we have the Tory government which was at the height of its power along about 1910 or 1911 and they had the sensation that in some way or other they were intimately involved in the development of northern Ontario. It stands, the Ontario northland transportation commission, in its original conception, stands as a tribute to the Conservative philosophy of the province of Ontario.

There is a place for Conservative political philosophy in any society, but it is now a pale shadow of its former self. It operates a relatively second rate railway line; it has completely abdicated from the field of communications other than to provide a necessary toll connection until such time as the Bell Telephone Company swallows it up, as it has swallowed up the local telephone exchanges in that part of northern Ontario.

Now if we come down, Mr. Speaker, into the area of the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), and what we have had to go through with him in the last several days. We have dealt with air pollution, and Mr. Speaker, we find in that bill mirrored very clearly the conception of a Tory government; the conception of a government which is frightened to entrust to the people any initiative action of any kind; a government which simply says that air pollution in urban areas has nothing whatsoever to do with the people in the area unless perchance we the government decide that something can be done about it.

When I asked the Minister of Health whether there was any way in which a citizen in the city of Toronto could initiate a procedure to have a study made of the quality of the air that he breathed, the Minister said: "Oh yes, oh yes, just come to the government." Well, Mr. Speaker, if you look in that bill there is absolutely no way in which a citizen can initiate the action to be taken by the government by way of a survey or a report about the quality of air pollution in an urban area such as Metropolitan Toronto —let alone its inability to, in fact, cope with the question of air pollution from industrial plants in other parts of the province of Ontario.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we had the Minister of Health bowing down before the medical profession as he allowed the medical profession to assert their unilateral rights and deal with the fees that were to be charged by the medical profession. He took no part—

Mr. Speaker: I think the member is trying to bring in to the debate several matters that really are not in the notice of motion. Air pollution is really the only point that he has mentioned so far as being mentioned in this motion and, unless he is drawing an analogy to some of the items in the motion, I would rather he get back on the items outlined in the motion.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Speaker, I had thought that my first comments related to the question of regional development and I thought the question of air pollution, as you say, is strictly within the limits of this debate. But leading on from the position of this government with respect to the question of medicare, we now have the ludicrous statement blazoned across the paper that the government of the province of Ontario is for a universal medicare plan. Then, within a very few hours, the Minister stands up in the House and denies that this is any inference which could be drawn from his remarks whatsoever; that he has not consulted with his colleagues.

Well, next time I suggest to the Minister of Health that he stop consulting with the press until he consults with his colleagues if that is the only information that he is going to give us in the Legislature about this important matter, which this government has kicked around for many, many years and is now on about the third or fourth version.

I want to refer very briefly and within the limits, Mr. Speaker, that you set about the

Prudential Finance Corporation. The Clarkson, Gordon report clearly indicates that, in 1961, Mr. Brien took control of Prudential Finance, it was insolvent; it clearly illustrates that. It illustrates, secondly, that the banks had withdrawn their support from Prudential Finance, that the banking system had refused to lend any money to that corporation and had withdrawn from its position in financing it.

Then Mr. Brien appeared, Mr. Speaker, and endeavoured to enlist other conventional banking facilities to provide funds for Prudential Finance, but was unable to do so. The company then turned to the public of the province of Ontario and the only thing standing between the public of the province of Ontario and the milking of the public by the Prudential Corporation, was the Ontario securities commission—and it failed totally. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no way in which we in this Legislature are ever going to discover the causes of the failure of the Ontario securities commission to protect the public interest.

The Clarkson, Gordon company clearly considered that this was not within the terms of reference that were laid before it, and only passingly referred to that matter. The Ontario securities commission stands condemned in the eyes of the people of the province of Ontario because of the failure of this government to have a public inquiry to find out what was internally wrong with the Ontario securities commission which permitted this particular debacle to take place.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I need only refer to housing and the related question of municipal taxation and the related questions of urban renewal to clearly enunciate to the members of the Legislature that what in fact has happened in the province of Ontario is that there is a crisis in municipal government; there is a crisis in every aspect of municipal government, just as serious as the crisis in the metropolitan area in 1953 which was the forerunner of the metropolitan system of government. The tax system is not operating to meet the needs of the municipalities of the province of Ontario.

The housing programme of this government was displayed last week to be nothing but at the very most a minor effort to deal with the problems relating to housing in the province of Ontario. And there are many more aspects of that which indicate that there is a total feeling of crisis throughout the province of Ontario as to how municipalities, in relation to this government, are going to discharge their responsibilities.

The answer of this government, Mr. Speaker, is the Smith report. Well, Mr. Speaker, events have overrun the government; the dam is about to break. What may have been an answer to the public of Ontario a few short weeks ago—that we could afford to wait for the Smith committee report—no longer has any relevance. We cannot afford to take that kind of leisurely view about the impending problems which relate not only to the urban areas but to the rural areas of the province of Ontario.

What does all this mean—those few random remarks about the various areas of concern to people in the province of Ontario—but one thing and that is that the government of the province of Ontario has had a diminishing relevance to the problems which society faces. The point has been reached where the government is no longer relevant—it has no way of providing solutions to the problems and the reason, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. In any society a government such as this Conservative government must of necessity reach the outer limits of its political philosophy. It has reached that outer limit. It now can no longer generate the kind of ideas that are necessary to meet the problems of the society. They cannot leap the intellectual hurdle beyond the bounds of their political philosophy to look objectively at the problems and realize that the methods that the government is using are not going to solve the problems in the areas of immediate and urgent concern.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that just beyond those outer limits are the problems of a society where this government has no choice, where it has no way of dealing with those problems. It is time this government passed from the scene and re-thought its political philosophy and came back into the political game at some later time when it has something useful to contribute to the solution of these problems.

It is time for this government, Mr. Speaker, to make way for a party—the New Democratic Party—which in its political philosophy has the programmes and the policies that will produce the solutions to the problems of the society in the province of Ontario, in an effective way, in a progressive way, and in an intelligent way.

This government, Mr. Speaker, would do the people of the province of Ontario a favour if it would dissolve this Parliament and let

us go to the people and let us put the position to the people of the province of Ontario, so that in due course we can have a rejuvenation and a renewal of the attack and the endeavours to solve the problems.

There are many more that cannot be dealt with in a short time, Mr. Speaker, but I simply say that this government must go, and the sooner this government goes, the better it will be for the people of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Riverdale complained about his time being shortened some brief amount and then spends that time, not in my view debating this motion, really, but in a political tirade which was mostly sound and fury.

Mr. Bryden: He certainly got under your skin.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He did catch part of the vision. At least he was able to perceive that the government was building, although albeit he thought it was building a dam with mud.

Now that is not the whole vision. Perhaps if we took him up to my part of the country, he would see that the government is building a dam on the Mississagi River to produce power for industry and for a better life for our people. And I catch the vision of little men of the hon. member's party, running around and throwing the mud, and attempting to undermine the foundations of that structure.

That is the situation I perceive.

Mr. MacDonald: You people have done a lot to undermine our way of life.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If these hon. members could come out into the great parts of Ontario and see.

Mr. MacDonald: We have been.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If they had seen the industries which have grown there, established because this government has brought about a climate where industry will seek to come and build and grow and make a life for our people, they would get a better and a truer vision.

The hon. member says this government brings in legislation, gives it first reading and then forgets about it. Let me remind him, and he should not need to be reminded, that he took part in the debates with respect to the securities legislation, a report received in 1965, brought into legislation in 1966 and now in force in this province. I think perhaps even he will admit that this is the most advanced legislation of its kind in the whole field.

Legal aid—the report received in 1965. Legislation enacted in 1966 and in force today, the most outstanding legislation in legal aid that is in existence anywhere and I make no apology for saying that.

Consumer protection. The report of the committee of this House, received in 1965, enacted into legislation in 1966 and in force today. I think this is leading legislation of its kind to be found anywhere, certainly in this country.

Mr. Renwick: Perhaps the Minister would answer a brief question. When was the Act proclaimed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Very recently, I believe. It is now in the hands of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree).

Mr. Singer: The government has not even bothered to get a staff.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I could go on to state the accomplishments of my colleague the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), my colleague, the Minister of Health with his medicare, my colleague the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), and the great programme of the Minister of Highways. And I can go on, and if, as you suggested, these things should be debated elsewhere outside the walls of this House I am sure we shall have a great story of achievement to talk about there.

I would like to say this before I pass on to the two particular items in the resolution, which gave me some concern when I saw them in the motion. The hon. leader of the Opposition talked about the failure of the government to have a plan for regional development.

There is, as he knows, the regional development plan. It is underway. I wish when he was referring to the part that the federal government plays, and when he spoke about the designated areas programme, that he could make his voice felt and heard in Ottawa. He was fair enough to say the programme is not perfect. If he lived where I live in northern Ontario, he would observe in northern Manitoba the designated areas. He would observe designated areas on the eastern side of Ontario, and in northern Quebec, but he would not find any in north-

ern Ontario and we have lost, and I admit this—we have lost industries which would have brought prosperity in greater measure to that area because of the failure, the refusal, and I think the deliberate attitude of the federal government to fail to designate some areas.

Mr. Nixon: Because there is no provincial programme at all.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have.

Mr. MacDonald: All buckpassing.

Mr. Singer: What about ARDA?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, we have lignite. We have transportation. We have timber. We have minerals.

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not develop it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have the seaway. We have everything. But we cannot get the federal government, which has the responsibility, to designate an area. The consequence is that the area still remains depressed in certain places, and industry is led elsewhere.

Mr. Nixon: That is a serious admission to make.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the hon. leader of the Opposition would just make his voice felt in the area where these designations are made.

Mr. Nixon: I am trying to make my voice felt here, if you will just admit it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Make it felt in the government which has the power to forgive taxes, to forgive capital expenditures, make it felt there and perhaps we might see some action.

Mr. Singer: You have not got the power?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have not got power to forgive the type of tax which the federal government imposes.

Mr. Singer: You can forgive your own type of tax.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We not only forgive, we mainly give to the federal people. I wish that message perhaps might get through, too.

Mr. Speaker, the motion refers to the terms of reference of the commission of inquiry into the charges made by Dr. Shulman.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, surely we are not going to let—

Mr. Speaker: I specifically ruled this discussion out of order.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was not aware. I thought there was some area in there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I thought that what had been ruled out was the cause of dismissal, not the width of the terms of reference.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I felt it would not be proper to discuss that.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No harm in trying.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is what I started out to say. The motion further referred to the matter of the lack of an inquiry into the matter of Prudential Finance, and the failure of that corporation. I would say this, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. members are aware that a very full, and complete, and thorough investigation is going on as a result of which charges have been laid. In this area too, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that since then, charges have been laid. Since, I believe it was April 17, that four additional charges were laid against one of the principals. It would be extremely difficult to discuss this matter without being in danger of prejudicing the trial, although it is people against whom criminal charges have been laid, and I do not propose to do so. I think this would be completely improper.

I think Ottawa members may accept the fact that the Clarkson, Gordon firm is carrying on its inquiries in the point of view of audit and the securities commission. And as a result of inquiries being carried on by the securities commission, and its investigating officers, criminal charges have been brought to light. In any investigation of this kind, and I could say Atlantic, the investigation is carried out by persons on the staff of the securities commission and with the investigating officers placed at its disposal. Nothing is lacking, and nothing will be lacking in that inquiry. It will be complete—it will be complete, it will be thorough and it will be full and it will be made public.

Mr. Singer: I always enjoy getting an opportunity to reply to my good friend the Attorney General. And he was really at his best this afternoon as he extolled the wonders and the wisdom of this government; the greatest in the world, he tells us. The greatest in the world—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The greatest in this part of the world, anyway.

Mr. Singer: The greatest in the world in securities legislation, he says. Where is the staff, Mr. Speaker, that is going to administer this Act that is the greatest in the world? Where are salaries they are going to pay to bring good lawyers and good auditors to this important branch of government? When is that going to happen, and when is it really going to be meaningful, that the government brings forward its legislation that is supposed to cure the ills that it has been unable to see with its blind eyes for the past quarter of a century? Where is that, Mr. Speaker, and that was the sort of answer I would not expect from the Attorney General this afternoon.

The greatest in the world, he tells us, insofar as enacting laws about consumer protection. Well, I have already pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that there is no staff yet. I heard the government was to enforce the consumer protection statutes. There is an empty office without any furniture in it. When is the government going to put meaning into its empty words that it brings before this House day after day, week after week, and month after month? Is that the greatest in the world, Mr. Speaker? I think not.

When we backed the Minister of travel and publicity into a corner the other evening, insofar as the cost of the Centennial centre; when we were reading the Prime Minister's wonderful press release written by somebody for him in 1964 about how there was going to be a Centennial building in 1967 to open on July 1, 1967, the Minister of travel and publicity shamefacedly said, "Well, we're not the worst in the world. Japan is a little worse than we, and some other jurisdictions. I think Eastern Slobovia or something, has a little higher cost than we do so we are not the worst in the world."

Mr. Speaker, it is wonderful how these phrases spring so quickly and so idly to the mouths of government spokesmen. Their words are really meaningless as you listen to them in connection with each particular programme.

Now, let me deal for a moment with the inquiry into the Prudential scandal.

I am going to abide certainly, sir, as I always do, by your ruling; I am not going to discuss the cases which are presently pending before the courts. But, Mr. Speaker, when the Attorney General has the gall, and that is exactly what it was this afternoon, to stand up and say, "the public may accept the fact" —that is a direct quote from what he said— "that nothing is lacking", I say, sir, the time has long since passed when we must accept the word of "big brother" that everything is fine.

I say it is not sufficient that government conduct an inquiry behind closed doors, deny access as to what is going on in that inquiry to members of the Legislature, deny access to the news media, emerge periodically with a bit of paper saying, "Aha, we have caught another villain and we have charged him."

I say this is not enough; this is not the answer, sir, as to what caused the Prudential situation to come about. Villains probably there are, and certainly the Attorney General has to do his job in that regard and when a villain has been discovered—charge him, and if he is convicted, let him suffer the full penalty of the law; but what about the major villain? The major villain, Mr. Speaker—and I am not contravening your ruling—the major villain is this government. Nobody has inquired into why this came about. Nobody has inquired why there was no action in 1963 or 1964 or 1965 or 1966 or 1967. Nobody has inquired into that.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, no junior official newly hired into the securities commission and paid a very nominal salary as a lawyer, as an inquirer, could be expected to inquire into the actions of the hon. Attorney General; into the actions of the former chairman of the Ontario securities commission; into the actions of the present Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Well, if he did, he would have been gotten rid of more quickly than that man whose name we cannot mention this afternoon. They would have just swept him out the door, Mr. Speaker. Fine, we have an open full inquiry because the Attorney General says we may accept the fact that nothing is lacking. If nothing is lacking, why then should we not have a full open public inquiry and why was someone not instructed to inquire into the action or lack of action by the government? That is the point, Mr. Speaker, and that is the point that the gentlemen on the government benches have com-

pletely overlooked. And that is the reason why the public is not satisfied, and that is reason why the big brother answer just is not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, the government's conduct in this, in denying members of the Opposition the opportunity to examine into these facts in any one of our standing committees, speaks for itself. The conduct of this inquiry behind closed doors again speaks for itself, and the idle words of the Attorney General are certainly no answer, sir.

Now I want to talk about the Niagara parks commission just for a moment. And I see that the member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) is here. I am sorry the hon. Minister without Portfolio is not here. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, even though it is in line with the government's big brother attitude, that the Prime Minister of this province will stand in his place and say, "I am not going to tell you whether people have resigned from a public commission or not."

Can you imagine that kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker? We spend public money to run the Niagara parks system, as my leader pointed out this afternoon; $9 million we voted this year, and the Prime Minister stands in his place after stories appear in the press and he says, "I am not going to tell you if anybody resigned or not. You will have to find out, because it is written to me in a private and confidential letter."

What arrant nonsense, Mr. Speaker—complete arrant nonsense and arrogance that goes along with it.

Surely we are entitled to know, sir, what has gone on in the Niagara parks commission and surely the members of the Legislature are entitled to make the kind of inquiry that would be meaningful by allowing this whole matter to come up before one of the standing committees of this House. The committee on commissions would be most appropriate. But no, the committee on commissions apparently is going to meet at one o'clock on Thursday and it will now deal with the Ontario hospital services commission.

That is fine; that is probably the last meeting it will have before the election. Any thought of bringing the Niagara parks commission before it? Not a thought in the world. Any thought, Mr. Speaker, of having the member for Welland stand in his place and say why he resigned?

Any thought of bringing before the standing committee that eminent gentleman, Mr. Daley, who served so well as a Cabinet Minister for so many years and was highly regarded by all members—to allow him to say in front of legislators why he resigned? Any thought of bringing the hon. Minister without Portfolio, Mr. Speaker, before the committee to allow him to explain his answer to the charges made in the press by Mr. Daley?

Mr. Nixon: He will not speak either.

Mr. Singer: No sir, big brother will not allow that. Big brother says, "I am not going to tell you. I am not going to tell you why people resign—it is none of your business". Well, Mr. Speaker it is the business of the people of Ontario as to why these things have gone on and as to why the Opposition, why the public is denied the necessary and important information.

I say, Mr. Speaker, this is what is going to defeat this government. They have been there too long—they are arrogant, they are overbearing, and they deny people the information they are entitled to. And for these reasons alone the people of Ontario are going to do something about this terrible situation.

Hopefully, sir, and I am not too optimistic about this—hopefully the good commonsense of my remarks will make some impression on some of the activated sludge over there, such as the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett). If he would just wait for the rest of the phrase he would have the full context of my remarks. But apparently it is a hopeless task. Trying to make an impression on someone as fixed in his views, as stilted in his thinking, as the hon. Minister, is really an impossible task, so we will leave him alone.

The only mistake, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin made in his great list of activated sludge was the fact that he neglected to remove the word "activated". Had he removed that it would have been a very good description really of what has gone on in that particular department in which he has some share of the responsibility. I did notice on the way by, Mr. Speaker, that he referred to the rivers that flow into Lake Ontario. I would ask him if he has bothered to travel the Don Valley parkway recently, and as he has travelled it, if he has bothered to look just along the side of it at the beautiful condition of the Don River. This impressive list of statistics has not taken any of the activated, or deactivated, or any other kind of sludge or pollution out of that river. I am sure that he would agree with me because he is a fair man, Mr.

Speaker, and an honest man. This great programme that he has been talking about has had no effect at all on the Don River, in fact it is worse than it was 10 years ago when the Ontario water resources commission was in fact set up. So all I can say is, where is this programme to remove pollution from the rivers and the lakes in the vicinity of our largest city? I suggest that it is non-existent.

I am afraid that the time restrictions have sort of caught me in mid-voice. I have so many more things I would like to say on this motion but I am sure that if the hon. members opposite did listen they will accept the obvious logic of what I have said and will rise and support the motion put up by my hon. leader.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest to the members of the House that they vote against this motion. I had really planned to do so a little earlier, and when the last speaker said that he was the victim of time I suppose I could say that I am a really greater victim than he is because this debate was supposed to end three minutes ago according to the agreement that we have bandied about here earlier today. However, I will not say what I had planned on saying. I was going to deal at some length with the whole problem of regional development because I am firmly convinced that at least the Opposition members in this House really do not have the vaguest idea what the government is doing in this area, and I would suggest to you further that they have no interest in it. I made a complete statement. If you refer to the debates of February 2 you will see a long statement that I put on the record and gave to this House at that time dealing with the whole question of regional development.

Mr. Bryden: That was a rehash of last year's statement.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course it is not a rehash. That is my friend the interrupter again. He cannot bear to sit there when somebody else has the floor without jumping in with interjections. It does not bother me as long as the Speaker is prepared not to recognize 6 o'clock for a few minutes—it certainly does not bother me at all. But I would like to make a few comments regarding the speech of the hon. member for Riverdale, and the last speaker, because in both these cases it seemed to me that the entire burden of their remarks revolved around the question of an election. And I would just like to stand in my place and say this to the House. We are here for the purpose of doing the business of the people of the province.

We have before us, I suppose, another billion dollars' worth of government expenditures which have to be voted. We have before the House in various pieces of legislation the culmination of a programme which we started five or six years ago and which has proceeded on a very orderly basis. We on this side of the House intend to complete what we have started on behalf of the people of this province. I was particularly interested in the derision that has been thrown upon the remarks of the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin because he happens to be dealing with a subject which certainly is—it would seem, as far as I can make out, that if nobody has anything else to talk about in this province they go out and make a big speech about what the government has not done in the field of pollution. The member for Wellington-Dufferin gets up and delivers some remarks which certainly are very pertinent, which bear exactly on the subject, which refute the allegations made by the Opposition. But will they listen? No.

They want to throw fun at him. They want to deride, to denigrate, to cut down. And I might say this, that last night in this Legislature there were $99 million voted for pollution and in the water resources commission, and not one word from the Opposition party; not one single word, and yet you have the effrontery today to get up and make fun of a speech which tells the people of this province what this government is doing.

Now I suggest to you exactly this: You are not interested in having the people know what is being done. This is the point. You put a notice of motion like this in the paper and yet you say "no inquiries"; you blame us for not telling the people when we try to tell you. Why do you interrupt? Yes, I heard it. I was sitting right under the gallery here and I heard every word of it. Certainly, you do not want to hear and you do not want the people to hear. You are the ones who choke off debate in this House, make fun of it, deride it. But when you had a chance last night—$99 million voted last night for the Ontario water resources commission, whose responsibility it is to look after pollution and the supply of water in this province. And that $99 million was voted without one word of comment from the Opposition.

Now, in suggesting to the members of this House that they vote against this motion, I would make this suggestion: Let us forget about the election for a while and let us think

about what is to be done for the people of this province. Let us address ourselves to the the legislation on the books and let us have no more comments about bills receiving first reading and nothing being done. Show me what bill has been left here with one reading? Just take the order paper and show me one.

The hon. member is building up straw men in order to knock them down, and this is what he accuses us of doing. You are trying to fight the election in the Legislature. The government is here to govern. We are here to introduce legislation and to put it through this House for the benefit of the people. My suggestion to hon. members is, to stop talking and thinking about the election, and stop your actions in this House in terms of an election. Let us get down to business and get it done and let us tell the people. Join with us when we tell the people what this government has done and what is being done for the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, my time is up and therefore, for these reasons, I would simply add there is much more I could say. But I will have an opportunity, believe me, I will have lots of opportunity right in this House, there will be plenty of opportunity to prove the complete fallacy of the reasoning contained in this motion. One member I thought made a very good contribution to this debate when he said that the motion was very poorly drawn, I think that is about the kindest thing you could say about this particular motion.

However, we agreed to it because we do not mind debating these things. We face these debates with interest. We like to hear what you have to say and particularly am I interested in what you do not have to say—when I can sit here and listen to the complete lack of anything new in a debate that has lasted for three hours, in the terms of the contribution you people have made. When the vote is put, I suggest, forget about your electioneering, forget about all your catch phrases and forget about activated sludge and how much fun it is, and let us get on with the business of running this province for the benefit of the people thereof.

The House divided on the motion proposed by Mr. Nixon, which was negatived on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Ben	Allan
Braithwaite	Auld
Bryden	Bales
Davison	Bernier
Farquhar	Boyer
Gaunt	Brunelle
Gisborn	Butler
Gordon	Carruthers
Lewis (Scarborough West)	Carton
MacDonald	Connell
Newman	Cowling
Nixon	Davis
Paterson	Demers
Renwick	Downer
Singer	Dunlop
Smith	Dymond
Spence	Eagleson
Taylor	Edwards
Trotter	Evans
Worton	Ewen
Young—21.	Grossman
	Harris
	Haskett
	Henderson
	Hodgson (Scarborough East)
	Hodgson (Victoria)
	Johnston (Parry Sound)
	Johnston (Carleton)
	Kerr
	Knox
	Lawrence (Russell)
	Lawrence (St. George)
	Mackenzie
	Morningstar
	Noden
	Price
	Randall
	Reuter
	Robarts
	Root
	Rowe
	Sandercock
	Simonett
	Spooner
	Stewart
	Thrasher
	Villeneuve
	Walker
	Wardrope
	Wells
	White
	Whitney
	Wishart
	Yakabuski—54.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 21, the "nays" 54.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

All those in favour that the Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply, please say "aye".

All those opposed, please say "nay".

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

The House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Health.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.10 o'clock p.m.

No. 70

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 20, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 20, 1967

Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, bill to amend, Mr. Gisborn, first reading 2401

Department of Tourism and Information Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Auld, first reading 2401

Ontario Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, 1967, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, first reading 2401

Tabling report, Mr. Dymond 2401

Question to Mr. Connell re salaries of cleaning and maintenance staff of the government, Mr. Spence 2401

Question to Mr. Davis re expanded facilities for retraining programmes, Mr. Walker 2402

Question to Mr. Davis re adult retraining, Mr. MacDonald 2402

Question to Mr. Dymond re advertising of meat, Mr. Gaunt 2403

Statement re annual conference on addictions and sexual deviation, Mr. Grossman 2403

Questions to Mr. Spooner re the city of Ottawa and the central Canada exhibition association, Mr. Racine 2404

Question to Mr. Rowntree re automobile insurance premiums, Mr. Renwick 2406

Human Tissue Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading 2406

Pesticides Act, 1967, bill intituled, Mr. Dymond, second reading 2406

Township of Cornwall, bill respecting, Mr. Spooner, second reading 2407

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond 2407

Recess, 6 o'clock 2436

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, St. Dunstan's separate school, Scarborough; and in the west gallery Canadian Martyr separate school, Toronto; and in both galleries, Leamington public school, Leamington.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, at present the mandatory vacational pay is one week a year during the first three years and then two weeks a year thereafter. The purpose of the amendment is to increase the mandatory vacations with pay to three weeks during the first ten years and then four weeks a year thereafter.

The amendment also provides provisions for the payment of vacation pay before vacations.

THE DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION ACT, 1966

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Department of Tourism and Information Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the amendments permit the Minister to take more active part in the development of historical parks; to permit the establishment of advisory committees to participate in the development and operation of historical parks, and authorizes the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to make regulations governing the use of historical parks.

THE ONTARIO DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION ACT, 1967

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, 1967.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, when I introduced the bill establishing the Ontario deposit insurance corporation I said, among other things, that it is our intention to continue to cooperate with the federal authority and to direct Ontario companies to participate in the federal scheme at such time as it is available. The Canada deposit insurance corporation started insuring federally incorporated companies effective April 17, last Monday, and certain by-laws have been enacted under that statute.

The bill I am introducing today permits Ontario incorporated loan corporations and trust companies to become members of the Canada deposit insurance corporation, and thereby be insured under that federal statute. It is our intention to proceed, pursuant to this amendment I am introducing today, with the necessary steps to accomplish what I have stated.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the sixteenth annual report for the year ending December 31, 1966, of the alcohol and drug addiction research foundation.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask of the Minister of Public Works, of which I have given notice.

Would the Minister tell the House whether he has plans to negotiate a salary increase for

members of the cleaning and maintenance staff of the government?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to support salary adjustments in order to be competitive with similar work being done under similar conditions elsewhere. However, the salary of the class to which these people belong, building cleaner and maintenance, is under the programme of cyclical salary review. Salaries are determined by negotiation between the civil service association of Ontario and the government. If negotiation fails, mediation and/or arbitration can be used to effect settlement.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a supplementary question?

I understand there are both men and women on this cleaning and maintenance staff of the government. Is it true that women receive $1.69 an hour and the men receive $2.06 for the same work?

An hon. member: Forty cents difference? You will never get anywhere with women doing that.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if you would call it the same work or not, but for the member's information, the female night cleaners are paid $1.69 per hour for a 27.5-hour work week, which includes a paid lunch period of one-half hour per night. The male night cleaners are paid $1.94 to $2.06 per hour for a 38.75-hour week, which includes a paid lunch period of three-quarters of an hour per night.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education.

In view of requests for expanded retraining facilities for unemployed workers in the Oshawa area, what does, or can, your department do to provide more expanded facilities for retraining programmes?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the retraining programme in Oshawa has really been one of expansion during the past year. The reasons, of course, for this expansion are varied, but perhaps the most important one is the increased allowances which were put into effect last summer, and these allowances permit many individuals to attend, who last year could not have afforded to do so. These new courses have spurred interest, and this year courses in commercial stenography, welding and fitting and English for new Canadians have been introduced. On the academic side, instruction is now available from grade 1 to grade 12.

I think one of the most important and gratifying aspects of the retraining programme is the increased attention being paid by a large number of students to the importance of academic upgrading. In numerical terms, where last year the programme had some 150 students at its peak, it has now about 800.

The industrial lay-offs in this vicinity, have also, of course, had an effect on the need for expansion, but the widespread impression that these courses were introduced solely to look after men laid off, is not in accordance with the facts.

Workers who have been laid off within the past six months represent about one-third of the total student population.

To determine what additional accommodation was required in light of the rapid expansion, meetings were held with the Oshawa board of education in February, and it was agreed that it was impracticable to design for what appeared to be, shall we say, an artificial peak enrolment, but certainly increased facilities would be an asset. Several different techniques of obtaining additional space were suggested to the board and their decision is expected shortly.

Another recent development is the approval of the purchase of a site for the Ontario Durham college, and when the college facilities are available, this will give the retraining programme added space and flexibility as all local educational facilities are intended to be used.

I must say that regardless of where this extra space is finally realized, it is assumed that the federal government will cooperate with financial assistance, although the exact terms are not known at this time. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that the officials of the department have cooperated in every way possible in establishing retraining programmes in the Oshawa area and will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker: Are all the questions somewhat along the same lines?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is a related question, but different, Mr. Speaker.

Is the Minister in a position to clarify the situation in which a change of Ottawa regulations with regard to adult retraining is expected to cut some 10,000 people from classes over the next year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think Mr. Speaker, as I received the question it was 7,000, not 10,000.

Mr. MacDonald: It was my mistake.

Hon. Mr. Davis: At the federal-provincial conference in Ottawa on October 24, sir, the federal government made the unexpected announcement that it was withdrawing all capital support from the field of education.

The federal government announced that federal funds would be channelled to the manpower retraining programme which was declared to be outside education and, therefore, a suitable instrument of federal policy. Not to precipitate any debate, Mr. Speaker, I should say that I question whether one can divide education into education and training, but this is a philosophical argument that we might pursue at the time of the estimates of The Department of Education.

The federal government in assuming responsibility for manpower training, announced regulations which made significant changes to the existing adult retraining programmes. After careful study, Ontario officials concluded that the proposed federal regulations would create serious problems and in some cases were not workable. Consultation with other provinces indicated strong support for the Ontario position.

The standing committee of Ministers of education wrote on several occasions to the federal authorities indicating that there were very serious problems and requesting a meeting to discuss policy matters. The federal government has not met with the Ministers. The provinces, Mr. Speaker, have been put in the difficult position of observing decisions in education and training being made by the federal government which has no experience in the operational aspect of the programme, and which rather consistently ignored the advice of the provinces who have accumulated valuable experience.

I would like to assure this House that The Ontario Department of Education, and I believe I can say the departments of education of our sister provinces, remain most willing to cooperate with the federal government in the interests of the citizens requiring retraining. I have been in touch with the office of the Minister of Manpower requesting a meeting at the earliest possible time to see if we can resolve the difficulties that were referred to in the question posed by the member for York South.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health, notice of which has been given.

In view of the report prepared for the Ontario food council by H. E. McGill, the Ontario livestock commissioner, which alleges the existence of misleading advertising and promotion in the marketing of meat, what action, if any, will the Minister take to protect the public against alleged deceptive practices in this area?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, since this is directed at advertising it really does not come within the purview of The Public Health Act. I have, therefore, no authority and it would seem to me that any action to be taken in this area would either have to be taken by the federal food and drug directorate or by the Ontario food council, since this has reference to misleading advertising.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day:

Once again I have the pleasure of extending an invitation to the hon. members of this House to attend the fourth annual conference on addictions and sexual deviation, sponsored by The Department of Reform Institutions. It will be held at the Alex G. Brown memorial clinic on Thursday, April 27 and Friday, April 28. You will note from the title that the scope of this year's conference has been extended to include the subject area of sexual deviation.

The aim of this conference is to offer those involved and interested in these fields of concern, an opportunity to be made aware of the latest developments in programmes and research in the areas of alcohol, barbiturate and narcotic addiction, and sexual deviation.

In keeping with the high standards set by the three previous conferences, we have invited three eminent guest speakers. Dr. Bruno Cormier is associate professor, department of psychiatry, and director of the clinic in forensic psychiatry, McGill University. Mr. Leon Brill, who was a guest at an earlier conference, is the project director of the Washington Heights rehabilitation centre. Dr. Ruth Fox is the medical director of the national council on alcoholism in New York, and is a practising psychoanalyst in New York city.

Other features of the conference will include addresses by Mr. W. E. Marshall, supervising psychologist at the Alex G. Brown memorial clinic; Mr. Robert Robinson, director of education for the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation; Miss A. D. Nicholson, administrator of adult female institutions, Department of Reform Institutions; as well as inter-disciplinary panel discussions including the guest speakers and members of the clinical staff.

Invitations have been extended to agencies and societies working in the field of addictions, as well as police departments, magistrates, probation services, and university and education department workers in this area.

The invitational brochure now on each member's desk indicates the broad range of topics that will be discussed at this conference. I am sure that hon. members will find the sessions extremely interesting, and their attendance would be most welcome.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways, notice of which has been given.

Would the Minister advise the House whether all contracts have been let for improvements to Highway 6 north and south of Highway 401, and when are the improvement schedules to be completed?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take this as notice.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

In view of the Minister's decision not to recommend the appointment of a commission to inquire into certain matters involving the corporation of the city of Ottawa and the central Canada exhibition association, would the Minister tell the House whether he would arrange to provide all information respecting the granting of a ten-year lease to the central Canada exhibition association, as requested by elected representatives of the city?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): In answer to the hon. member's question, I think perhaps I should provide some preamble information. The petitioners who provided me with the petition, also provided me with a photostatic copy of an unsigned lease between the corporation of the city of Ottawa and the central Canada exhibition association. I would presume, therefore, that if the petitioners were able to obtain a photostatic copy of an unsigned lease, that they do not have to get it from me; they can go to the city clerk of the city of Ottawa and obtain as many copies as they wish.

And furthermore, I would suggest to the hon. member that no lease can be entered into between the corporation of the city of Ottawa and the central Canada exhibition association unless a by-law is passed. And as far as I have been able to ascertain, no such by-law has been passed by the city council of the city of Ottawa.

I would suggest that he might refer to section 215 of The Municipal Act and section 216 of the same Act, which provides that the clerk of the municipality has certain responsibilities with respect to furnishing documents that are in his possession.

Therefore I see, to begin with, no responsibility on my part or on the part of my department to supply this particular copy of a ten-year lease, because as far as I know, there is no such lease in effect. When I reexamined my files I found again an unsigned photostatic copy of a lease, and I can only come to the conclusion that there is no such lease in effect now. I would suggest to the hon. member that those who are requesting this material from him should be directed to the city clerk of the city of Ottawa, who would be able to provide them with all the information that there is in connection with this matter.

I am sorry I cannot be of any further assistance to him at this time.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, would the Minister allow a supplementary question? I wonder, has the Minister received representations from groups other than elected municipal representatives regarding this matter? I understand there were some groups which were sending a petition to the Minister of Municipal Affairs asking for an inquiry into the matter.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, that is quite correct. I received two petitions, one signed by a group of ratepayers or presumably ratepayers, and the other signed by a number of members of the city of Ottawa municipal council. I spoke to some of these people on the long-distance telephone and I was rather surprised that they were not aware that members of the city council certainly should be able to obtain documents that are in the hands of the city council or the city clerk. I recommended to them that that was the place to get their information. Now, whether they have sought to pursue that course of action or not, I am not aware. But the documents that are of public interest are available at the clerk's office.

They may have to pay 10 cents for every hundred words but I would doubt very much that the clerk of the city of Ottawa would have enough nerve to ask a member of the city council to pay ten cents for a hundred words. Of course, that is his business if he wants to follow The Municipal Act.

But those documents are in the hands of the city of Ottawa council and as far as I

am aware, the council itself has not entered into a lease agreement. They may have done so since I last received information from my staff on that situation, but what I am saying is, that is the place to obtain the information as to what action the city council has really taken.

If the hon. member thinks I can be of any further assistance I will be glad to cooperate, but the suggestions that are contained in the petitions are that there are certain facts that are known: They are known to the members of the city council, and they are known to the petitioners, and if the council of Ottawa has gone beyond its powers then it is up to the courts to decide. Any ratepayer can take an action before the county judge to have a by-law ruled invalid or have the by-law quashed, and I am not the judge of the county of Carleton, nor am I a judge of the Supreme Court.

Hon. W. D. McKeough: (Minister without Portfolio): He is not even a QC.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am not even a QC. In giving advice to the petitioners I thought I was being of service by suggesting that under certain sections of the law as it exists now, their remedy was before the courts. For some reason or other they do not wish to do that. I am sorry I cannot be of any greater assistance.

Mr. MacDonald: After this afternoon the hon. Minister should become a ghost writer for Ripley's *Believe It or Not*.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I would like to thank the hon. member very much for the compliment.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) who is not in this afternoon, but I would like to put it on the record at this time.

Did the Prime Minister tell a group of municipal officials that the Smith report on taxation would not be ready until June as was reported in today's *Globe and Mail*?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce needs to redirect his question.

Mr. Gaunt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that my question does touch on perhaps three departments—The Department of Health, The Department of Agriculture and Food and The Department of Commercial and Financial Affairs—and in view of the fact also that it deals with advertising and promotion, perhaps it would be more properly directed toward the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Would it be proper to give this question as notice at this time to the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes I would be glad to look into it.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a matter that I would like to bring to your attention for your advice. I received in the mail yesterday a script of a radio programme by Gordon Sinclair that deals with the NDP, and a few weeks ago a similar script by another radio announcer that dealt with the Liberal Party. In the past there have been other radio scripts made available to us as members that deal in a political sense with the Conservative Party.

In the last case they arrived properly identified in the easily recognizable blue envelope that the executive assistant to the Prime Minister uses, but the others arrived in our mail to the Legislative post office which is under your control, I understand, without any identification whatsoever. My own feeling is that some over-zealous press assistant to a Minister may be doing this, but I ask you, sir, if it is allowable that this material, interesting though it may be, be placed in our boxes without identification and perhaps at public expense.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I just intercede briefly to say that I have no objection to that being spread about because I am convinced the more it is spread about the more votes we will get.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I may say I am not aware of this piece of news. If the member would pass it over—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, it makes very interesting reading but this is not the first time it has happened.

Mr. Speaker: I would say this. Repeatedly, there are outside interests who wish to place mail on the members' desks, and my office repeatedly refuses them and tells them that if they want the members to get this mail they must put it through the post office and place a stamp on it. We make then mail it.

I will look into this matter and if somebody is putting things coming from outside to the members in the box, they may do so if they put a four-cent stamp on it, and I will see that they do so.

Mr. Nixon: You will tell us where that one came from?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was probably the member for York South. He said himself that it would get votes for the NDP.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I did not, although I admit again I do not object to its distribution, though I share with the leader of the Opposition some curiosity as to what zealous footman of the Conservative Party or government did get it all in circulation.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I may have missed it because I was late arriving, but did the Minister of Health reply to the question I put before him yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I did not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have two outstanding questions for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, one from Friday last, and one from yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not have the material. The material is on my desk and I will be in a position to look at it with respect to Friday's question.

With respect to yesterday, this question had to do with a press release by a Mr. D. B. Martin, one of the insurance underwriting groups. I have spoken with representatives of the industry who do not necessarily subscribe to the view referred to by the hon. member for Riverdale. As is known, there are two major conferences that deal with insurance, the Canadian underwriters association and the independent insurance conference. I am informed that actuarial figures for the first two months of this year are now being analyzed and that based on the information available there is nothing in the thinking of those two groups that would indicate a rise in the cost of premiums as suggested. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, one party of some seniority in those organizations intimated to me privately that there might even be a possibility of a slight reduction, in automobile premiums.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE HUMAN TISSUE ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill 75, An Act to amend The Human Tissue Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PESTICIDES ACT, 1967

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill 76, The Pesticides Act, 1967.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have just a few brief comments on this particular bill. There are, I guess, three principles involved here, all of which are very worthy. However, I do feel that in this province we should perhaps be going a little bit further in this area than we have heretofore.

I suggested earlier in the session that perhaps we should be taking under advisement some of the things that they are doing in California in connection with pesticides—their use and their application. In California they do have registered outlets for pesticides; they do require the people who purchase those pesticides to come in and sign a register indicating the amount of the application, the location, and any other details that might be pertinent to the use of that particular ingredient.

It is my feeling that we are dealing with very lethal substances. They are substances that can have very ill effects on human health if misused. They are materials which can have long-lasting effects, perhaps effects that we are not entirely aware of at the moment. In other words, what I am saying is the full implications of the misuse of pesticides is not known to us at the moment, but we do know this much, that they are very dangerous, that they are very potent. I think we should be taking steps to control them to the extent which I have suggested.

It seems to me that if we adopt a very sensible and reasoned approach when there is no particular danger to human health—and I feel that to be the case at the moment—then we can continue to use the materials in a well controlled atmosphere. But if we continue to mark time while these things continue to be abused—as they sometimes are—then I think we get ourselves into the position where we will have to come in with emergency measures in order to control a bad situation which could have been prevented had we taken the necessary steps in the first instance.

I suggest to the Minister that he consider these things, because I think they are important in the whole area of controlling pesticides and the use and application of pesticides. I feel that he should give these things consideration. I think we all support the principle of the bill. It is one step in the right direction, but I feel that it should go

even further than this, and move along the lines which I have suggested.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I will take it under advisement.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF CORNWALL

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 81, An Act respecting the township of Cornwall.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 26th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): At the time I introduced my estimates last year, I informed the House we were launching into a complete re-organization of The Department of Health. I am pleased to say this has now become a reality, and this explains why the format of the estimates differs from that of last year.

Reference to pages six and seven of the 42nd annual report of The Department of Health, recently distributed, will show in graphic form the organizational structure, with explanation in detail. It is anticipated most of the major changes will be accomplished during the year. Several of the appointments have been made already and in these estimates before you I am asking for funds to recruit additional personnel, as well as funds to implement the many changes in the health services and care for the people of Ontario, which are being recommended to this House.

In essence, the department is now comprised of four divisions—mental health division, financial and administrative services division, medical services insurance division, and public health division. Each division, consisting of two or more branches, reports through an executive director to the Deputy Minister. In addition, there are five specialized branches providing supporting services to the department as a whole: research and planning branch, information branch, personnel branch, legal branch and data processing branch. They report directly to the Deputy Minister, and are included in the estimates as "departmental administration".

You will note we have shown separately all general grants to organizations, associations, and so on, including those administered by central office. Other grants have been allocated to the respective division and again shown under the branch responsible for the administration of the service.

Funds requested for the financial and administrative services division are required to carry out the various functions such as accounting, auditing, office service accommodation, purchasing, and so on.

The public health division consists of four branches. Under the local health services branch, grants are provided for official health agencies, some of which—called health units—were formerly under public health administration branch. Similarly, the grants for school dental services, now under this branch, were formerly under dental branch.

There has been little change in the format of the estimates for the laboratories branch, while many items in the special health services branch were heretofore shown individually in the estimates. The services of this branch include tuberculosis prevention, registered nursing assistants, medical rehabilitation, chronic care, maternal and child health, epidemiology, the provision of biologicals, emergency health services, which includes ambulance service, and so on.

The funds for the environmental health branch are required for various services relating to air pollution, pesticides control, environmental health laboratories, public health engineering radiation protection, and so on.

The format of the estimates for the medical services insurance division is similar in layout to that of last year. However, this division has been re-organized into three branches. It will be noted that data processing branch is no longer provided under this division, as it has become a service branch for the entire department and is included, as mentioned previously, in departmental administration.

There is no change in the format relating to the estimates for the Ontario hospital services commission.

Ontario council of health: The council has met on three occasions since it was established by order-in-council in June, 1966, after it had been announced in this House.

Already, areas of interest which are of fundamental importance to the further planned development of health services in

the province have been identified by council and a series of committees set up to examine these matters.

There is a separate committee for each of the following: (1) health manpower; (2) education of the health disciplines; (3) regional organization of health services; (4) physical resources; (5) health research; (6) health statistics; (7) library services.

These committees have been given broad terms of reference and freedom of action in order that they may carry out their tasks with maximum despatch.

The council has been most successful in attracting to serve on these committees, a very knowledgeable and active group of individuals from all areas in the province, representing a very wide range of interests, not only scientific and professional, but also from industry, labour and commerce.

As a result of this developing effort it is expected that these committees will be making significant recommendations to council during the course of this year.

The support work for this council of health activity is being carried out by the newly formed research and planning branch of the department.

This branch includes an operational research and planning potential, a research grants section, a health statistics service, and a library.

A recruitment programme is underway now to acquire the research personnel required for the branch. These will include not only physicians and nurses, and other health professions, but also economists, sociologists, systems analysts, and so on, and also the necessary technological support, so that the most modern techniques of scientific analysis can be employed.

It is the intention that when the additional research and technical staff have been hired that the branch, in addition to the support role for the council of health, will develop a programme of operational research into the effectiveness of health services programmes. Some of this work will be carried out directly by the branch; however, it will also encourage and sponsor complementary operational research projects being carried out in universities and health agencies.

Data processing: Members will note that the proposed expenditure for a data processing branch is $1,995,000. Prior to the re-organization of the department, data processing was carried out in a number of locations. We are now planning to establish a focal point for all data processing, not only for the department, but also to receive information from a variety of sources. This facility will form the hub of a health statistics and health intelligence system. I expect the health statistics committee of the Ontario council of health to develop the detail and propose suitable arrangements for a comprehensive statistical and intelligence system. This system is required for the planning, development and evaluation of health services in Ontario.

You will recall that the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) announced in 1965 a comprehensive programme for the development of health resources in this province. A senior coordinating committee was established composed of the Deputy Minister of Health (chairman), Deputy Minister of University Affairs, and the chairman of the Ontario hospital services commission. This committee has been meeting usually at weekly intervals and is supported by technical and professional staff in the agencies concerned. A close working relationship is maintained with the committee on university affairs and the Ontario council of health.

The council, through its committee structure, is providing advice in many areas. The presidents of the universities and their advisers in the health sciences are collaborating with the committee and defining the role of the particular university in education, training and research for the health sciences. The potential of the colleges of applied arts and technology is also being explored.

Hospital participation in terms of interest in education and research and also as service agencies is receiving full attention. A regional concept is being developed with regard to certain training programmes. Our preliminary estimates would indicate that the federal health resources fund would need to be at least doubled to provide the level of support set out for that fund if Ontario's needs are to be met. However, "bricks and mortar" are not enough and the province has substantially extended its programme of bursary assistance and through the Ontario council of health will be defining a provincial role in health research, which will be complementary to the federal government. In this way we will be prepared to play our part in reversing the "brain drain".

The remarks I had proposed to make on the public health division, sir, were prepared before the amendment to The Public Health Act was introduced. Since they have already been submitted to this House, I will spare the time and attention of the House and ask your permission to have this included in *Hansard*, since it has already been detailed.

Regarding local health services: The Department of Health for many years has supported the development of strong local public health services through the establishment of health units which, since 1945, have received provincial grants as well as consultative services from members of the department. Because of the needs at the present time for local boards of health to move into new areas of service, we propose the following programme so that the people of this province will receive the benefits of the best possible public health service from their local boards of health:

(a) Full time public health services: Since the introduction of health unit grants in 1945 there has been steady growth in the number of health units established, and at the present time over 95 per cent of the people in Ontario are served by full time public health services either in health units or in local municipalities. Experience has shown that such full time services are absolutely necessary if the public health needs of a community are to be met satisfactorily.

Legislation now before the House will require municipalities not now receiving such services to provide these, either by establishing a health unit or joining with an existing health unit. In some parts of the territorial districts this would be difficult because of the scattered population. In such cases an alternative will be provided allowing organized municipalities to contract directly with the department for the provision of these services. This may be done through our own northern Ontario public health service, which was established some years ago to provide public health services to the unorganized municipalities.

(b) Grants to municipal boards of health: Although grants have been paid since 1945 to municipalities that have established health units, no grants have been paid to the large urban municipalities that have provided full time public health services with programmes similar to health units. In order that the programmes in these urban health departments may be strengthened, legislation already introduced will provide a 25 per cent grant to all municipal boards of health that provide a satisfactory programme of public health services through the employment of full-time qualified staff. This will be effective April 1, 1967.

(c) Grants to cities in health units: Over the years grants have been paid to cities that form part of health units, at a lower level than those paid to other types of municipalities in health units. While this differential grant was necessary in the early years of the health unit programme in order to encourage the smaller municipalities to obtain full-time services, it is in my opinion no longer indicated. To encourage the strengthening of programmes in health units, which include cities, it is proposed to increase the grants to all municipalities in health units to 50 per cent of approved expenditures.

(d) Health districts: Over the past 20 years it has become apparent that to provide an adequate level of public health service, a large population must be served by the health unit or the local health department. Many of our health units have been established on county boundaries and recently have experienced increasing problems in properly serving these areas because of the small populations under their jurisdiction.

In order to encourage the establishment of larger units, a grant of 75 per cent will be paid beginning January 1, 1968, to all municipalities forming part of a health district. The boundaries of these health districts will be prepared by my department in consultation with local authorities. In northern Ontario, health districts will generally be established following the territorial district boundaries.

The underlying purpose of the increased grants to local public health services is the realization that many new projects must become the responsibility of local boards of health to be carried out by their staff. Up to the present time each board of health has been autonomous in the development of the programme which they feel to be best suited to meet their individual needs. I feel that this no longer can continue and we must establish a provincial objective and standards for programmes to be provided to all people in Ontario, and I believe the increased grants to the boards of health will allow them to aim for and achieve a high level of service for their people.

In order that provincial objectives may be established, I have set up under my Deputy Minister of Health a number of advisory committees and task forces made up of persons expert in their own field to advise on specific programmes. These areas of programming include: Dental health services; tuberculosis prevention; maternal and child health services, including school health services, family planning clinics, cancer detection; immunizing agents; medical rehabilitation; adult health services, including chronic care facilities, multiphasic screening programmes, adult health clinics; home care; community mental health; accident prevention—including

medical aspects of home and road accidents; ambulance services; food control; zoonoses, with particular reference to rabies.

A number of these task forces have already been established and have made their reports. For example, the measles vaccination programme already announced to you was prepared by our immunizing agents advisory committee and our own departmental experts. In my opinion this is the most up-to-date programme in this area being contemplated by any province in Canada. Our task force on tuberculosis prevention have discussed the programme that must be introduced to keep pace with the many changes that are occurring in the field of prevention, treatment and rehabilitation aspects of such a programme.

A meeting will be held in the very near future with all our full-time medical officers of health, and the chairman of each board of health to discuss in great detail with them this new plan for increased support to strengthen the local health services available to each person within this province.

Since the inception of this programme of homes for special care to its present stage of development—that is, from June, 1964, to January, 1967—3,200 patients have been discharged from Ontario hospitals to nursing homes, and over 600 patients discharged to residential homes. Of this total, 300 have been returned to Ontario hospitals for a short time for restabilization and sent back to the programme, and only 60 had to be retained in hospital on their return.

Not only has this programme been a success in this respect, but it is also developing arrangements for recreational and occupational activities entailing the involvement of local communities and voluntary agencies who assist in this work.

In addition, the department is undertaking studies of the patients presently in the programme, with the view to upgrading those patients. The discharge rate back to the patients' own families has been somewhat disappointing; only 60 have been so returned to their families. But examination of this facet of the programme is receiving special attention, particularly as so many of the patients' relatives have expressed themselves as being most pleased with the progress made by the patients since discharge from hospital. They still do not exhibit a great willingness to have them back in the home, unfortunately.

The homes for special care programme was well designed by the original legislation so that it lends itself to adjustment to meet the chronic care nursing and residential home needs of the province. The department is presently studying the whole area of chronic care to ensure freedom of movement of chronically-ill patients from active treatment beds to facilities more suited to their needs within the framework of homes for special care and back to community and family setting.

The role of nursing homes, their standards and financing, will be an important part of the study. It will be a collaborative effort by the department, Ontario hospital services commission, The Department of Family and Social Services, and the committees under the Ontario council of health.

It is proposed that, commencing April 1, 1967, organized home care programmes in Ontario will be financed on an equal basis by the Ontario hospital services commission and The Ontario Department of Health. This is a progressive programme designed to provide a better balance in health services, and it is the aim within the activities of the medical rehabilitation and chronic care programmes to stimulate development of such arrangements throughout the province.

There are presently six coordinated home care programmes active in the province. Five of these programmes are administered by visiting nurse organizations, and the Toronto programme is administered through a new agency from the Ontario hospital services commission offices. A seventh programme in the Kitchener-Waterloo-Galt area is anticipated in 1967.

The services provided within coordinated home care programmes will vary in different areas of the province, depending upon the availability of services through agencies in that community. As a general rule, direct services rendered by trained people and purchased from existing agencies include: skilled nursing visits; physical, occupational, and speech therapy; homemaker services.

The ancillary services include diagnostic tests, drugs, dressings, and medical supplies, and hospital and sick room equipment where indicated for patients who have referral to the programme in lieu of further hospitalization.

Royal assent to The Ambulance Services Act, 1966, was given on July 8 last year. In order to provide financial assistance to municipalities already operating or contributing to ambulance services, as well as to those planning to do so, it was decided that proclamation of the Act and registration of

regulations pertaining to it should be effected in two phases.

The first phase involved proclamation of those sections of the Act enabling provincial grants to be offered to municipalities. The regulation covering this aspect of the bill's implementation was filed on September 6.

Immediately thereafter, every municipality in the province was provided with a copy of the bill, a copy of the regulation pertaining thereto and at the same time, each was advised on the procedure to be followed in requesting a grant.

Shortly after this, all municipalities were advised of the draft general regulations contemplated under the Act and were also supplied with information concerning the ambulance services task force, including its terms of reference and proposed programme.

At this stage, it was apparent that The Department of Health would be involved permanently in many aspects of ambulance service in the province.

It was decided, therefore, to expand the emergency health service to include responsibility for continuing the task force programme and for assuming additional responsibilities as they emerged in relation to ambulance operations. As a result of this adjustment the emergency health service has extended its interest and activities to include the medical aspects of all disaster situations from those affecting the individual accident victim to those which could threaten the whole population in the event of, for example, nuclear attack. We believe that day to day interest, planning and operations concerned with natural or peacetime disasters is a sound basis on which to plan for expansion of our capability in support of possible major catastrophes.

Under its terms of reference, the ambulance services task force had, prior to this, undertaken a review of many reports and studies on ambulance services in the province. They had also studied information available from other provinces, the United States and the United Kingdom. On registration of Ontario regulation 275/66, they assumed responsibility for the departmental administration involved.

The continuing intensive investigations by the ambulance services task force have been assisted greatly by direct contact with a growing number of municipalities and with all types of ambulance service operations.

One of the stated objectives of The Ambulance Services Act is to improve the standards of ambulance service. General regulations designed to implement this objective will be registered shortly, on proclamation of the remainder of the Act itself.

I would emphasize at the outset that full use will be made of the interim licensing provisions authorized in these regulations. We have no intention of arbitrarily eliminating existing ambulance services. We will continue to work toward assuring a comprehensive service to the whole province. The standards we are introducing define basic essentials of any first line ambulance service.

We believe that adequate ambulance service represents only one echelon in the care of accident victims. First aid and careful handling immediately after an accident or injury is vitally important, as is proper treatment at the hospital receiving or emergency department. I therefore urge the importance of first aid training for all citizens.

Another important feature is a cooperative study with the Ontario Provincial Police in regard to the possibility of broadening their participation in initial care for accident victims. We have also entered into an active study of training programmes and "career" planning for paramedical personnel engaged in ambulance service work.

I referred earlier to expansion of the emergency health service activity in disaster planning. I am pleased to report that we here in Ontario are proceeding rapidly with the programme of prepositioning our allocation of medical supplies and equipment from the national stockpile. The Department of National Health and Welfare will be underwriting the cost of actual prepositioning of equipment and we are building up a staff complement to handle this assignment. Essential training of personnel in the use of this equipment as well as the conduct of a variety of disaster institutes and exercises is a major responsibility of emergency health services.

I am quite certain that during the next 12 months many municipalities, universities, schools of nursing and hospitals will become very much aware of the extent to which we are intensifying our whole approach to the medical aspects of disaster planning.

The remarks I made pertinent to the amendment of The Public Health Act re public health programmes applies to those pertinent to air pollution control. These were already delivered on submission of the bill before the House.

Our pesticides control programme, an amendment to which Act was introduced

today, has undergone steady expansion during recent years. In addition to the licensing of 944 commercial exterminators in 1966, field inspection offices were opened at Chatham and Simcoe, supplementing those at Toronto, London and Ottawa. Over 2,500 farms were inspected prior to the spraying of Endrin by aircraft, to ensure that forage would not be contaminated. In this year's estimates, provision has been made to open two additional field inspection offices. Legislation to amend The Pesticides Act now before the House, provides authority for regulations more specifically applicable to structural and land exterminations, to require the licensing of owners of firms engaged in extermination services, and to establish an advisory pesticides board to examine applicants for exterminators' licences.

The mental health division was formally established April 1, 1966, as a new division in the re-organization of The Department of Health, responsible for all aspects of the provincial mental health programme, including: standards and patterns of care for the mentally ill and the retarded; operation of provincial mental hospitals and facilities for the retarded; approval of programmes, and provision of financial assistance to general hospitals and other health agencies providing psychiatric services under a local authority; collaboration with other departments and branches of government offering services to the mentally ill and retarded; coordination of all resources into a balanced programme of prevention, diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation of the mentally ill and the retarded.

The development and expansion of the programme has been directed to the following objectives:

1. Appropriate distribution of facilities in order that services will be readily available.

2. Provision of a full range of diagnostic and treatment resources in each area which will afford a continuity of out-patient, day care, and in-patient services in accordance with the needs of the patient.

3. Adequate volume of services, of a high standard.

4. The coordination of community, regional and provincial resources to achieve a properly balanced programme of prevention, diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation.

The mental hospitals branch is responsible for the development of programmes for the mentally ill, and for the administration and management of provincial mental hospitals. Particular attention is given to the coordination of mental hospital programmes with the services offered by general hospitals and other community resources. During the past year, a survey of all provincial hospitals was undertaken in an effort to identify problems relating to the clinical services, administration or physical plant. Master plans are being developed for each hospital to establish short-term and long-term objectives. In the assessment of the needs of the area served, appropriate attention will be given to requirements for special services for children, adolescents, and so on.

Close collaboration is maintained with the homes for special care programme in the placement of patients in the community. Efforts have been made to promote a closer workng relationship with the local public health authorities, The Departments of Education, Public Welfare, Attorney General, and Reform Institutions.

The staff of the rehabilitation branch has been assigned to the mental hospitals branch, in order to achieve a better integration of these services in the total programme.

The mental retardation branch is responsible for the development of programmes for the retarded, and for the administration and management of provincial hospitals and facilities for the retarded. Provision has been made in the branch for programme consultants to assist with the development of medical nursing units, educational units, progressive activity units, and adult rehabilitation units, in the provincial facilities. Regular conferences have been instituted to coordinate the services offered by the various hospitals on a regional basis. The total needs and resources for serving the retarded throughout the province are being assessed in order to establish short-term and long-term objectives. Emphasis has been placed on the development of regional diagnostic and assessment centres in planning for the further development of services for the retarded.

Continuing efforts are being made to reduce the numbers of patients in the larger facilities, through the establishment of nursing care units, and approved nursing homes in the community. Increasing attention is being given to the diagnostic assessment of all children referred to hospitals, and to the counselling of parents in order to assist them in the management of the child in the community wherever possible. Educational programmes within the hospitals are being expanded as quickly as space and trained teachers are available.

Close working relationships are maintained with The Departments of Education and Public Welfare through the interdepartmental committee on mental retardation.

In addition to the on-going coordination in respect to the basic programme, this committee concerns itself with special problems, such as children with hearing difficulties. A close liaison is also maintained with the Ontario association for the mentally retarded.

Provisions have been made in the professional services branch for consultants in psychiatry, psychology, social work, occupational therapy and psychiatric nursing. This branch is primarily concerned with the development and application of professional skills in serving the mentally ill and the retarded. A new bursary programme for psychiatrists has been instituted, and particular attention is being directed to the development of training programmes for clinical psychologists in collaboration with the universities within the province. The unification of nursing services within the provincial mental hospitals is being implemented under the direction of this branch. In-service training programmes for ward staff have been revised to achieve a higher standard of care.

Particular attention is being given to the further development of industrial therapy programmes. The recruitment and placement of professional staff is a major concern and responsibility of the branch.

The hospital management services branch provides consultant services directed to the development and application of administrative concepts and management skills which will raise the standards of care within the facilities for the mentally ill and the retarded. Provision has been made for consultants in hospital administration, financing, food services, medical records, engineering and maintenance, laundry, veterinary services, farm and garden, and fire safety.

Current activities of the branch are directed to a review and revision of the administrative organization of the provincial hospitals, and the master planning of all facilities in the province. Bed complements and staffing patterns are under study. Assistance is being provided to those hospitals preparing for accreditation. Problems relating to admission, documentation, and handling of medical records are being given particular attention.

An in-service training programme, directed to the development of management skills, has been undertaken within the division, and will be expanded to include senior staff within the hospitals.

Earlier in this session, Mr. Chairman, you will recall that I tabled a report in the form of a white paper setting out in detail the principles and policies of a coordinated programme for the provision of additional services, facilities and treatment of children suffering from mental and emotional disorders. A technical committee is now working out the timing and phasing for this programme. The committee has been instructed to define areas of action which will result in the implementation of the total programme as quickly as possible and consistent with quality of care. My department has included in the estimates for the mental health division, an amount of $4 million for 1967-1968 to be applied to this programme. In addition, a committee on accreditation of treatment facilities is already in active process of formation and will be ready to implement an accreditation programme early in this fiscal year.

On-going consultation services are offered to general hospitals and other local agencies and services in respect to the planning, development, and staffing of mental health services. Close liaison is maintained with the Ontario hospital services commission in respect to the location, size, and provision of financial assistance in support of psychiatric services in general hospitals and other local facilities.

An increasingly close liaison is being developed with The Departments of Education, Public Welfare, Attorney General, and Reform Institutions, in resolving problems related to the care and treatment of the mentally ill and retarded throughout the province.

Regular meetings with the heads of the departments of psychiatry at universities within the province have been established in an effort to coordinate the university training, and clinical service elements of the mental health programme. A close working relationship has also been established with the Ontario psychiatric association and other similar and interested groups.

With the introduction of the Ontario medical services insurance plan, arrangements were made to extend these benefits to patients within provincial hospitals. An on-going review of the arrangements for the provision of financial assistance to local agencies is maintained with Ontario hospital services commission and Ontario medical services insurance division, and changes are introduced as the need arises, to further strengthen and support the development of community programmes.

The two-year study of mental health legislation undertaken by Mr. B. B. Swadron in 1964 has been completed. Consideration is now actively underway to the implementation of changes and the drafting of legislation to be presented to this session of the Legislature.

Extensive research in various social and biological aspects of mental illness and mental retardation is carried on at many of the provincial hospitals. Particular attention is directed to research programmes at the Ontario hospital, Toronto, Lakeshore psychiatric hospital, children's psychiatric research institute, and Thistletown. Such activities are encouraged and supported.

The reorganization of the central administrative offices of the mental health programme in April 1966 is of particular significance. In establishing the new division and its four branches, the resources for providing leadership and direction in the further development and expansion of services for the mentally ill and the retarded have been greatly strengthened. The focus of the division is the total mental health programme for all the province, to be achieved by the effective collaboration of all departments of government, and the coordination of all local and regional facilities serving the mentally ill and the retarded. Considerable progress has been made in the implementation of the reorganization programme, but it will take some years to develop the full potential of the central administrative and consultative services.

New facilities and services are as follows.

By way of physical plant there were added in 1966: unit for emotionally disturbed children – CPRI – 15 beds; mental retardation centre, Toronto–70 beds; adult occupational centre, Edgar–250 beds; midwestern regional children's centre, Palmerston–240 beds.

Added to local facilities supported by The Department of Health in 1966: the Clarke institute of psychiatry–206 beds.

Additions to general hospital units include: Hamilton, St. Joseph's–40 beds; North York, Branson–24 beds; Toronto, Wellesley–29 beds (replacement).

Additions to out-patient services in general hospitals: Barrie–Royal Victoria; Niagara Falls–Greater Niagara general.

Additions to nursing care units for retarded: Ontario homes for mentally retarded infants–10 additional beds.

As members are aware, the medical services insurance division has been appearing before the Legislature's standing committee on health. Rather than repeat the report of the committee, as it covers 21 pages, I would request permission to table it for the record. Copies have been made available to all members. I can assure you that my department, and this division particularly, appreciated the opportunity of meeting with the standing committee to present the facts which pertained to this very important programme.

There are two additional items I would like to mention and as they do not relate to any particular division of the deparment, they might be dealt with in closing this presentation.

I placed before you an amendment to The Public Health Act to permit regulations to be written to regulate and accredit health facilities such as laboratories, radiological clinics for diagnosis and therapy, prosthetic and orthotic establishments and such other classes of health facility as may be defined by the regulations. This is to encourage high quality of care and the orderly development of these arrangements and to ensure that those offering such services are competent to do so. Certain facilities are already subject to this type of legislation, namely hospitals, nursing homes and so on. The proposed amendment would extend this principle, which is already well established. My department will have full discussion with interested groups in order to develop the regulations which will be designed to achieve these objectives. The department is still very much concerned and troubled by the inequities evident in the distribution of health personnel.

The research and planning branch of the department have been given the responsibility and are working on proposals to encourage a better distribution of personnel, particularly to areas of the province with sparse population. It appears likely now, that a health centre complex will be proposed including a limited number of beds providing an emergency level of care. Group practice will be prominent and the team will include doctors, dentists, nurses and basic public health staff. Good levels of remuneration will be guaranteed and we hope to include a bonus principle, bursary assistance, as well as the regular additional generous benefits. These centres should be valuable for the training of general practitioners. There are already indications that certain of the health science centres in our province are keenly interested. The proposals are now ready to be submitted to the Ontario council of health at its next meeting for their consideration and advice.

Mr. Chairman, I felt that it would be better to wait to make my remarks concerning

the Ontario hospital services commission prior to the introduction of that vote.

This is the ninth time I have put the estimates of The Department of Health before this Legislature. In 1959 the amount was $81,201,000; this year it is $358,742,000, an increase of more than 300 per cent. Quite apart from the amount of money involved, I believe the programmes proposed this year, for which I now ask you to approve funds, are the most far-reaching and exciting of any ever put before any Legislature since our department was established in 1923.

Mr. J. B. Trotter: (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, in listening to the Minister giving his estimates and looking over the record of this year and the records of past years—this Minister's record of nine years—or going back over the last 20-odd years, I do not see very much to get excited about. I see a lot that can be highly disturbing. On occasion I have been encouraged but not too often.

I will say that there was one thing that I think is encouraging although we have to wait and see what happens, and that is the reorganization of The Department of Health. There seems to be a lot of Indian chiefs in the list. There are 57 of them and I hope there are not just all Indian chiefs and no Indians. But undoubtedly there is good personnel in The Department of Health and I want to express my hope that these Indian chiefs will, in the long run, prove of great benefit for the health services of The Department of Health and for the province of Ontario. Certainly, from this side of the House the reorganization has our best wishes.

When we read what has been done, even though we see maybe a glimmer of hope that there is more money for mental health this year than last, we still really despair of the future of mental health in the province of Ontario.

Now, I want to dwell on this a bit, not too long, Mr. Chairman. But mental health is—I have said, and so many others have said, and much better than I have—mental health is the most important single health problem in Canada, and likewise in the province of Ontario. Over half our hospital bed space is taken up by mental patients. I believe there are approximately 70,000 hospital beds in Canada. That makes about 35,000 mental patients in Canada at any given time of the day in any day of the year, and probably that is now increasing as our population increases.

We have not given the effort that is required because of the tremendous cost to individuals—just in the loss of life and the loss of time and in the tremendous loss of money. But certain buildings may symbolize what has not been done and what the neglect is. I think one of the worst symbols of mental health is 999 Queen Street West in the city of Toronto.

Here is a location that should be one of the very best mental hospitals in the world. It is well located in a large city and it is centrally located. It is located near a great university. It is well administered under the circumstances that they have—they have many good men, in fact some of the psychiatrists and the top men in that hospital are extremely well known throughout their profession. Yet we see that they do not nearly come to grips with serving the area that they should serve.

The hospital is packed. It is so overcrowded that it becomes more of a custodial care, not that psychiatry is not carried on and even some research done, but they do not begin to do what they should do and what they could do.

When the Minister announced that we were going to have homes for special care, I thought we were going to see that 999 Queen would have its population greatly reduced. Sure enough, there were 380 people last year removed from 999 Queen, into homes for special care. How much did that actually reduce the population? A year ago there were 1,250 patients at "999", this year it is only about 100 less—1,150 some-odd. In other words, homes for special care have not made a very great difference to the overcrowding at the hospital.

I think about two years ago they had about 1,800 new patients per year. A few months ago it was at the rate of 2,000 new patients per year, and now it has gone up to 2,400 patients per year, simply because it is trying to serve an area that is growing rapidly and the facilities have not been provided.

I do not believe that there have been any new psychiatric beds in downtown Toronto in the last five years. Despite all the talk of bringing the general hospitals into the picture and adding psychiatric wings attached to general hospitals, we still have not had any new psychiatric beds in the last five years. I think that this is a neglect by The Department of Health, because we have here a major problem, and we are not coming to grips with the approach.

Number 999 Queen is a monstrous building. It was originally built in 1847. I have known people that have lived nearby and to them it

has always been the lunatic asylum, the idiot house, the nut house. It has been subject to every kind of rebuff and fun-making possible. Yet if we are to bring mental health forward and give it the prominence it should have and the respectability it should have, we are going to have to provide facilities that are known with respect and not in a position where people make fun of what goes on.

I know that the Minister has probably been to 999 Queen. The smell of the ages goes on as it has for many years. In the old wing that was built in 1847, the incessant sight of cockroaches goes on, this in a time and age when the bricks and mortar are available to stop such things. In one ward for the incurable patients, two years ago there was one toilet facility for every 24 patients. Well, you could say that because of the homes for special care there has been an improvement. Now it is one toilet facility for every 16 people.

Yet if we allowed that in a private house in the city of Toronto, the health authorities would be after the owner of that house. But here is our own health department permitting conditions to exist that simply should not be.

I do not blame the hospital staff, because they are the ones that have to fight the cockroaches; they are the ones that have to put up with the facilities that are shocking, that are a disgrace to the province of Ontario. The responsibility lies with the Minister of Health, and it amazes me how men of great ability and tremendous dedication can put up with the conditions that they have to put up with year after year.

There have been promises to rebuild 999 Queen. They have plans. For years and years they have had plans. In fact, I have an old newspaper—December, 1964—where the Minister of Health is quoted as saying that they would begin to put up the new building at 999 Queen either in 1966 or in 1967.

As far as I know, all they have still got are just plans. When we have a symbol such as that old building on Queen Street, we not only inflict tremendous suffering on thousands of people over a period of years, but we are harming tremendously the whole cause of mental health.

There is no doubt that at this stage in our history and at this stage of the development of science we should bear in mind that today 90 per cent of all the scientists who ever lived, regardless of what scientific field, are alive working today. We have tremendous opportunities to grow and to develop, particularly in this field. We in the province of Ontario have the people available, or could have them available.

It is surprising to look back and see that there have been some years in the not-too-distant past where 40 per cent of our psychiatrists have left Canada for the United States. It is no wonder when we provide them with only the bricks and mortar, and old facilities that are hard to work in, and when we have no respect for the numbers of people that we cram into these buildings.

We know that Dr. Paton, the superintendent of the Ontario hospital at Kingston, claims that there is a high turn-over of patients—he calls it the revolving door—where patients are discharged too soon because they do not have the personnel and they do not have the facilities. They are under such a pressure to get rid of them that these people are sent back home too soon. As a result, nearly 60 per cent of them come back through that revolving door.

I think Dr. Christie at Queen Street, in an article, referred to it as the swinging door. Because we fail to give ourselves the proper facilities to encourage enough personnel to take an active part in psychiatry in our Ontario hospitals, we are adding to the cost, and the cost over the years is tremendous.

I think one example has been mentioned—using Canada as a base—that if we could solve the problems of mental health, the money we would save would wipe out the income taxes paid by every person, earning $10,000 or less. The problem is going to be solved only when we make up our minds that we are going to see to it that there are proper facilities to cope with the problem.

I do not know why it is that the Minister has permitted the years to go by. He has had nearly nine years to go after this one problem at 999 Queen Street. I know there are other hospitals, but I pick this one as a symbol of governmental neglect of mental health, and of literally milking headlines by getting out announcements that there is going to be a new hospital at 999 Queen.

Even those of us who were on the committee on aging realize there are many elderly people in that old building who should not be there, simply because they are old. Admittedly, today a superintendent will not admit an older person unless there is a psychiatric problem, but once that psychiatric problem has been solved, these people are left there simply because there is no place to send them.

This is a problem for both The Department of Health and The Department of Public

Welfare. There have been many occasions, sir, when I have seen people who are in homes for the aged with the same difficulties, they are senile. My feeling is that the way the facilities are in the province of Ontario, for our older people it is almost a matter of luck whether they end up in a good home for the aged or in one of these great, ancient, monstrous mental hospitals that we have here in the province of Ontario.

About 30 per cent of the people at 999 Queen are people who are 65 years of age and over, and a good proportion of those people could be released to many of our facilities that we have in The Department of Public Welfare if we had enough of them or if we had enough personnel to do a proper screening job of the patients that we have in our mental institutions.

We have at 999 Queen, ten psychiatrists, and I think that for the size of that hospital that is about half the number the American psychiatric association recommends that a hospital should have. Yet that hospital on Queen Street is lucky because it is in a large centre and the psychiatrist is more apt to want to work there simply because he is in the city of Toronto.

We know from experience that hospitals in other districts have difficulty getting psychiatrists because they are too far away from what some regard as the centre of activity. Those who live outside Toronto might not believe that, but this is a practical problem that the Minister's department has, Mr. Chairman, in that it is sometimes difficult to hire psychiatrists in mental hospitals because of where they are located. The pay also makes a difference and certainly the working conditions.

I have met many of these outstanding men and it still amazes me how they can work under the conditions, and how over the years there has been a consistent, almost a wilful neglect of our major health problems in the province of Ontario.

The Minister talked of reorganization. I hope when he is reorganizing the mental health department, that he will bear in mind the importance of reorganizing mental hospitals, not only in rebuilding many of our old hospitals, but also creating autonomous boards, and seeing that everything is done to build a community interest in these mental hospitals.

At one time I might have doubted that in a large city there would be that much interest in a mental hospital, but I have been amazed at the volunteer system, the auxiliaries—particularly the women's auxiliaries—at 999 Queen, that have been built up. Yet how much better it would be, Mr. Chairman, if we had a facility at 999 Queen where it would be a pleasure to work, and where the women's auxiliary, after they came down to work, could go back and tell of the fine facilities that we have in the city of Toronto.

But this is not the case, and so many of the women who work voluntarily to help these patients are horrified at the conditions that exist down there. From the top people down to those who voluntarily go in to work, they know that many of the patients just sit around because there is nothing to do. There is not the therapeutic treatment, occupational or otherwise, that there should be.

I am not saying there is not any, I am saying there is simply not the occupational therapy provided that there should be. Anyone, even those of us who are laymen, know that one of the main answers to many of the mental difficulties is to give people something worthwhile to do.

I regretted when the Minister made his opening remarks that despite the extra millions which are going to be spent on mental health, he could not tell us that we were going to have a new facility down on Queen Street.

I understand it is hoped to build a new hospital some time in the future, in five or six sections, again trying to follow the theory of keeping patients in small groups of no more than 300. I hope this is going to come about, but the tragedy is that it is just a wilful neglect, whether it be because this Minister cannot persuade the Treasury board or that the Treasury board itself is just so obtuse that it fails to grasp that this is one of the great health and social and economic problems that we face in this province today. This government has made a sad and sloppy job of the whole situation. It is a situation that is continuously growing worse, particularly in those areas where there has been what we call the population explosion.

In using 999 Queen as a symbol—that black dome that has sheltered so many personal tragedies and has been such a symbol over the years of governmental neglect and of public apathy—I cannot but say through you, Mr. Chairman, to the members of this House, that it is about time that we as members of the Legislature, as representatives of the public, pressured this government into taking swift and immediate action. It seems to me that this government does nothing until there is a major crisis facing it in whatever problems they have to solve.

If you see the outpatient services at 999 Queen, if you see the facilities and smell the facilities, you know that it is a building that needs to be ripped down and replaced by modern facilities based on modern concepts of psychiatry in the care of those who are mentally ill.

There is one more item in a similar vein that I have dwelt on before. We might say, if we look back over *Hansard* that there has been repetition over the years, but we have to keep repeating and repeating until something is done, and by "something" I mean a very major reform. This is the problem that we have in caring for our retarded children and retarded adults.

Last year during the estimates I brought to this House the problem of the retarded adults at Aurora, Ontario. I do not think there has been any substantial change at that home for retarded adults. Last year there were 250 people crammed in there, and I think I told the House at that time that in order to go from one end of the dormitory to the other it would be quicker to walk across the beds, they were jammed so closely. Aurora was then and is now a firetrap, simply because over the years the public has taken no interest and the government just does not care.

A lot has been done in recent years as the result of the work of the Ontario association for retarded children, and particularly in this area of Toronto, by the Metropolitan Toronto association for retarded children. They have done a tremendous work, and as a result of their particular efforts there are almost 1,000 children in the Metropolitan area who would have been crammed into Orillia or somewhere if they had not gone to work to see to it that schools were built. Eventually, the government took an interest in these schools, various sheltered workshops were built and these children kept active.

These volunteer groups have proved that there are many retarded children and retarded adults who can be helped, and I know that the government, under Dr. Zarfas, is making a beginning, an effort, in this line; that there are in the department men like Dr. Zarfas and men under him who are very dedicated. They should get, in my view—and so should many of the men who do work in the department—far more support from the government than they have been getting, because all these men are proving that much more can be done if politicians would vote the money and see to it that the facilities and the necessary personnel were made available.

As is so often said—and it has to be repeated—in the long run it is much, much cheaper to have many of these people out working, and doing something—in some cases even earning enough money to pay taxes—than to have them shut up in some great ancient bastille. Believe me, most of our buildings are pretty old and ancient and are not much credit to the people of the province of Ontario.

For example, today under the Metropolitan Toronto retarded children's association, they have 876 children in schools which, a few years ago, people would have said simply could not be done. If you go through the workshop on Beverley Street in Toronto one can see many young people and adults kept busy at useful work simply because there were people who took an interest to see that something was done and to demonstrate that something was done.

Yet, despite this, I think here in the city there are retarded children of 10 and 11 years old who could go to school but cannot go all day because they do not have the funds. Here in Metro Toronto we need two new schools. The Minister of Health might well say that this is now under the Minister of Education, and it is not his problem. But let us bear in mind that if these children are not kept active and not taught to develop what abilities they do have, inevitably they are going to end up on the hands of the Minister of Health. So it is in the interest of his own budget to see to it that the Minister of Education supplies the necessary school rooms that are required. The Metropolitan Toronto association for retarded children can show by the use of the schools they developed, by the residences that they have developed, that they can save the taxpayer money and they can keep these children active.

I do not know what we are going to do in this province unless we do one of two things. The first is to get the children while they are young enough, the retarded children, so we develop the facilities that they have. This has been done to some extent, but far more could be done. There could be immediately in Metropolitan Toronto two schools. These are required now, and as I said 10 and 11 year-old children are being sent home because there are simply not the facilities here in Metropolitan Toronto.

Then there are the residences that, if well supervised and if in part run by volunteer groups, would go a long way towards helping the children developing and keep them out of such places as Smiths Falls and Orillia.

But no private organization, no matter how dedicated it is, even when they have one or two millionaires taking an interest in them, can pay the cost. It would be far wiser if our province went to a group like the Metropolitan Toronto association for retarded children and said we will pay 90 per cent of the cost of the residence—you pay the other 10 per cent, we will help in the supervision. It costs approximately $3,000 a year to keep a retarded child in an institution like Orillia or Smiths Falls. It may be a little under $3,000 but I am using round figures.

To keep a retarded child in a school or a residence costs approximately $1,000 a year, and there are two advantages in that. If you want to be very hard-boiled about it, it saves us a lot of money, because the volunteer groups seem to get things done more cheaply simply because a lot of the help is volunteered, even the architect who helps put up the building. The rates, if they are paid anything, are a lot lower than the government has to pay, so we save ourselves a lot of money.

Secondly, we keep the children out of huge places like Orillia and Smiths Falls which are pretty shocking places.

We have gone into the situation that exists in Smiths Falls and Orillia and there is no point of hammering away at that again. The fact that we fill these buildings to the extent we do gives the men who are in charge little opportunity to teach. It is a disgrace, and I think that maybe the government, in its saner moments, realizes that in Orillia and Smiths Falls they have dug themselves into a hole. The only way to solve it properly and do it in the immediate future, is to seek the help of these associations that have done so well.

The Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) has been of great assistance in this matter in the last two or three years after being perennially badgered to do something. It was not until it became a major crisis that even The Department of Education decided to do something. Despite the fact that men learned in this field can tell you that even children with an IQ of under 50 can be taught something, there is still no teaching system at Orillia for anyone with an IQ of 50 or under. Despite the fact that many leaders in this field can tell you that a lot can be done, we still do not even have a plan to make a start. It is true that the length of education or the time at Orillia for a course has been slighly increased, but we are still far behind what could and should be done.

To show what could be done and where there are a number of things still wrong with the system, I want to show as an example the home for retarded adults at Cobourg. Let me say that that ancient building is absolutely spotless. You cannot compare it with Aurora—not that Aurora was not kept clean, but the whole outlook in Cobourg is far different and far better. There is one major reason for that—the type of patient at that hospital had a much higher IQ than the men at Aurora.

As for the retarded adults who have a higher IQ—50 and over—where they are located I do not know. In Aurora it was a pretty sad and dismal sight, and I have no reason to believe that it is not as bad as it ever was. But you go to Cobourg, and obviously there is much more activity there, and of the patients there, about half of them are there probably for a period of only two years.

Now you get the idea—many of us do—that when you are an adult and you end up in a home for retarded adults that is a dead end, that is it.

Obviously, Dr. Berry has been successful in putting many of these women out to work as domestics and in some cases into factories. A real effort has been made there. And he is quite frank to admit that he has been given patients with whom he could work, that were of a higher IQ; but this is another thing I question about our whole screening system.

There are some people listed as retarded who have an IQ of 80 or slightly higher. It is rather questionable if they should even be in a home for the retarded. And you find that there are patients who were really classified as mentally ill, not retarded, mentally ill. The experts will tell you there is a great difference between someone being mentally ill and being retarded. And yet they are quite frank to admit that there are people who are mentally ill. Also at Cobourg, is one girl from Warrendale. Warrendale was not supposed to have been a home for the retarded, and yet one was taken from Warrendale—at least one that I know of—and taken to Cobourg.

Now, I ask the Minister why? I do not blame the administration at Cobourg but I do question why these poeple would be sent there. Is Cobourg a hospital for the retarded, or is it not? And then there are the facilities. The building they are in is an historic building, built about 1832, I think, by the Methodist Church. It was the old Victoria college and Egerton Ryerson was the first president in that building; a lot of history was

made there. But history is not being made there today.

Despite the very fine staff they have—again I say that the building was spotless, they have an excellent staff, and I am not criticizing them in any way—I do not criticize this government for the facilities they provide.

Obviously, these girls can do far more than we would ever think they could do because the IQ of over half of them is not that low; they are getting up in the 60's and 70's and the 80's, and they can work in factories. And there are people there interested in training them on the staff. But they do not have a workshop of any decent size and they do not have the proper sleeping quarters.

When you go in these dormitories, with 36 beds—there are about four of them with 36 beds, three rows of twelve, in one wing that is at least over 50 years old. The main part was built in 1832 and the wings, so I am told, are approximately 50 years old. So I am not misleading anyone. I must admit that the dining room is quite modern; it is only eight years old.

But by and large these facilities are outmoded and it is a disgrace that these retarded people have to live in such conditions. As they improve, or as a reward, they do go to another part of the building where there are only eight beds to a room and then they have the privilege of having their own little small bureau, which is considered a reward. In these other places, in these dormitories, it is just one great mass of beds.

And these patients are not the type of people who just do not know where they are; there may be a few that way, in one particular ward, but in the vast majority of these cases they can be treated. And I am told that nearly half of them within two years can be sent out and put to work. Now, this is not a hospital for the retarded as we might see in Aurora, where we know that the percentage of those going to work is very, very small.

Again, this building in Cobourg simply is another symbol of governmental neglect and public apathy over a long period of time, where we are not treating these people as we should. And this is where the government is lucky and where the province has been lucky: despite the years and years of literally wilful neglect there is always a nucleus of good people on the staff. I do not think I have ever been in a building of The Department of Health where this nucleus has not existed and where these people have not stayed on. There are shortages just as on Queen Street. There is a shortage of about 19 registered nurses and that means more work for those who are on staff. There is a shortage of about five at Cobourg and that means more work for those on staff, but in fairness to them most of the staff have been there over a long period of time. And this department is most fortunate.

But the taxpayer has not been fortunate nor have the patients been fortunate, and I would rather suspect that the staff, whether it be the trained staff or otherwise, has been vastly disappointed in what this government has been doing, because particularly the highly trained staff knows full well what the government could do if it wanted to, but just will not.

So, again I appeal to the Minister. I think it is a fruitless appeal and having studied and looked at these estimates over the years, I think far more should be done in this field. It is a major economic problem as well as being a social problem. We have to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into this department over the years; this year it is more than $300 million, and we, as taxpayers, want to see that we get the value out of it that we should.

But we are not going to get the value for our money if we continue to operate with these decrepit old plants—just as a business, a manufacturing plant, cannot carry on properly if it uses old run-down equipment, and that is what we are doing in The Department of Health today. And what I fear when I see these places like 999 or Cobourg or Aurora and so many of the others, is that they are, in essence, fire traps. No matter how neat and clean Dr. Berry keeps it in Cobourg, it is an old building that would be like a trap if a fire ever broke out.

I think there was a fire in London, Ontario, this morning and I thought at that time: My heavens, if that ever happened at Aurora, where they are crammed into that dormitory, there would be a major disaster simply because when you cram the people as you do in Aurora—or even in Cobourg where the room is much brighter and at least where there is an aisle to walk down the middle of the room—still, with 36 people in those dormitories you are just asking for a major disaster some day in the future.

The tragedy is, we are supposed to be training and taking care of many of these patients; it is a custodial problem because there are so many and because it is overcrowded. But even looking at it from a custodial problem, many of these old buildings

are just fire traps and it is up to us and up to this government to see to it that we bring into effect policies which are going to build a good system of care, especially for the mentally ill and for the retarded.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge this government first, even as a symbol, to rebuild 999 Queen Street on modern lines of psychiatric thinking in the way that the mentally ill should be treated. It is a place for many thousands to see; let us wipe out this neglect of the past and this attitude of the past and let us quit announcements and saying we have programmes, or something has been planned.

Let us go ahead and put shovels into the ground and give ourselves the facilities we should have. And simply because they know something is being done, I am sure many people who are highly trained and interested in this field will be attracted by what is being done, so that these 57 Indian chiefs will have some good people with whom to work, with whom to train and also facilities that are proper accommodation in the province of Ontario.

Again I urge the government, in dealing with the retarded, to encourage such groups as the Metropolitan Toronto association for retarded children in helping to supply the residences for small numbers of retarded children. They have proved themselves; and if the funds are available, the people are available. In the long run we do the retarded children a tremendous service; we do their parents a tremendous service. But even being hard boiled about it, we do the taxpayer a tremendous service because we get far more value for our dollars than we are getting at the present time.

So with these thoughts at the beginning, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Minister to give us some action.

Mr. Chairman: I did not know whether we would be able to recognize the hon. member for Scarborough West as the next speaker or not.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): We are about to adjourn now.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I am sure you could bring yourself to recognize me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Can you recognize that there are fewer government members than there are Opposition members?

Mr. J. H. White (London South): No, there are not.

Mr. Singer: You are seeing double again.

Mr. White: No, there are not.

Mr. Singer: You are better at building courthouses than counting.

Mr. White: I guarantee a majority.

Mr. Singer: Here they come now.

Mr. Chairman: The members understand this is entirely out of order! I know the members are anxious to hear from the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis: I would not have rushed so hurriedly to my seat, had I known there was a preamble.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Better wait until the rest come in.

Mr. S. Lewis: When, like the member for Parkdale, I look back over the estimates, inevitably, during the last three or four years a good deal of repetition must creep in, and I was uncertain today how to proceed. I was of two minds. I had the distinct feeling not so long ago that we might get to the lead-off speeches and no further. We might never get into the sub-estimates before the Prime Minister pulled the plug next week.

I am still of that persuasion, despite the events of the last few days, and so I think that perhaps the lead-off should deal in general with the nature of the department.

I do it, Mr. Chairman, you understand with a certain nostalgia. This is the last time the Minister presents his estimates from that side of the House, and the last time that I present them from this side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The last time too that you will be here.

Mr. S. Lewis: Our roles will be reversed, so necessarily there is a certain sentimentality about this, my final delivery.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The last time you will be back!

Mr. S. Lewis: I might also say, Mr. Chairman, that I was profoundly impressed by the reorganization of the department alluded to by the member for Parkdale. It is an impressive reorganization, indeed, as it has with it all the apparatus of reorganization, all the charts, all the attendant features, and, as he said, 57 chiefs notated on this significant list of names.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that there is only one thing wrong with this list of the chiefs of protocol of The Department of Health. There are, and the gentlemen concerned will forgive me for putting it this way, there are too many doctors. Fully 50 per cent of The Department of Health is governed, as it were, by the medical profession. One of the things which has often worried me about this department—without any personal feeling about the medical profession—is the tendency to be preoccupied with medical models and medical features to the exclusion of community orientation in this whole field of health services.

I have often felt that there would be some considerable value involved if the leading civil servants, and indeed the Minister himself, were not medical practitioners in such large and inordinate numbers. I think it gives an unhappy focus to the department, and it worries me just a little. I wonder whether it should not be thought through on some future occasion.

But that is by way of preamble and is not of any great significance.

I want to make a short review, Mr. Chairman, of certain aspects of The Department of Health over the last few years. They are, I would suggest to the Minister opposite, at least in my short time in the House, four years of failure in all the crucial areas of health care, and I say to him that in that there is no personal malice. There has been a tendency for Opposition and Minister to clash with a bitter vigour from time to time.

I have always felt in the course of these debates, Mr. Chairman, that what is really clashing here—inevitably in The Department of Health perhaps more belligerently than elsewhere—is the clash of social philosophy. What really accounts for the failure of the health department over the last four years is, to use the words of my colleague from Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), the fact that the government has reached the outer limits of its philosophy of health and is incapable of further movement, further expansion, further improvement.

The Minister, indeed, moves most vigorously in reverse. I have never seen a Minister move backwards with a greater sense of feeling and militancy and enthusiasm. He is always wrongly directed. The department is almost always wrongly directed, but at least it is done with some sense of spirit. There is a bewildering perversity about this department, Mr. Chairman. It flouts all the trends. It flouts all the evidence that is available in the field of medical services and health care, and it feels somehow, for reasons that I have never understood, that the public will accept it, when in fact, of course, what has happened over the last four years at least is a tremendous sense of public disenchantment about The Department of Health and the services it provides.

Now let me review it in certain distinct particular. Let me throw the minds of the members back to the subject which animated the first year of this nearly-ended Parliament, the hospital bed crisis in Metropolitan Toronto, highlighted, I would remind the Minister, by the Agnew report in 1964 which argued that there was a staggering deficit—those are the words of the report—a staggering deficit in hospital beds numbering somewhere in the vicinity of 2,360 beds required immediately.

This report computed the number very carefully and with a single appreciation of all the factors that should be brought into play. They looked at it in terms of the required beds per 1,000 population; they looked at it in terms of the length of stay; they looked at it in the context of the kind of bed care; they looked at it in terms of occupancy rates and of waiting lists; and they came out with the figure of 2,360 beds required in 1964, highlighting what appeared then to be an insoluble crisis for this Metropolitan Toronto area.

Consequent upon that, Mr. Chairman, there proceeded from the Minister of Health and the member for Humber (Mr. W. B. Lewis), a series of releases itemizing the various hospitals that were to be built in Metropolitan Toronto and how the bed gap would be filled and how by the year 1967 a veritable panacea would be reached, and that the hospital bed crisis was a figment of people's imaginations and was not to be taken seriously.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I must say that out of simple curiosity and following some considerable pressure from the area in which I live, I undertook in the last 24 hours to do my own survey, not nearly as reputable, but at least as honourable, of Metropolitan Toronto hospitals, to get an idea of the continuing pressures that exist in this community for hospital beds, and to see what, in fact, had happened to the government's grandiose scheme. The Minister, of course, will be the first to admit that the government is given to grandiose schemes and grandiose pronouncements and this is what I found in terms of the waiting list. I want to put it before the House because it is really something to contemplate for a moment or two.

The North York Branson hospital had 335 patients waiting for elective surgery, 48 waiting for very urgent surgery, 10 waiting for urgent medical care and 242 in the pediatric area. The hospital is still only operating with three operating theatres. When it actualizes its potential, to quote the person to whom I spoke, it may find itself in an improved position, but at the moment the situation is, to say the least, unhappy.

The Scarborough general hospital has 1,000 people on the waiting list, 400 requiring urgent surgery, 600 requiring elective surgery, and at any given day of the week one can find 12 patients on stretchers in the corridor for lack of hospital facilities.

The Humber memorial hospital: The fellow who conveyed the information to me used the whimsical expression: "What's the use of giving you a waiting list when you know the airplane will never leave the ground?" But after asking him at least in terms of urgent surgical care what was required, he came up with the figure of 109 people on the waiting list and a period of at least two months before you could book for elective surgery.

At St. Michael's hospital as of yesterday, Mr. Chairman, there were 264 urgent cases waiting for surgery, 886 elective. They are booked to the end of May and are afraid to book beyond.

At St. Joseph's, there are 741 people waiting surgery, of whom 50 per cent are considered urgent cases. Indeed, I think it is fair to say the admissions department said this was a conservative estimate of the situation at St. Joseph's, and that so many of the patients awaiting surgery were in the serious category that it was impossible to discriminate between elective and urgent in that hospital.

Toronto general: This is the significant one, Mr. Chairman, because it is one where I was able to get a precise comparison. As of this morning, in the Toronto general there are 29 emergency cases, 377 urgent cases and 1,470 elective cases, all awaiting surgery.

I asked them to find for me the figures that corresponded in April of 1964, just to get some appreciation of what has happened in the intervening three-year period. And the figures in 1964 were as follows: At that time there were 1,133 waiting elective surgery, so we have gone up over 300 patients in that area. There were the same number waiting for urgent surgery and there were fewer waiting for emergency surgery. In other words, Mr. Chairman, despite all the multitude of plans put before the people by this government, the situation at the largest general hospital in this metropolitan area is more severe in April of 1967 than it was in April of 1964.

Northwestern general hospital: 611 people awaiting elective surgery; 134 awaiting urgent surgery; another ten awaiting urgent medical attention. And I cannot put it too strongly, Mr. Chairman, that the people who are awaiting urgent surgery or urgent medical attention are exceedingly critical cases. If there was any easing, any relaxing of the overcrowding of the Metropolitan Toronto hospitals at this point, they would be in there now. They are in fact emergency cases, construed only as urgent by virtue of the fact that the beds simply are not available.

Toronto western: 1,000 people on the waiting list, 125 of whom are urgent; the others are elective. They are booked to June, and their emergency ward is staggering beneath the load.

Wellesley hospital: 60 waiting urgent surgery; the longest period of time, a patient on the urgent list dating back to February 1; 685 awaiting elective surgery.

At the New Mount Sinai, again a thousand patients on the waiting list; 700 of them elective, 300 of them urgent. They book patients four and a half months ahead; at this point well into the month of September.

Doctors' hospital: the waiting list—there are 75 people awaiting urgent surgery.

In the east general, 500 on the elective list, 125 on urgent surgery. Mr. Chairman, let me tabulate the figures for you.

On a survey of 15 Metropolitan Toronto hospitals on this date in April, 1967, there are 7,284 people on the list for elective surgery, 2,427 people awaiting urgent surgery or medical cases, for a total of 9,711 people. And I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that this does not include many of the pediatric urgent cases, which means that at the best interpretation possible—and there are hospitals I was not able to reach—there would be 10,000 people on the waiting list.

The significant fact, Mr. Chairman, is that there are more people in April, 1967, awaiting urgent surgery, which means emergency surgery to all intents and purposes, in Metropolitan Toronto; more people of that category than there were bed requirements in the year 1964.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if ever the failure of government were emblazoned for all to see it is in that field of the hospital bed shortage, and what was previously critical is now beyond description. And whatever the Ontario

hospital services commission has put before the government commission group—and I would say that if they are honestly counting on the Scarborough Centenary to be completed in 1967, then I suggest rather closer consultation with Scarborough council and some others—if there is that kind of ambiguity in their presentation in the number of beds they predicted, as low as it is, then we have fallen behind in the hospital bed crisis. We have not in fact accelerated in any significant degree.

Mr. Chairman, it does not matter how you measure these things; the Minister could, I am sure, as a medical practitioner himself, make a very persuasive argument about the frailties inherent in using waiting lists as a basis of establishing need. Well, it balances it out, Mr. Chairman. It is often an effective demand; it often does not begin to hint at the real need. The real need is frequently even greater.

But if one were to take the other aspect which the original report emphasized, namely, the occupancy rate percentage, then I would like to point out to the Legislature, Mr. Chairman, that the report suggested that an occupancy rate in excess of 80 per cent was a dangerous level. As a matter of fact, they used this phrase: "Far higher than it is safe or acceptable for a hospital of any size." Well, here are the occupancy percentages, Mr. Chairman, they might be of interest to the House.

The east general is running at 96.6 per cent occupancy; Branson is 94 per cent; women's college, 84 per cent; Scarborough general with 93 per cent; Humber memorial with 88 per cent; St. Michael's is 94 per cent; St. Joseph's at 90 per cent; and I could go on endlessly, Mr. Chairman. In other words, even on the basis of the occupancy rates which the Ontario hospital services commission itself attests to, the formula demonstrates that conditions are critical and insecure and unsafe. And I cannot imagine any more formidable indictment of government than the situation which prevails three years after the event. A state, Mr. Chairman, of entire departmental paralysis.

Frankly, I do not understand exactly what happened. I have a feeling that there are analogies here to the HOME programme, that what we had were a series of fanciful announcements, some of which will materialize. And I suspect in the sub-estimates we should go through those announcements in 1964 and 1965, hospital by hospital, and find out where they are; but primarily fanciful, primarily designed to divert public attention from the grim reality of the shortage.

And it is obvious, too, Mr. Chairman, that whatever the basis be of government planning in the Metropolitan Toronto area, whatever the basis be of hospital services commission planning in the Metropolitan Toronto area, it is inadequate. It is not sufficiently thoughtful, it is not sufficiently prescient, it is not sufficiently appreciative of all the factors involved.

And frankly, Mr. Chairman, with the accelerated population of the Metropolitan Toronto area, and if Jean Marchand's immigration policy goes through and we have this tremendous boost in numbers each year, which is perhaps desirable providing this government builds homes for them and provides hospital beds for them, then the critical situation we have now will absolutely be beyond recall.

I am being happily and pleasantly heckled here on the left, Mr. Chairman, and the answer to the member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) is, yes, I do expect the government to provide the housing accommodation for the new people who move into this society, and I say so without reservation. Because the government is about to change; the government will make that provision.

Mr. Chairman, there are fascinating political currents abroad in this province and we will judge the dreamers in a few weeks' time. But let me say this, that the Minister of Health has contributed significantly to the decline of his party, because you cannot allow situations like the hospital bed crisis in Toronto to perpetuate themselves indefinitely without evoking an angry and strong public response; and that is precisely what is happening in this metropolitan area. It is happening on a variety of issues but it is happening on that issue in a significant and telling way.

There is another aspect of this, Mr. Chairman, which must be dealt with. It is the second area of government's failure, and that is the intimate relationship that hospital financing has to the question of hospital construction. And I want to say here again, Mr. Chairman, that the position continues to be intolerable. It is immoral—never mind wrong—it is immoral, to force hospitals like the Scarborough general and the Scarborough Centenary and the sick children's hospital, and all the others out on to the public charity block rather than recognizing governmental responsibility and providing the moneys for the beds at the senior levels of government.

And, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister says to me, "Well, the federal government has not paid its share," then I would be the first to admit to him that it is true, and I would be the first to join in any representation he makes to the federal government or to this Liberal Party which sits in this Legislature and perhaps rather unhappily watches it happen. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that if the federal government will not respond, then it is morally incumbent on this government to make the response and there is absolutely no alternative whatsoever. Again and again, not only is there a failure of the department in this second most significant aspect of health in Ontario but again to use the words of my colleague from Riverdale, and I like the phrase—you will forgive me for quoting him excessively but you will understand that he is a quotable fellow—again the Tory government has reached the outer limits of their philosophy.

They are completely incapable of grasping the fact that local autonomy is of no consequence in the question of hospital financing, that you can guarantee local autonomy of hospital boards in all the decision-making processes without crippling hospital construction by forcing the board out into the community in finance drives that inevitably fail, postpone construction of hospital beds, and result in serious maladjustments for the community.

This is precisely the same, Mr. Chairman, as the education component in the property tax. Again it is the myopia of government, and particularly of the Minister of Health, an inability to sense, to see, or to understand the tremendous undercurrents that exist in hostility and antagonism to the social policies of this government.

No sense of priorities, Mr. Chairman, whatsoever, and for this government it matters not the consequence. They are perfectly willing even to undermine public confidence in the Ontario medical services insurance plan by not providing beds for people when they are required, rather than to provide the moneys which are necessary to construct the beds. That is the secondary failure, Mr. Chairman.

Perhaps I can go a little bit further. I was not sure that I intended to, but at the moment I feel up to it so I will continue.

The third area of patent failure, Mr. Chairman, and an equally critical one, is in the field of mental retardation, and it was alluded to very strongly and properly by the member for Parkdale. Some time ago, there was an analysis of the impossible Conservative Party programmes in this field and it was made both in the Legislature and outside the Legislature. It was an analysis which occupied itself with the overcrowding and understaffing which led to death, to accidents, to a series of tragic mishaps, to an inadequate pattern of care, and to, as you know, a proliferation of newspaper and media stories outlining the nature of the crisis. Some two years ago, the Minister of Health rose to the floor of the Legislature, pulled himself to his formidable height and said to the Legislature, and said, I think, with great conviction, that he was not a Solomon, that he was not prepared to make the very difficult pronouncements necessary in allocating one child to one institution and preventing another child from going to another institution.

It was a baring of his bosom to the public, Mr. Chairman, it was an act of public penance, seeking redemption. Everybody in this Legislature was prepared to give the Minister the benefit of the doubt. The commiseration which was asked for by the Legislature would have been forthcoming if there had been any sense at all of change.

The Minister had promised – he is in *Hansard* to that effect—to reduce the overcrowding at some of the large conglomerative institutions. He is forcefully on record indicating that this impedes effective treatment and effective care of the mentally retarded, particularly of mentally retarded children.

Well, it has been pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that at Smiths Falls, Ontario hospital school – to take one example – the number presently there is 2,511. The school was built for 2,100. There has been no significant decline, whatever.

Just today, and out of curiosity, I polled the various hospital schools to find out where they stood in terms of waiting lists and pressures on them. I seem to have lost the figures, but I am almost certain I can remember them from memory.

There were 225 on the waiting list for Smiths Falls, 300 on the waiting list for Orillia, about 150 on the waiting list for Cedar Springs, or perhaps those latter two are reversed. In other words, Mr. Chairman, something in the vicinity of 700 people on the waiting list for Ontario hospital schools and not a jot of improvement in this area.

No cottage units established by the Minister, no improved staff ratios, nothing of significance has occurred. I want to say to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that in the field of providing hospital facilities for the mentally retarded, this government has seen through

a reckless and cruel policy without any justification whatsoever.

There is no reason in the world why it would not be possible to dismantle those Ontario hospital schools and break them up into the cottage units which all his superintendents are clamouring for. It is not as though these are subversive ideas foisted on the Legislature by Opposition members. These are ideas which come from within the Minister's civil service. These are ideas which are his imperative to act upon, or the entire edifice will come crumbling down because it has been deteriorating for far too many years. It amounts to a legacy of failure, Mr. Chairman, provided by the Minister and the government.

I had intended to say something about public health, but I shall not do so. I shall leave that for the sub-estimates.

I would like to say a word about mental health as another aspect of the failure which has been perpetrated in this area over the last three or four years. The member for Parkdale had much to say about 999 Queen Street. To be fair to the Minister—the Minister probably thinks I never do him sufficient justice, or I am not capable of sufficient justice—but it is my impression that the Toronto Ontario hospital is rebuilding. It is to start this year. The plans are, in fact, completed and we have probably raked that hospital through the public debate frequently enough without doing it again.

In fact, the relentless Opposition barrage in that one area has resulted in a significant change in policy in that we will, in fact, be getting an entirely new building and the shovels will go into the ground in 1967.

But the field of mental health, the essential policies and principles of mental health, Mr. Chairman, show the area of greatest neglect. This is the area where the government's background movement is positively awesome and I really have to admire the Minister who retains his aplomb in the face of a crumbling disarray. What emerges from all of this, Mr. Chairman, is a series of basic issues, and I just want to put them very simply. We can pursue them during the estimates themselves.

1. There is continued and pernicious financial discrimination against the Ontario hospitals in this province. It is a bitter pill for the mentally ill to have to swallow, and it puts the lie to all the proud utterances of this department that they regard mental illness and physical illness on a par. It makes a mockery of their requests from the federal government for increased or partial subsidy of the costs of mental health care.

I do not know what the average per diem in the Ontario hospitals is this year, Mr. Chairman, and I stand to be corrected, but I would venture to say that it will be in the vicinity of $9 per diem per capita; that is what it will be, $9 a day. That compares with something in the vicinity of $35 a day for the best general hospitals, or indeed higher, with something in the vicinity of $18 a day for chronic hospital care, with something much higher than that for many of our nursing homes and many of our jails and many of our reform institutions. In other words, Mr. Chairman, government moneys for the mentally ill stand right at the bottom of the sense of social priorities; right at the bottom—one quarter of what we spend for the physically ill.

And I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is a completely intolerable and discriminatory attitude and nothing, but nothing, can be of consequence in the government policy in regard to mental health until that aspect alters. That is point one.

Point two, Mr. Chairman, is that the staffing situation in the Ontario hospitals continues to suffer an almost incredible attrition. I thought I would put these figures on the floor of the House because they document it fairly vividly.

In the Ontario hospital system in 1964—and this is the last year for which figures are available—there were some 55 full-time psychiatrists. In 1965 that number had dropped to 39. There were 54 part-time psychiatrists in 1964. In one year it had dropped to 42. Full-time psychologists: 35 in 1964 and in one year it had dropped to 16. The rate of attrition in the government's mental hospitals, Mr. Chairman, averages somewhere between 22 and 40 per cent per annum. And these figures are corroborated by the years which preceded 1964.

Something has to be done, Mr. Chairman. Something has to be done to save the Ontario hospital system from ruin. There is no other way of describing it, because you cannot denude a mental hospital network of all its trained professional help without the most impossible consequences for active treatment of patients. And that in fact, Mr. Chairman, is what has been happening. And whether these practitioners have been attracted to the psychiatric wings of general hospitals, or whether they have moved back into the community for private practice, or whether they are rebelling against the absurd salary levels

which they achieve in the Ontario hospital system, all those things are beside the point. It is incumbent on government to take note of the attrition and to step in and stop the attrition.

I might say this, Mr. Chairman: I think the Minister of Health positively glories in the staff shortage because he offers it as the argument for every critical position in his department. It is the bogey which the Minister has effectively propagated to the public—staff shortage. And when we come to that branch of the department's estimates, Mr. Chairman, I think we should take a good look at the staff shortage because I think it is time that we asserted in this House that staffing would not be a serious problem in the mental health and social services of this province, if (a) the government did any planning whatsoever, by way of providing the facilities for training; and (b) if there were any imagination or incentives available for the people who would like to enter the field. I for one am painfully tired of the staffing bogey as the answer to every vulnerable point, every chink in the Minister's armour—whether it be the present situation at Warrendale, or the Hamilton Ontario hospital, or the children's psychiatric research institute in London, or what have you. It always turns out to be a staffing shortage, and that is the weakest and most unacceptable kind of argument.

The third basic issue, Mr. Chairman, which I want to allude to, is the question of re-admission rates. I shall not take very long on that except to point out from the government's own report that the re-admission rates in Ontario approximate 50 per cent and that any re-admission rates in the Ontario hospitals which rise that high tend to bring into question the entire programme of the government.

I am having considerable difficulty finding the report, but I know I brought it with me, and if the Minister will bear with me for a moment, I will have it.

I think these figures are again significant and I put them on the record, Mr. Chairman, not to abuse the privilege of the House—I beg the members' indulgence—but because they are significant.

The Goderich Ontario hospital had a re-admission rate in excess of 50 per cent. The same was true for Kingston. And the same was true for Toronto, whose re-admission rate was 53 per cent. The same was true for Woodstock. In the case of Brockville and Hamilton and London, and North Bay and Port Arthur and Whitby, the re-admission rates all rise to between 46 and 49 per cent. There have been some specious arguments put on the floor of this House that re-admission rates simply demonstrate the willingness of individuals in the society to use the facilities of Ontario hospitals. Well, Mr. Chairman, in the body of the annual reports submitted by the superintendents of the Ontario hospitals to this Minister, lies the truth. And the truth is that they are so overcrowded and so understaffed that people are literally propelled in a revolving-door policy through the mental hospital and in again. And that in fact there is no genuine opportunity to provide the therapeutic treatment programme which many of the superintendents would wish to provide. And that it would be possible to lower the re-admission rates if certain of the ancillary health services were also available, like mental health after-care and community mental health and community follow-up.

The fourth area, Mr. Chairman, in the general field of the principles of mental health, lies in the field of the medical models which the government is pursuing. I shall not belabour this point at this time. Again we can enter it in the sub-estimates. But the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, the medical preoccupation in mental health is undermining the community channels. Again when you look at the Minister's own departmental records you will find that almost all the referrals come from medical practitioners but very few indeed come from courts of probation services, or educational agencies, or children's agencies, or are self-referrals. But in fact what the Minister has been able to do is to contrive a network of medical models which have no sense of the ancillary professional contributions to be made in the field of social worker psychology and have no sense of community involvement. More of that later, Mr. Chairman.

Also later, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal at some little length with the question of emotionally disturbed children and the Minister's white paper. But that perhaps is more obviously applicable to the relevant sub-estimates.

The final point I want to make, however, before wrapping things up, is in the field of OMSIP. And I would like to ask the Minister to put before the House as quickly as possible what exactly is going on in this friendly little state of negotiations between Queen's Park and Ottawa. I think this House deserves to know other than through the medium of the press what the Minister's intentions are for OMSIP *vis-à-vis* universal medical coverage.

I want to know, and I think the entire House wants to know, Mr. Chairman, what interesting little procedure is being worked out between the Tories in Ontario and the Liberals at Ottawa which will effectively result in the scuttling of the principles of medicare, not to mention the scuttling of the provincial Liberal Party. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, it is a measure of the cynicism of the federal Liberal Party that they are prepared to work in the field of the sacrificial lamb with such alacrity.

What has hapened in those negotiations over the last few days? Is it true, Mr. Chairman—and let the House know—is it true that the Minister will be allowed to bring a bill before this House where the private carriers' profit or non-profit can be included in the 90 per cent figure required by the federal government? Is it true that all that the Minister will have to show the House is a public audit of the non-profit carriers, private carriers, in order to make them eligible?

Is it true, Mr. Chairman, that all the private, profit-making carriers will need to show to this House is that there is no profit on the health insurance aspect of their general insurance coverage? Is it true, Mr. Chairman, that we will have different premiums or could have different premiums, different kinds of coverage, different measures of eligibility, different degrees of subsidy, is it true, in other words, Mr. Chairman, that what was seriously discussed at Ottawa was the destruction of universal medicare as all of the western societies understand it—except perhaps for the Minister of Health in Ontario, and the Minister of National Health and Welfare in Ottawa? What exactly is happening, Mr. Chairman? I think it is important that the Legislature know.

I am not at all certain that the propositions I put forward have any validity, and if the Minister wishes to shoot them down, I will be the first to welcome the barrage, because what we in this group would like to feel is security, that in order to win some immediate political advantage, the federal Liberals are not in fact conspiring with the provincial Tories. We would like to know what the situation is likely to be and I think that within the next 24 or 48 hours we are entitled to know, because there are important social principles involved, as I am sure the Minister would admit. I appreciate that on medical care insurance, we have different viewpoints and I accept again that they are differing viewpoints on the basis of an honest difference of opinion over social philosophy.

What in fact is his viewpoint, and how much of that viewpoint is acceptable to Ottawa, and where have the negotiations broken down, and of what do the differences consist? Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I may say that the part about the federal Liberal participation in this conference, which most distressed members of this party, was the refusal of the federal Minister of Health and Welfare to deny openly all that the Tory party here was requesting. There was apparently some measure of agreement and even partial agreement on that kind of implication is thoroughly unacceptable to this party at any rate in this Legislature.

Let me say further, Mr. Chairman, that OMSIP as a programme is of itself still only barely sufficient, and one of the things which worries us is the continuing discrimination against the other paramedical groups—and the fact that it would be impossible to justify in any terms the continued discrimination against the optometrist, the continued discrimination against the chiropractor, the continued discrimination against oral surgeons, and against dentists and against the inclusion of drugs in a universal plan. In other words, Mr. Chairman, these tentative steps which the government has taken, discriminate against a large number of paramedical practitioners and against the public as a whole, because general practitioners in the medical profession are being compensated for procedures which are identically performed by others like optometrists and chiropractors, but for which they cannot receive compensation under OMSIP.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that something has to be done about the medical profession. I think it is very important, Mr. Chairman, that the college of physicians and surgeons in the province of Ontario come under a rather closer scrutiny in terms of this House, that the medical profession has a rather greater accountability to the public through this House, that we must bring the medical profession back into the democratic process for which at the moment they have no use and in which at the moment they have no participation.

Whether it be the unilateral increase in the fee schedule, whether it be the discrimination, open and unfriendly, against the Asian doctors last year, whether it be their attitudes to the auxiliary medical services and groups in the society regardless of where the medical profession flexes its muscles and exercises its injudicious discrimination, regardless of where that may be, Mr. Chairman. It is time that

this House took a look at it, certainly at the very least, bringing the professional society within the ambit of the Ontario Human Rights Code.

With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, given the latitude of the estimates themselves, I would have reached my conclusion. I suggest to the Minister that, of course, what has happened on so many fronts over the last three or four years, is an absolute inertia, a paralysis of government activity—if activity in fact can be paralyzed—an inability on the part of government to recognize most of the social currents in the health field. The basic fault, and I cannot help but re-emphasize this, is the Tory philosophy. That is why in the field of health, as in every other field, the government is losing its grip. It is coming apart at the seams, it has lost control over the legislation and the programmes and the policies which it was once able to promulgate.

There is no longer any relevance to the Conservative Party in Ontario, Mr. Chairman. It has reached the point of no return and nowhere is this more dramatically shown than the area of health care. The irrelevance and the immobility and the inertia which characterizes the department, however fighting, however enthusiastic may be the Minister on occasion, that particular inertia and that particular irrelevance is what is so depressing about The Department of Health in the province of Ontario. It has a superlative civil service, it has a measure of policy, it has a framework on which it would be possible to build. All I can say, Mr. Chairman, I am sure with your agreement and support, is that some of us on this side of the House look forward to the alterations in the structure which are imminent.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Minister, are you prepared to go into the vote? Well then, dealing with vote 801, I was wondering if it was agreeable to the members if we do it by sections. We have the main office, information, legal, personnel and research if we do it by sections, if this is the wish of the members?

Under the main office? Agreed to.

Under the information branch?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Just a minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Under vote 801.

Mr. MacDonald: Is main office the area where one would come back to a discussion of morbidity?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Public health.

Mr. MacDonald: Public health?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The member means diseases?

Mr. MacDonald: No, no, I am sorry. I was being a bit facetious. Mortality and the funeral procedures – the administration that the government has established for them.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Funeral directors?

Mr. MacDonald: Funeral directors, right.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, there is really no place, 801 would be better.

Mr. MacDonald: Vote 801 would be better? Well, Mr. Chairman, I have raised this matter on a number of occasions in recent years, and quite frankly I usually got rather a bland and evasive reply from the Minister, who is not really coming to grips with the board which is supposed to administer this Act. Indeed I think there has been a vacancy unfilled for nigh on two years. Most of the fire that I have drawn has been from the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Racine) who rises to defend the profession, so-called.

This year I want to review this problem briefly again, but I do so not in my own words, but in the words of a person who is obviously familiar with this field and who has written a book called *Death, Here is Thy Sting*. The author is Coriolis, obviously a pseudonym for a person who feels that he has got to protect his identity within the industry. The book is published by McClelland and Stewart and, Mr. Chairmain, I trust you appreciate the value of this. You are getting a preview, because it is going to be published on April 22, towards the end of this week.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): No commercials.

Mr. MacDonald: It is an advance, with no particular charge, as far as the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is concerned.

As you will have noted, Mr. Chairman, some of this has been published in one of the Toronto papers by way of a preview earlier.

One could go on at great length, because it is a fascinating book, but there are two or three issues that I want to touch on, in trying to provoke this government into facing up to the problems in this industry—if I may describe it as such—at least to reforming the administrative body to which the Minster

passes the responsibility, or filling the vacancies in the existing body, if he is not going to reform it.

The first issue that I want to touch on is the training. If everything that is said in here is the case, I think it is really stretching the point to suggest that the people involved are "professionals" in the normal sense of the word.

What is required to get into the service is two years of apprenticeship, and the author goes on to point out that 80 per cent of the people who enter the funeral industry leave it within five years. Talk about mortality rates! There is a pretty formidable one right there—80 per cent of them who enter it have gone within a five year period.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): A dying profession! You did not smile.

Mr. MacDonald: I was smiling. The humour is wry when we get on to this topic.

On page 43 of the book, Mr. Chairman, he notes that a letter, printed recently in *Mortuary Management*, gives a 20 to 30 per cent retention figure over the five years. The letter suggests—this is what I draw to the Minister's attention—a lowering of educational standards to combat the exodus. The contention is that a man with less education will find it more difficult to obtain another job, and thus would remain in the funeral business!

The author's comment is that:

> There is something sick about a business when 80 out of every 100 aspirants desert it within five years. These fellows began their embalming careers as apprentices at a salary of about $40 a week. In the United States, embalmers attend embalming schools for a period of up to two years, but in Canada for two years they wash cars, clean floors, cut lawns, and are taught the basics of funeral directing and embalming. In many establishments they are simply regarded as cheap help and their indoctrination suffers.

After some time they are apprenticed and begin to pick up the actual practices, the actual knowledge of the business itself.

Without going any further, surely here is something that either the government, or the appropriate administrative body which the government is neglecting should look into, because clearly it is not a very creditable kind of situation.

I quote again, on page 44:

> In Ontario, the board of administration is encouraging the low salary scale, whether consciously or not, by allowing its office to suggest an outrageously low salary to prospective employers of graduates of its school. Seventy-five dollars weekly is too little for a young man to support a wife, having invested two years of his life as an apprentice for nearly half that amount. It is almost unbelievable that in the sixties I should know a young man who receives $12 a week as an apprentice embalmer.

That is the first point I would like to draw to the attention of the House, and I am curious to know whether it can be defended by our "professional defender" from Ottawa East.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, one other comment in this same area, with regard to the school. This is found on pages 46 and 47:

> The Canadian school of embalming, which is the only outfit in Canada worthy of mention, is located in Toronto and enrolls primarily Ontario students. It operates in conjunction with the Ontario system of apprenticeship, and it provides a total of 13 weeks of formal classes at three stages during the two-year indenture period.
>
> This school is no less farcical than the system that spawned it. Its course of study, which only a few short years ago barely lasted ten days, has been padded and embellished to 13 weeks. Throughout, it smacks of the artificial; the futile attempt to construct a façade to place in front of the mouldering slum that is the funeral business. Rather than maintain high standards in its courses, the school has geared itself to the lowest level of the apprentices who enroll.

And then it goes on to elaborate this more fully. I am not going to take the time of the House to put this all on the record, interesting though it may be. But here you have not only the conditions, the lack of standards, you have a school which, it is flatly charged, is really palming off a shoddy product that normally used to be given in ten days and has now been spun out to some 13 weeks.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me move on to what is perhaps of more general interest to the public—the costs involved. On pages 85 and 86, he points out the increase—my friend from Ottawa East, was not here when I identified my source. I am quoting from a book to be published at the end of this week by McClelland and Stewart, called *Death*,

Here is Thy Sting. It is the Canadian version of the American book which you were dismissing, so now you are going to have an up-to-date documented Canadian story to cope with.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): No doubt about it.

Mr. MacDonald: That is right. He points out, for example, on page 85 that in 1893 the cost of a funeral, complete with varnished casket was $36.

In 1919, the cost of a funeral was $37.75. And then he proceeds to indicate what has happened in the interval:

> "The funeral with a solid oak casket, which in 1933 was $185 and in 1941 was $245, is now $850 and rising like a helium balloon. At this rate of increase, about $25 per year, it will cost $1,725 to be buried in an oak casket in the year 2000.
>
> In any conversation regarding the cost of funerals in which a funeral director takes part, inevitably two phrases will arise. These are "average overhead per adult funeral" and the "below-cost funeral". He will contend—

The author suggests,

> —that the average funeral he conducts costs him $400. Thus, when he sells one for less than this figure, he is selling it "below cost".

Now Mr. Chairman, I draw this to your attention:

> "At the other end of the scale, however, the game becomes more lucrative. In the instance of a $1,200 funeral—here is a breakdown from a man inside the business:
>
> "Average overhead $400; cost of casket, approximate, $250; total cost $650; profit $550".

Not a bad racket, I would suggest in conclusion.

Mr. Ben: Is that supposed to be a documented—

Mr. MacDonald: He proceeds, Mr. Chairman—and I will give the pages so that they can be checked and followed through later—in consideration of costs with the following observations:

> The executive secretary of the Ontario board of administration stated in a panel discussion recently that funerals could be had in Toronto for as little as $135. He neglected to explain that these funerals were never on display in showrooms nor did he explain why a minister who polled four establishments searching for one for a needy family in his congregation, had finally to settle for a $300 funeral. To elderly people who must live on modest incomes and to younger couples with low incomes and large families, the $350 to $400 minimum shown in most places represents an awful lot of money.
>
> It follows that one's first consideration in proposing changes that would benefit the funeral purchaser is the price. A law compelling all funeral establishments to have in their showrooms in full view at all times, a casket bearing a price not exceeding $125, is essential. This casket could be purchased by the funeral director for as little at $40. No firm, no matter what its overhead, is going to suffer appreciably by making only $85 a few times a year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I might just bring my friend, who is eagerly listening, into the picture in light of last year's debate. His interjection to be found on page 2792 of *Hansard*, for April 28, 1966 was to the effect, "I made a statement at one of the meetings of the committee on aging that there was not one funeral director in Ontario who would not supply a complete funeral for the sum of $300." Now that, obviously, in light of what the author of this book has put forward, is rather an interesting comment. Not one funeral director who would not supply it for no more than $300—This is a rock bottom price—but they can get a casket for $40 and they could supply it for $125 and they could still make a profit of $85, so declares a man from within the industry.

Mr. Worton: A man from London told us you could have a complete one for $125 but it did not add up to the way most people would want it.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right? Well, we will come to it in a moment here, Mr. Chairman. He makes a suggestion with regard to an experiment that he thinks should be conducted in the Toronto metropolitan area. He points out that in the metropolitan area there are 9,000 adult deaths each year. Therefore he says it is a prime location in which to conduct an experiment in low-cost funerals. His suggestion is that if such a business were set up—and he goes into the details of pointing out the number of people who would be available to be drawn in; he even makes the suggestion that the Toronto memorial society might be the appropriate body to sponsor bringing this group together.

If such a business were set up in Toronto and were to handle 3.3 per cent of the yearly deaths, or 300 funerals a year, they could operate in the black by charging $80 per funeral. Indeed, the author adds that:

> Affiliation with the Toronto memorial society would allow membership dues and personal donations to subsidize this figure and it could be reduced to $50 or even less. Immediately there will be claims by funeral directors that funerals are presently available for as little as $135 or $150, making all this bother unnecessary for the small savings realized. Indeed there probably have been a few sold at these prices but they are not displayed in the showrooms and they are not readily available, as many people who have searched for them can attest.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to draw to the attention of the House a matter of major concern to us as legislators. Having gotten an up-to-date expert's view of the situation, which I am glad to present rather than mine, which might be rather automatically dismissed, we should come to grips with the administrative problem involved; and what this government has not done about it, though the issue has been before it for quite some time. On page 105 of the book—I quote again:

> The Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act of Ontario states "the board of administration shall consist of five persons of whom not fewer than three shall be licensed funeral directors". Obviously this clause was intended to insure that the establishment have a veto over outsiders in the board's deliberations, since it loads the dice in favour of funeral men. It is at best an unfair piece of legislation. But this is only the beginning. A quick check of the members of the board which is responsible for governing some 1,700 embalmers and funeral directors in Ontario, revealed that all five members are licensed funeral directors —not just three.

Then there is an asterisk to note that one of the five has either died or resigned.

There is one vacancy, and that vacancy has been there since June of 1965 and has not been filled. "There are rumours around," the author adds, "to the effect that the provincial government is considering risking the indignation of the funeral directors by appointing a total outsider to their board." But in characteristic fashion prolonged consideration has gone on for well nigh two years.

However, let me proceed with his suggestion as to the appropriate kind of board, and I put this to the Minister for his comments in terms of what he has not done, or what he might do.

The author says:

> The board should be established of seven members of which three should be funeral directors and three should be prominent citizens including a clergyman. The final member and chairman should be a representative of the provincial health Minister. In the case of tied votes, his deciding ballot would reflect the opinion of the provincial government.

This is our responsibility as legislators, in addition to our interest as citizens—as public spirited citizens—speaking on behalf of the people of Ontario. I would appreciate getting this year's version of what is the Minister's reaction to it all.

Mr. Ben: May I ask the hon. member a question? Did I understand him to say that if a funeral director handled 3.3 or 300 funerals a year at $80 a funeral, he could make a profit? Did I understand that correctly or did I miss—

Mr. MacDonald: This man said that you could set up a new funeral organization in the Metro area to handle no more than 3.3 per cent of the 9,000 adult deaths in the province of Ontario in this area, and that this would make it possible to operate with a profit on an $80 charge.

Mr. Ben: In the black?

Mr. MacDonald: In the black, yes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: There is a chance for you.

Mr. Ben: I believe the minimum cost for cremation is $50 plus $5 for a notary fee to have an affidavit taken. That would be $55—$16,500. Surely there is some transportation costs. Do they not believe that anybody in this business should be paid something for his services? The minimum cost would be $55 for a funeral.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to argue with the hon. gentleman on the details. This has been put forth by the author of the book. I invite him to read it. It is a non-profit organization that he suggests should be associated with the Toronto memorial society, and it is his view—from a person who has been within the industry—that it could be done at this price.

Mr. Ben: I was just pointing out, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps I was misunderstood, the minimum charge for cremation in the Toronto area is $50. You have to pay that to the crematorium. In addition to this, there is a $5 charge for obtaining necessary affidavits to satisfy the requirements of the Act—that is $55 a funeral. That is $16,500, exclusive of transportation costs, and does not include a pine box that you would have to put together to put the body in for the crematorium. So I question those figures, unless everybody is going to be volunteering their services.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into this debate. To take the Minister off the hook I think perhaps he should respond to those remarks of the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party. I would like just to say one thing, Mr. Chairman, the costs that the hon. member has mentioned are far away from the fact, and I think that perhaps the Minister could ask the chairman of the board of examiners to appear as one of his advisors during this debate. He probably could give very interesting statistics.

I do not know whether this has been done in the past, but possibly this board, being under the jurisdiction of this Minister, should have a say either in this Legislature during the estimates, or appearing before some other committee. Now, just from memory, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the average cost per funeral, the average administrative cost, in this province would be well over the $400 mark that the member has mentioned. How anybody could operate any business selling something at $125 on a continual basis which cost him between $400 and $500, I do not know how it can be done.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Racine: Well now, Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that we should be discussing a problem of this kind without having the experts here. I do not consider myself one of the experts. I think somebody in the administration, somebody appointed by the government, should come and reply to those allegations made by the hon. member. And I think possibly that tonight or some other time during the estimates that the chairman or one of the members of the board of examiners should be called upon to come and reply to some of those allegations.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, before the Minister replies, the hon. member may, if he so chooses, say "the charges that have been made by the hon. member for York South." I am not making charges this year, I am quoting from a book which is now going to become part of the reading of this country. It is coming out on April 22, the end of this week. And I do not think this book can be dismissed, because it is somebody from within the industry who is now going to give us an inside view of the industry. I do not object to the proposal of the hon. gentleman, but I do not think the procedures of this House will permit it here. It conceivably could go to a standing committee of the Legislature, but I would make an alternative suggestion: Namely, we should establish an appropriate board of administration—not one which is loaded with the "establishment" of the industry, with at least three of the five, according to the Act—and the Minister has tended in the past to have five of the five—being funeral directors. I suggest consideration of the author's proposal, that we should have a board of seven—three should be prominent citizens, including a clergyman, and three should be funeral directors. The final member should be a chairman representative of the provincial Minister of Health. In other words, you would have a fair balance, three representing the public, three representing the industry involved and an impartial chairman representing the provincial Minister of Health. I think that is the appropriate body to look into the allegations that are made here and have been made generally across the North American continent with such frequency that no spokesman on behalf of the industry can dismiss them in the easy fashion they often attempt.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it absolutely clear that I am not here to defend the funeral industry or any other industry.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a good beginning.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am here to try to look after the interests of the people of the province. The board as it now exists, I inherited. I believe that in my term of office I have named a new chairman who was an existing member of the board. I am subject to correction on this, but if my memory serves me right, I do not believe that I have named an appointee to this board in all my term of office. The vacancy exists as a result of the death of a late member of this Legislature, the late Mr. Fullerton. He was a member of the board for many years. I have deliberately left this vacancy, and let me again make it absolutely clear that I am not the least bit

worried about the indignation of the industry. I could not care less. They have never shown any evidence of indignation, but I have deliberately left this vacancy because of a concern evidenced by the public about the constitution of the board.

First of all, I do not believe that this board belongs in The Department of Health at all. I think the time has gone when dead bodies have much relationship to public health.

Mr. Ben: Change it then.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If the hon. members would not be quite so impatient, I might get to this.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The Minister has taken several years to get to it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Another few minutes will not hurt. We will let the member know before he leaves. If he is gone before we get at it, we will write him a letter.

We have looked at this and I have discussed this with public health authorities. I have discussed this with my advisors and it is the consensus of their opinion that this should not be included with other state register Acts coming within the purview of this Ministry. There are no health matters involved. Consequently, the Act should be assigned to some other department, and now with the establishment of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs this might very well be the place where it should go, because there is a very large business element in the operation.

However, so long as it is under my—

Mr. Singer: Why does the Minister not wait until he comes in and then suggest it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have tried it on for size with many of my colleagues, but I have not been very successful. Nobody wants it.

Mr. Singer: No takers.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: But I do want to point out that while it is under The Department of Health, we will try to administer the Act and the reason—

Mr. S. Lewis: What do you mean, tried it on for size?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The reason we have kept this vacancy is in the hope that out of the deliberations of the healing arts committee, which will deal with some bodies with a distant relationship and function, we will get some clue as to where this kind of thing really does belong and what kind of government or state registered board it should have.

This is frankly why an appointment has not been made. Indeed we were on the verge of making one when we determined to take another look at it and since we had waited so long—the member says now nearly two years—since our late colleague died—the board is not going to suffer for another year.

The board is not, under the Act, charged with the responsibility of setting prices and this is not to be construed in any way as my defence of the industry. I have no intention of defending any industry, but the board of directors which administers this Act has absolutely no authority to set prices or fees, or anything else. It is concerned with standards. The quotations read by the hon. member for York South from this book are quite revealing and quite enlightening, and unfortunately I do not know anything about the course they take. I did not realize that the school did go for this length of time. But even so, the responsibility and the authority to set up the standards of education, to determine what course of instruction shall be given, how long it shall last and all of these things, so that the members of the industry may qualify for a licence, these things are the responsibility of the board and the government does not interfere in it.

But again I can only say that we have noted the remarks of the hon. member and I have noted very clearly, as he stated, that he is not giving his own views; he is reading from a book that will be made public. I do not think there is any need, there is no right or authority to bring any member of the board to this floor. There is not any question however that the board could not be asked to come before the standing committee on health, if they so choose, and this is—

Mr. MacDonald: If we so choose.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, if the Legislature so chooses, there is no—I do not presume there will be any question, you can order them to come anyway. But this why the vacancy has not been filled.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add this to my comments. I believe that after we start the new session next year, there might be half a dozen more of my colleagues in this chamber, so maybe I will have new support of that kind.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: How does he define colleague?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): What he means is that he is going to bury the government.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health, in the brief statement he has just made, attempted to suggest, as I understood it, that he was taking a neutral position on this matter. I would like to suggest to him and to the committee that by leaving the matter in a state of suspended animation, he is not taking a neutral stand at all. He is taking a stand—whether deliberately or otherwise is beside the point—in favour of the existing set-up. That is what is happening. The set-up is remaining unchanged. The board is dominated entirely by the funeral directors. The public interest is not represented on that board at all and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that is not a satisfactory state in which to leave the situation for an indeterminate period of time.

When I said to the Minister—I do not remember now the exact words—that he had been sitting on this matter for several years, that we had been waiting for him for several years, I was not referring merely to the vacancy that occurred on the board a couple of years ago, owing to the unfortunate death of one of the members of the board. I was referring to the fact that this has been a matter of his responsibility ever since he took over as Minister of Health, which was a good many years ago; and he has done absolutely nothing about it in all that time. I think the time has come when the government has to act. I think the Minister should have in mind bringing in legislation to change the set-up as far as the governing board is concerned. I think the public has a right to be represented, that there is an important interest to protect. The Minister may be correct in stating that the function is not appropriately in his department and that it should be transferred to some other department, but as long as it is left with him, it is his responsibility and he should do something about it.

I would like to say with regard to the statement made by the hon. member for Ottawa East that the average cost of supplying funerals in the province is over $400. He raised the question as to how anybody could stay in business charging low prices if that is the cost of providing funerals on an average. The point, in this book, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman—I have not read it, but I have read the articles in the Toronto *Star* that were based on it—the point is that a great many of the costs involved in most funerals are not necessary costs. They could be avoided, but people are led to believe that they are necessary costs.

People, I suppose, are in the most defenceless position possible when they have to deal with the arranging of a funeral for some loved one who has died. In my opinion, the evidence is overwhelming from a great many different sources that the industry takes unfair advantage of people in this psychologically defenceless position. It saddles them with all sorts of costs which they cannot afford and which are not necessary.

Even the item of embalming. Most people, I think, still have the view and are encouraged to believe that embalming is necessary under the law. But it is not necessary at all, as long as certain other requirements are met.

They are induced by subtle psychological manipulation to buy caskets that are far beyond their means, and, as I understand it, the price of the funeral more or less relates to the casket you buy. The more expensive the casket, the more expensive the funeral. People are very susceptible to this subtle type of influence at this particular time in their lives.

This is a matter that the government should act on. I think the Minister has a very good idea when he says that it is a matter that could appropriately come within the scope of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs. I have never liked the title of that department because I do not think it indicates the kind of approach that the department should have. But within that department is the function of consumer protection, and this comes within the field of consumer protection. The relatives of a deceased person are consumers in this case. I think that department should get cracking on this matter.

I hate to see the continuous delay that has always taken place. The Minister quite courageously stated that he is not concerned to protect anybody other than the public, and that is the attitude that a Minister should properly take. The only thing is, he is not doing anything to protect the public at all. And to do nothing is to continue to permit the public to be rooked. I think that the government has to move in, and until some change is made as far as the allocation of functions within the Cabinet is concerned, the Minister of Health should accept the responsibility he has and move in and do something in this field.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, in his own inimitable way, has twisted this matter completely out of proportion. It would not matter if the board appointment had been made the next day—

Mr. Bryden: I am not talking about that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It would not matter if the board were all people outside the industry. Under the Act the board has absolutely no authority over prices of funerals.

Mr. MacDonald: Give it some authority.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No sir. I do not believe that The Department of Health should advise anybody to set prices. That is not our business, but the board as constituted under this Act and whose responsibility the Legislature has made the administration of this Act, has no authority over the cost of funerals; and if the board were filled, I repeat, and if it were filled with outsiders under this Act it would have no right or no authority to set the price of funerals.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I am not in this particular business although I have had some experience with people in that business especially in the last election. But as a result of a number of American books written and which were distributed here, I took it upon myself to make some enquiries and visit a number of these establishments, and I was rather surprised at the figures that were given to me. For instance, my hon. friend from Ottawa East made a statement that the average cost is around $400. He was not able to put his finger on it but if you take your pencil and paper and start doing a little calculation you will see it works out very easily.

For instance, the average establishment in the metropolitan area has a value of about $100,000. If you take 6 per cent—that is just bank interest on that—it is $6,000 a year. You amortize that building over a 20-year period —that is the capital cost—that works out to $5,000—that is $11,000. You also have to calculate depreciation on this building, and even if you put that only at 5 per cent, that is another $5,000 for a total of $16,000.

A hearse cost $18,000. It depreciates at 30 per cent a year and already you have another $5,400. So you tack it on to that and you already have $23,400. You have to buy two Cadillacs—they run at $10,000 apiece—that is $20,000. Again depreciation at 30 per cent and it works out to another $6,000.

Mr. S. Lewis: Why a Cadillac?

Mr. Ben: People want to go away in style. Aside from that, you have your other equipment on which you have depreciation. Now, the hon. member for York South pointed out that there are approximately 9,000 funerals in the province in a year.

Mr. Bryden: In Toronto!

Mr. Ben: In Toronto. In Metro Toronto—all right! So you average out how many a funeral director would handle, and what the average cost is for a funeral depends on how many clients the undertaker has. If he has 100 and it costs him $40,000 a year on his overhead alone, there is your average of $400. On the other hand, if he handles 200 funerals a year instead of 100, his overhead drops to $200. This is exclusive of the cost of the caskets, the embalming fluids, and the employees, so it is quite easy to see how these average costs could add up. What I want to talk about is my own experience in these matters.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: I have had the knife in the back more than one time—I just resurrect easily.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have to say to you that while this is most fascinating, it really has nothing to do with my estimates. I have nothing in the world to do with the price of funerals. There is nowhere in my estimates where this has any place. I would suggest, that this is a proper subject for the Budget debate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: I am sorry, I thought we were going to call at six o'clock.

Mr. Chairman: This would be a good time to conclude.

Mr. Ben: Well I had better conclude—Amen.

It being 6.00 o'clock, the House took recess.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 71



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 20, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 20, 1967

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued 2439

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 2477

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
(Continued)

On vote 801:

Mr. Chairman: Before starting vote 801 dealing with the main office, perhaps the Minister would like to welcome his guests.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your kind indulgence in allowing me to present to you, sir, a group of something in excess of 100 fine folk from the great riding of Ontario, the only riding in the province that was deemed worthy of being called for the province itself, sir.

I am not going to tell you, sir, that these people are all Progressive Conservatives. I am going to tell you that they are all progressive and they are folk of rare and discriminating taste, because I can assure you that at the appropriate time and in the appropriate place, they will remember that Dymond is Conservative. I know that you will welcome them to this House, sir.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I yielded the floor to permit the hon. Minister to welcome his constituents to this House. I think it is only fair that I welcome him to Port Perry on April 28 where I will be to say a few kind words about this government. I hope the whole 100 turn out. Now, Mr. Chairman, before we recessed for the dinner hour we were on the subject of funerals and I created some jest in the House when I said I was speaking from my own experiences. My own experiences do not involve being six feet under, although many endeavours have been made to bury me in the past. My experiences concern the psychological aspect of these funerals and I only make these remarks in more or less rebuttal to what the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) stated.

It seems today, Mr. Chairman, that more emphasis is placed on the dead than on the living and it is not quite fair to try to place the blame on any particular profession in existence today. The experiences that come to my mind are where I acted as executor—actually it was on three occasions, and another one—where in order to preserve a rather small estate for the beneficiaries in looking after the funeral, I tried to keep the prices within reason. Great abuse was heaped upon me and I was accused of not showing proper dignity to the deceased.

Just recently I had an experience where these people came to me; a person had passed away. They were distant kin. They would not benefit from the estate, the estate would go to somebody in another country, and they consulted me. I explained to them that when a person passes away any money he leaves does not any longer belong to him but it belongs to the beneficiaries and if they are going to be the administrators, it is their bounden duty to preserve the estate. I advised them that an average funeral in the province of Ontario ran from $465 to $500 and suggested to them that they keep the total cost of the funeral in that range. Heeding my advice, they did go out, and the total cost including the cemetery charges was barely over $500.

Well, Mr. Chairman, not in my life have I received so much abuse over the telephone, nor did so many people abuse this couple, who had taken upon themselves the duties of administrators. They charged them with being disrespectful to the man and trying to take the money themselves, "it was a cheap coffin, cheap this, cheap that". It seems that we are obsessed these days with throwing big weddings, big bar mitzvahs, and big funerals. You can deride the profession as much as you like, but it is the whole philosophy that we have to change—that it is the living that are important today. It is the living that must be served and not the dead.

As long as we do not change the existing policy, we are going to go on and I think the hon. member for York South pointed out what the funerals are going to cost in A.D. 2000. They are going to keep on going up $25 a year as he indicated. It is the philosophy that we must change and if there is any blame

to be put on the government, it is that they permit this policy to exist and they do not place enough emphasis on the necessity for serving the living, rather than the dead.

Mr. Chairman: I did not want to interfere with the statement by the member. He was making his point. But I pointed out earlier that there is no money in the estimates to deal with this. I just wanted him to complete his statement—

Mr. Ben: I read your mind and I sat down.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, under the main office, could the Minister tell us a little about this committee on the healing arts? What is it doing, other than hearing the briefs which have been presented to it over the last few weeks?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This committee, Mr. Chairman, you will recall, was set up last year to look into many matters concerning the health manpower professions, technologists and para-professionals, para-health people. The terms of reference of the committee were to inquire into and report upon all matters relating to education, and regulation, relative to the practice of the healing arts. This is a very broad reference as will be readily understood by the hon. members.

They have invited briefs from all those who are involved in practising any or all of the healing arts. I cannot tell you the statistics now, but I did hear from the chairman a short time ago how many briefs had been submitted to them. Certain of the bodies have been invited to appear before them. They will all be invited to appear before them in order that they can lay a good background for the study, out of which it is hoped that they will bring forward—at least they will present their views on the existing legislation. And if, in their opinion, change is necessary, they will make those recommendations to the government. In addition to hearing briefs and listening to people and questioning people, they are, of course, carrying out some background research on the whole matter in respect of what is done in these areas of activity in other jurisdictions.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, who conducts the research for them? What is the manpower of the committee itself other than the people who sit and listen?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not certain that I can name them, I do know they have retained several well known—I believe the number is seven—research workers, and they are also commissioning studies. I might say that the chairman if the three-man committee is a well known businessman who held high and important executive positions. One member is a professor of economics, Professor Urquhart, at Queen's university, and the other, Professor Kreever, professor of law at Toronto university, or one of the Toronto law schools, anyway.

Mr. S. Lewis: Would it be possible, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister to inform the House the nature of some of the background studies they are doing ahead of their being published? Is that within the public domain?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It will be within the public domain. Indeed, the chairman asked me about this and I stated, of course, that in my view, if whatever was done for them, in their opinion, ought to be published, then it should be. But I do not believe it will be published until their own report is submitted and I am not in a position to give the member any information about it because I do not know myself. I have not asked them for any definitive statement so far. I do not believe the researchers are progressed to the point where they would have a meaningful report ready yet.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the Minister could tell us if the committee on healing arts consider optometrists and chiropractors as part of the healing arts?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Exactly. Everyone—I believe there are 18 different groups acting under the laws of the province of Ontario. All of those are automatically within the purview of their study, and any others who want to come forward or any others whom they in their wisdom may call. But all of them are included. Indeed, I think most of them—most of the well known groups—have already submitted briefs to the committee and have appeared before them at least in a preliminary way.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, when the college of optometry appeared before the committee on the healing arts, they said, "The provincial department is neither organized nor representative of the broad spectrum of health services for which the department is responsible." I hope the committee on the healing arts will take the words closely to heart. I think the optometrists made a good point here when they appeared.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prejudge the committee but the member for Scarborough West made reference to the optometrists and I just say to you that I think the same thing applies as far as the chiropractors are concerned. I have stood in my place here in this House on many occasions and indicated to the members that the chiropractic profession, in my opinion, makes a very valuable contribution in the whole area of health services. It seems to me that this is a valuable study and I hope that the committee comes up with some very definite and precise recommendations as they apply to the paramedical people.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the Minister if the department has undertaken any studies in any community concerning the need for a—I will term it as a community centre—where you could assess and coordinate the needs of crippled children in the various types of afflictions they may have? I refer to cerebral palsy as being one, and any other group that you may have.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have not undertaken research as a direct activity of the department in this matter, but we do support research. Now, whether any study in this specific area has been done—I would presume it has been, although I am not familiar at this point in time with it—but we do support the society for crippled children and any other body that makes application for support of a research project.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the O'Hern committee, or the Dr. O'Hern report that is being prepared in the city of Windsor, is not at the expense of The Department of Health then, it is a private research into the health needs of the crippled children in the community, is not not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot tell the member that, because we might not know whether a project is receiving support. They submit the project proposal, it comes to our department—and most research is, of course, financed out of national health grants—but they are screened by us in a preliminary way, then they are sent to a federal screening committee and they are approved or rejected according to that committee's determination. I would not be in a position to tell the member if this particular project has backing or not. I would say in addition to what I have already said, that we did stimulate the establishment of a provincial register of all crippling diseases of children.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, is there not the need in each of the major centres, then, for a complete study of the needs of the unfortunate children, the crippled children, so that the various associations may not work at loggerheads and could coordinate their activities better?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I can tell the member that a very great deal has been going along in this direction at the instigation, and with the support and stimulus, of the Ontario society for crippled children for at least throughout my whole tenure of office so far. They have done a very great deal to bring together, to coordinate the efforts of the various bodies which were doing the major part of this work in the care of crippled children. One of the things that is of great importance is the establishment of the register, because we have not limited it to crippling in the ordinary sense, the disability of the limbs, we have tried to broaden it to include all kinds of crippling. That register will tell us more about the real problem perhaps than anything else or any other project we could undertake.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, that registry would also apply to a local area because, from your studies in there, the local area could assess the exact needs for the crippled child in their community; am I right?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. Newman: I thank the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Main office, carried?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, what exactly are—if the Minister will forgive my ignorance—the boards of review? What were they designed to do?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: These, Mr. Chairman, you will remember, are the boards which we set up by legislation under The Mental Health Act last year to whom patients who are held involuntarily in hospitals for the mentally ill can appeal for a complete review of their case. If in the view of the attending physician, a patient should not be discharged that patient has the right to appear or seek appearance before the review board. The review board must consist of at least one psychiatrist, one lawyer and one other person, but preferably two psychiatrists, one lawyer and two other persons, and some of the boards have that membership.

There are five boards set up across the province. The decision of those boards is binding upon the department. Whether the decision is contrary to the beliefs of the staff or not, their decision is binding by law upon the department. The membership of the boards is completely divorced from the department. No member of the department staff, no member of government staff can serve on those boards.

Mr. S. Lewis: I thought that might be what it was. I did not realize it would be under this vote. Could the Minister give us some idea of how many decisions have been made by the boards?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The boards have not been operative very long. The five boards were set up last December. I believe the eastern board has met and has discharged one patient on recommendation of the board and I have just received a note telling me that petitions are now being received by the boards.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the Minister a question concerning suicide clinics; I had asked this one year ago and since then I have noticed that several centres in the U.S. have promoted the idea of an anti-suicide clinic. The city of Buffalo apparently is quite active in it. Does the Minister not think that such a project might be worthwhile in a large centre, such as the Metro Toronto area, in which I understand more people commit suicide than actually are killed by motor vehicles?

Mr. S. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, if I may ask, sir, I wondered whether this would not come under the mental health vote? I do not want to—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I was about to say that.

Mr. Chairman: I believe so too.

Mr. Newman: Under research and planning branch, I thought possibly that—

Mr. Chairman: No, that would come under vote 806, mental health.

Mr. Trotter: Before we leave it, just to be certain, last year we discussed the various grants under the main office. Now I presume we are going to discuss them under 803, even though we ask questions of how you spent the money last year, we still ask them under vote 803?

Mr. Chairman: I think if a grant for money is provided under vote 803 we should discuss it at that time.

Main office—information branch.

Agreed to.

Legal branch.

Agreed to.

Personnel branch.

Agreed to.

Research and planning.

Agreed to.

Vote 801 agreed to.

On vote 802:

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on vote 802, the data processing branch. Has that anything to do with the equipment that was purchased for OMSIP?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This, as I stated in my opening statement, Mr. Chairman, is for the whole department. Last year it was exclusively for OMSIP, but in these estimates it is for the whole department. It is to form the core of our statistics and intelligence branch of the whole Department of Health.

Mr. Trotter: This would not include, I presume, the data processing that would be needed for the Ontario hospital services commission? That is separate?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is separate, yes.

Vote 802 agreed to.

On vote 803:

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on vote 803, there are one or two items I would like to make a few brief remarks on.

One is on the Canadian mental health association. I think there is a grant in here for $10,000; item 13, the Canadian mental health association is $10,000.

I think this grant for $10,000 has been given for some years and despite the expansion of this particular association, the grant has not been increased. I do not know if they have asked for it or not. I assume any association would not turn it down. But this particular group has done a tremendous amount of good work. They have pioneered in the mental health field. They have pioneered many things that have now been taken over by government and we now take for granted. I feel that more support should be given to this particular organization. As I was saying in my opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, the mental health field is probably one of the single most important problems we have in this province. It is admittedly most expensive, but it will be even more

costly unless we take far more active action than we have in recent years.

Just to give you some idea of the changes that have taken place, this group in 1960 had various volunteer services, such as hospital visiting. I think they set up nine branches for that work. Today they have 19 branches, and yet are still using the same grant. They have also gone into industrial rehabilitation workshops. Instead of two white cross centres, they now have 10. Instead of three bus services to hospitals, they now have six and of course they have also expanded their homes for special care services.

This is volunteer work and if the government, no matter on what level, had to do it, it would certainly cost the taxpayer far more money. But still it is costing this particular group more money. They are able to raise more from the general public, but my understanding is they are—as any such group in this work is—hard-pressed. But where they have really had tremendous expansion since, let us say, looking at the period for 1960 and comparing probably the year 1965-1966, they have had tremendous expansion in the work they have done in education.

For example, back in 1960, the Ontario division programme of the Canadian mental health, pioneered what is now known as mental health week. They had public meetings and then they had three branch workshops on mental health and then they had public health workshops. That was the work that they did in 1960. Since that time, they have not only continued having the four items that I have mentioned, but as no doubt the Minister is aware and I am sure his staff is aware, they have published a very great number of items—various papers for psychiatrists and psychologists and particularly for parents of children of various ages, such as the pre-schoolers, the teen-agers and generally for children of school age, emphasizing I think in some instances, children in grade 13. They have put out a tremendous number of publications on family life and on aging and I know one of the most successful conferences held on mental health, especially on after care, was held in the latter part of 1965, I believe, in Niagara Falls, Ontario.

This is much-needed educational work. As I was saying earlier, there has been a great deal of public apathy when it comes to mental health. These people, the Canadian mental health association, and in particular our own province, the Ontario division of that group, have certainly been the outstanding pioneers in this work. Without their help, the province would not have made nearly the strides that it has made. I feel that for every dollar that is granted to this particular group, we get at least 10 in the value that is paid out, because they have such a tremendous number of volunteers that if you ever had to pay for the work they did, it would be a very large sum.

Again, it is not so much in the work of education, but I believe in the field of what they would call "social action." Back in 1960, I think, they had a York county mental health clinic; and then in Ottawa they had a community hospital. Since that time, in what they call social action, they have established a camp for emotionally disturbed children in York county; they have provided a clinic in Belleville and there has been a considerable amount of planning on new conferences.

I have not mentioned everything these people have done; these are just a few that come to mind. I realize that as a matter of policy, the government cannot give too much in the way of money to one particular private group, but $10,000 is not a very tremendous sum. I know, for example, The Department of Reform Institutions gives $30,000 to the Salvation Army and we certainly as a government get our $30,000 worth of taxation money plus. It would cost the government a great deal more to do the same work that the Salvation Army does for The Department of Reform Institutions.

Again I say, in comparing this Canadian mental health association with the work that they do for The Department of Health, I think that any grants given to them are well invested. I know that the Canadian mental health association and particularly the Ontario division, has probably been the most informed—it has a tremendous amount of literature available—and seems to have contacts with all the authorities in this field, not just in North America, but literally throughout the world. It is highly informed and they have well trained people. But to get well trained people they need to pay decent salaries and there is always work that needs to be done. I was wondering if the Minister would comment and tell us if it were not possible to pay a larger grant to this association. I just say in concluding my remarks on this particular item—I do not know if they have requested more money, I have never asked, but I suppose any particular group could use it, and from what I know of the Canadian mental health association, the Ontario division, they could certainly use it, and

I feel the government money would be very well spent.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the association has asked for increased grants periodically over my years but when I took over this chair the grant I think was $2,000, and we did get it up to $10,000. But the philosophy underlying grants to volunteer organizations is that they are a token grant to help them get started, to get the work started. These are voluntary organizations, they do the volunteer work, and while we have continued to give them $10,000 we have taken over ourselves a very great deal of the work that called for the expenditure of money. The hon. member pointed out rightly that the association used to operate clinics and found a very great deal of the financing to pay for those. The government took over the cost of those some years ago so they are relieved of that. The association opened a camp two or three years ago. We looked upon this camp as an approved boarding home. While in the first instance they took our patients and gave them a holiday and kept them at no cost to the department, we felt that this was imposing a rather difficult burden on a volunteer group and we would have had to keep the patients anyway, therefore we recognized the camp as an approved boarding home for the purpose and we sent out patients there and paid for it.

The hon. member spoke about the literature. Yes, they do distribute a great deal of literature but in large measure it is literature that we get through the federal government for distribution or we ourselves produce and the volunteer organization distribute it. They do get literature from other sources but a great deal of what they distribute is provided either through the federal Department of Health or our own here. There is no doubt that they are doing excellent work and I do not want to downgrade it in any way, but as one looks over the lists of grants a very large amount of money is being put into this grant system and the very argument my hon. friend has used could rightly and well be used in behalf of almost any of these organizations, particularly, for instance, the Canadian arthritis and rheumatism society. This is just as great a health problem and equally disabling and we have not been able to raise the grant to this voluntary organization. It is just a matter of dollars. I do not have enough and we try to spread them around the best way we possibly can.

Another matter that the association used to do, that has been taken over by government, was to provide a great deal of money to stimulate research. Now, as you look at the grants here, the government's own arm established within the last seven years the Ontario mental health foundation. It does this directly for government and this year will spend a budget somewhere in the neighbourhood of a million dollars. So that while we have not raised the grant to the voluntary organization we have taken over responsibility for a great many expenditures that they themselves used to make.

Mr. Trotter: Well, there is one thing—you mentioned the literature that they would probably get from the federal government. I realize there may be some pamphlets of that type but what I really had in mind was the briefs that they have prepared for various committees. For example, I was on the committee on aging and this particular group prepared an excellent brief which is worth keeping—it is a reference. The same on the committee on youth. These are well done and certainly they originate with this particular group. It is not a hand-me-down that they have received from someone else. I believe they also prepared an extensive brief for an education committee here in the province and this type of literature really consists of original research, and it certainly saves government a cost because this information is needed. I think it is unfortunate that the Minister does not think more kindly toward this. I know that there are other groups that are important—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think I have to interject here. I think very kindly of them but I have not got the money. I cannot spend money I do not have, sir, and I just do not feel justified in asking this House to give me any more for this particular purpose. But I feel very kindly to them and I deeply appreciate the tremendous amount of work they are doing.

Mr. Trotter: Well you see, I feel, and I think many people in this province feel, that mental health is probably the major problem in your particular field, and even with all due respect to the many other groups I think great emphasis should be put on this field within the next few years, because it is by far the most costly thing we have because of lack of mental health. In fact, I think there is more loss to our economy because of mental health than all the other diseases combined. This is why I feel that it should be emphasized, and I do not think this government is emphasizing the problem enough. The fact that you would let this matter go by at $10,000 is peanuts for the problem that

you have, I know every dollar is important but with the extent of this problem that we have to face—and we simply are not facing it—I think that this is indicative that the government simply is not doing enough.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Forest Hill.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Chairman, I may be able to cast a little light on this matter by way of analogy. The work of the Canadian arthritis and rheumatism society has been briefly mentioned and as members may or may not know my principal non-political activity is as executive director of the Canadian arthritis and rheumatism society. We are a voluntary agency and, like the Canadian mental health association, I think, we feel that our strength depends upon our ability to acquire what might be regarded as votes of confidence, not solely from governments, but from individual contributors.

We, for example, have not asked the government to increase this grant to the Canadian arthritis and rheumatism society in recent years and yet our total revenue has increased in my time from $10,000 all told in one year, 18 years ago, to something like $2,250,000. We think we have more influence with government when we are not simply the payees of government. In the case of the arthritis society, during the past few years, very many important projects have been assumed by government. For example, the payment for physiotherapy for outpatients. And so, too, the arthritis society derives several hundred thousand dollars a year of income from the Ontario hospital services commission which buys those services from us.

So, too, one of our very important projects in recent years was the establishment of rheumatic disease units at university hospitals. In Ontario this year these units will cost us something in the neighbourhood of $140,000. The Ontario hospital services commission will pay well over $1 million towards their expenses, but not through our books. I think it is part of the philosophy of voluntary agencies, not only to move accepted projects into the public sector, but also not to become solely the payees of government and to demonstrate popular support by the extent to which they can achieve that very real vote of confidence which a personal subscription to an agency demonstrates.

Mr. Newman: May I put in a plea to the Minister at this time, for further assistance, if they have asked for it, to the multiple sclerosis society? I can recall that they attempted to form a local association in the city of Windsor. They did form one eventually but they had a most difficult time. And I would say that if either some guidance from The Department of Health or some financial assistance or some individual had been available there to assist them, they would have been able to form the association much sooner. The individuals suffering from multiple sclerosis, Mr. Chairman—there is no use telling you about the difficulties they go through—but certainly in my estimation they are worthy of all the support we can give them.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is another case where we do support research, but again this is only a token grant to the voluntary organization. In addition to this, this is one case where in order to assist them we have seconded a staff member full time, whose expenses we pay in full, so this is not clearly delineated, but all he does is to help these people in their work with the multiple sclerotics.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I was not referring to grants directly to research in the field of multiple sclerosis, I was referring to it to help areas throughout the province form multiple sclerosis societies, so that they themselves could help one another and be much better informed as to ways and means by which they could counter some of the serious effects of multiple sclerosis. My own community was confronted with that. They had difficulty forming a society and I know The Department of Health could have helped. Perhaps they were not approached.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what plans he has to increase the supply and flow of people in the nursing profession of Ontario and also what plans of—

Mr. Chairman: We are on grants at the present time.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about grants, Mr. Chairman; I am talking about grants to the college of nurses, $20,000; talking about grants to the registered nurses association of Ontario, $5,000; the grant for the St. Elizabeth visiting nurses association for $1,250. This government is prone to spending millions of dollars on research yet the most important thing facing our people today is the doctor shortage. Every time we talk about this we get the back of the hand from the government and from the Minister who pleads no control over this very important aspect of our life.

I do not know who he is trying to kid when he tries to put through grants to the RNAO, who have no bargaining power; they are not a union, they cannot go on strike and they cannot really effectively bargain collectively for their rights to be paid as a profession, and the doctor at all times absolves the right of any responsibility. What plans, I would like to know, has the Minister in mind; what research is he doing to solve this problem that is on our doorstep?

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest this does not properly come under this vote.

Mr. Sargent: It certainly does.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, I am sure, must have seen that the first item in vote 803 is doubled from last year. Concerning bursaries for mental, dental and other health personnel, I have asked the House for an increase of $500,000. Last year you voted me $500,000, which I think we spent well. We have asked that this be doubled in order to try to increase the flow of people. I might suggest that in the last year we provided bursaries to 1,134 people.

Some years ago, we established a special type of bursary assistance to medical and dental undergraduates. Unfortunately, the medical students have never picked up this bursary for some unknown reason. We do have a return of service attached to it and I do not think—

Mr. Sargent: How much is the bursary?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The bursary is $1,000 a year for four years and as a condition placed upon their getting this bursary we ask the doctor after he is trained to serve in a designated area one year for each $1,000 he gets. Now, we do not think that is an unreasonable or an unfair condition.

Mr. Sargent: It is $1,000 a year, is it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is $1,000 a year for four years, and then we expect them to serve in a designated area in the province for four years for the $4,000. We have undertaken that we will not send any doctor to any designated area where we cannot demonstrate that he will make a good living, so there is no question as to him giving anything back except the time. If I gauged the tenor of this House, at least two or three members on the other side of the House have made very clear their views which in some measure I share, that when one is educated at the expense of the state, that one owes the state something. We do not think it is at all unreasonable to ask that doctors who are given this bursary to help them through university to prepare themselves for a life career should give something back to the state in return. All we ask is that they go to a place where a doctor or dentist is needed.

Mr. Sargent: For how long?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: One year for each $1,000 he gets in bursaries.

As I explained in my opening statement this afternoon, we are looking at some new programmes in this area. In addition to that we hope to be able to offer some additional fringe benefit, if you will, by way of post-graduate work or special study. This is what we have done with psychiatrists for many years. When the psychiatrists get post-graduate training, one of the conditions of that training is that he gives us a return in services. This of course happens in practically all of these bursaries. But the only ones who have not taken very kindly to this have been those in my own profession, the profession of medicine. The dentists have picked up every bursary that was available to them and this year, as I have just suggested, I am asking for double the amount, $1 million instead of $500,000, in order that we can expand this bursary system.

The $5,000 the member mentioned granted to the RNAO is specifically earmarked for assistance to them in their recruitment campaign, to encourage high school students to go into the profession of nursing. The $20,000 advance to the Ontario college of nurses is to help them defray the costs of inspecting schools of nursing. This, we believe, is a responsibility they have under their laws, a service to the people of the province and it is not something from which they themselves derive any benefit. The only other way they would have of paying for it would be to levy a charge against their own members. Last year you will recall the House voted this for the first time and established the principle.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, is the $1,000 a year grant given to medical students, in addition to the national council research grant of $2,000?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is no national research council grant to an undergraduate.

Mr. Sargent: On a Ph.D. is there not—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: A Ph.D. is not an undergraduate student.

Mr. Sargent: The records show that 82 per cent of the applicants on first year medical were turned down because of lack of space. In other words, you had 141 people who were accepted in four medical schools. Now, where is the bottleneck, insofar as training facilities are concerned?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to go into this because I am not familiar with the figures at this time, except that I can repeat what I said last year—and I am having it cleared up by a study carried out by at least one of the two health sciences centres—that the numbers who made application for admission to medicine as published in the daily press were not accurate because they did not take into account multiple applications. Often, particularly now when there are limited spaces, a student planning to go into medicine will apply to each of the health sciences centres and that will mean there are four applications registered or filed when there is only one body. So this takes the figure down a very great deal, but I am assured by the deans of the health sciences centres in Ontario that practically every student who is capable of being enrolled in medicine has found a place. This is not 100 per cent accurate, because there is still a lack of space, which is being overcome as quickly as it is possible to put up the buildings. You can see a huge one going up on University Avenue. Queen's University has approval in principle to rebuild. Ottawa University has approval in principle to expand, but McMaster University has approval in principle to establish an entirely new school. Now, until they are built, there will be a shortage of places, not only for those who are applying presently, but to produce the number of doctors necessary to provide service for our growing population.

But I do want to make perfectly clear that the deans of the Ontario universities have assured me that these figures published in the press are not accurate and it is not a case of four applications for every place in the medical schools. These figures, of course, extend to the other health sciences as well as medicine itself.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Chairman, on this point—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor here.

Mr. White: With great respect—

Mr. Chairman: Allow the chairman to rule, please. The member for Grey North.

Mr. White: With great respect to the Minister, I think the deans are misleading him. I am absolutely certain that there are far more qualified students applying to the medical schools of Ontario than there are places for them and I can substantiate that assertion with statistics.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I do have a lot of faith in the Minister and his ability to convey the facts as he sees them and he has not likely had before in this House a man who sells a bill of goods for a phoney product. This man is doing a great job and I respect him for the job he is doing.

An hon. member: But!

Mr. Sargent: No, not "but".

I want to say this, that I thank the member for London South for what he said, but there are to my knowledge many, many able people who cannot get into a medical course because of lack of connections or lack of space; but I never seen a doctor's son who cannot get into a medical course. To my knowledge there has not been a doctor's son turned down. So this shows the clique—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will give you five names.

Mr. Sargent: Well, doctors do up our way, but we have many able people that have been turned down because of lack of connection, or what have you—money or something. But I do want to say I am glad you have a designated programme for the allocation of medical resources and people to the outlying parts of the province. But I am concerned with the fact that you leave the nursing profession out on a limb and say, "fend for yourself".

I think there should be a concerted plan on behalf of this very important arm by you, sir. No one else can pinpoint this and give it direction, because it is drifting right now and you are losing nurses day after day, going to the United States. My daughter who is nursing and I am not selling a bill of goods for her, but it is criminal what is going on in this country. The nurses are leaving us and going to the United States and we are going to have real trouble in this area. So I think it is time to forget about—if you are going to do research and all these great jobs you are doing, technological things, like science. Let us put it into human resources, into research on the need for medical people in medicine.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have overlooked telling the hon. member that the executive group of the council of health has carried out a research project in this matter of nursing personnel. I am advised they are just about ready to submit their report to me with definite recommendations as to how we might cope with it further.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, a little earlier, the Minister stated that he was mystified by the fact that the medical bursaries are not being taken up. I do not think we can let the matter rest there. It is bad enough if people are not getting to university because the money is not available. It is something more than just mystifying that the bursaries are not being taken up.

There is the problem that the hon. member for London South has pinpointed, I think, quite accurately, namely that there is a shortage of space. I am inclined to believe that people who are getting into the universities today for doctors do tend for the most part—not exclusively, but for the most part—to come from economic brackets that are perhaps not in need of bursaries. This is perhaps the answer to the fact that your bursaries are not being taken up. If you had more space in your medical schools, so that all those who wanted to get in, including those from some of the lower economic brackets, then the bursaries would be taken up. But I am just thinking out loud on the basis of the facts that have been presented to us. My point to the Minister is that it seems to me that either he or the committee on healing arts, or somebody, should be looking into the problem of why we are not training more doctors.

That is one problem. The other problem that I wanted to query the Minister on specifically is the question of the brain drain at the opposite end of the training process. Is the Minister in a position to indicate, for example, in the last two or three years, what proportion of our graduating class left immediately for the United States? When they leave, in some instances it may be just for interning purposes, but what proportion of those who leave ever come back? Again there are figures in the paper that suggest that we are spending a great deal of money in training doctors, but for a variety of reasons we lose them, it is a problem that is comparable to the kind of situation in the nursing field, but if anything, worse.

Mr. White: Well, you are one of the reasons.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, go away. If they took a good look at you they would all go away.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the hon. members the numbers. I do know that fairly substantial numbers of our graduating classes go to the United States particularly, but to other countries for their internship. We have not accurate figures on the numbers who come back. But I was rather heartened two weeks ago to have two of the health sciences centres advise me that they are very encouraged by their success in attracting teachers, who have left Canada, back into Canada, particularly back into Ontario. They are of the opinion that the brain drain is stopped because of the very vigorous programme of rebuilding and new building of health sciences centres in Ontario.

Why we are not producing more doctors is in part no doubt because we have not yet got enough buildings. But the buildings, I repeat, are going up as quickly as it is possible to build them and we can see this before our eyes. The University of Toronto procured a university hospital. Again, there is no use in going over what I have already said. Every health sciences centre in Ontario has approval to build or expand and when these programmes are brought to fruition then our numbers of doctors will not only soar, but with the Ontario council of health active, we are not only planning for today and for five years hence, we are planning as far as we can project into the future.

One of the most important and most active committees within the purview of the Ontario health council is the committee on manpower and this is the project to which it has applied all its efforts since the council was established a year ago.

The bursaries included in our item for additional bursaries represent money to provide support for men and women who are capable of, and interested in, and willing, to go on to further study in order to prepare themselves to teach in the new health sciences centres. This is, no matter how we look at it, a very important matter. And again, a building, no matter how modern or how elaborate it may be, if it is not manned by properly trained and fully skilled people, cannot develop new people for service.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the bursaries are available to non-Canadians resident in Canada, not citizens?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: As long as they are going to serve in Ontario.

Mr. Newman: Regardless of citizenship at the time they apply?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. Newman: Are they available to—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There has to be an undertaking that they are going to repay their return in services in Ontario.

Mr. Newman: Are they available to students attending the colleges, the medical schools in the United States or in foreign jurisdictions, other than the United States?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We do not have a hard and fast rule. We would prefer they take their training in Canada, but we have granted bursaries to take training outside of Canada and outside of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Until you solve your space problem surely it would be wise.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right. I was going to make that point—and the specialized training they might get outside too.

Mr. Newman: I was going to mention the fact, Mr. Chairman, coming as I do from a border town, that it would be much closer for our residents to cross the river and take their training in Detroit if bursaries were available to them. I do not say that any of them do but I know of individuals who are going into business school there and I understand they do not have too much problem coming back into Canada to practise.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think in fairness and honesty, Mr. Chairman, I should point out to you that we have had one or two unfortunate experiences. This is not a debt that we can collect by law and this is not an extraditable offence and we have lost a few of those—I do not suppose it is loss to humanity —they have gotten their training at the expense of the people of Ontario and have forgotten to come back to pay us back.

Mr. Newman: By the same token there will be others, Mr. Chairman, who would have had the same thing happen to them in their other jurisdiction and have come into Ontario and provided us with their abilities.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is not very appealing to an Aberdonian.

Mr. Newman: Well, we do have the doctors coming in from India, Mr. Chairman, that we still—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, let us not start that one.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I know we hashed this shortage of doctors over last year and we are still hashing it over this year but I feel that the rural areas are suffering the most in regard to the shortage of doctors. Some of the towns are making every effort to try to get a doctor and it is practically impossible. Could the Minister inform us how many doctors are coming to this country from England, Scotland and Ireland, or are there any?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I cannot tell you the numbers, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Forest Hill.

Mr. Dunlop: Mr. Chairman, speaking a few minutes ago, the hon. member for Grey North rather discounted the importance of research. He said we should invest more money in doctors and manpower. Some people have discussed places in medical schools and as you know a very great deal of money is being put into the development of physical places. I would suggest that members might well read the report recently brought out by the committee of presidents of provincially assisted universities on the training of people in the health sciences. It indicates that in the next few years we will require about 500 more teachers in our medical schools in Ontario.

One has to bear in mind that it takes from 10 to 13 years of higher education to train a teacher. The reason that we have lost many of our teachers to the United States is because of the tremendous amount of money which is available for research in those schools. We need to spend a great deal of money on research to develop settings in Canada, which are comparable to the glittering settings in the United States. It must also be understood that while the fathers of Confederation had never heard of research, or if they had they did not mention it in The British North America Act, it has long been assumed that scientific research is principally the responsibility of the national government.

There are many who feel that the medical research council of Canada must spend very greatly increased funds on medical research in order to recruit, or assist us to recruit, a number of Canadian expatriots back to Canada to teach in our medical schools. Thus research cannot be discounted as lacking importance in the development of medical manpower. Research must be regarded as being of central importance in the development of medical manpower.

Mr. Sargent: I do thank the member for Forst Hill and I do concur in his remarks in

this regard but I want him to understand this, that we have—if the member for Forest Hill will listen, I want to tell him this—that we have literally, figuratively and physically billions of dollars in this province tied up in physical plant and hospital plant and the physical billions of dollars equity that we have is only as good as the personnel we have to train in it, and make it work.

We have equipment too, but the most important factor is the human element, and if the Minister will allow me to say this, I have here a number of resolutions from the outlying parts of the province from the federation of agriculture in support of this plea. The ratio in this province in 1950—there were 25 medical students per 100,000 population; in 1960 there were 19.6 medical students per 100,000 population, and the facts show that the Canadian medical schools graduate about 850 doctors a year; another 400 to 600 doctors immigrate annually and are registered here; and despite this infusion from abroad, Canada's doctor-population ratio is poorer than 20 other countries. We are poorer here than 20 other countries and we have the outlying parts of the province pleading for medical doctors and medical people.

Now, for the record, the advertisement in the Windsor paper calling for nurses on February 10, 1967, shows that for RNs the monthly rate of pay is $525, day rate; $525 per month, afternoon rate; and $632 per month for night rate. The nurses' pay in Toronto general hospital is as follows: an RN takes home $365 a month. Now, how are you going to equate this? $365 a month for an RN in Toronto to $632 a month, 200 miles away? This is the most important thing that we must decide—to treat our own people fairly first. You wonder why they leave us. The Minister is acquainted with the problem but he says, "Where am I going to get the money?" Well, that is his problem but when the Liberal Party is in power then it will be our problem and we will do something about it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think I have to counter those figures because that salary for nurses in Toronto is not correct. I do not think there is any nurse in Metropolitan Toronto or in Toronto general hospital earning less than—this is not the vote under which to take it—earning less than—$400 per month.

Mr. Sargent: I said take-home pay, $365 a month.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, take-home pay does not mean a thing because nobody knows what comes off take-home pay. It is what the pay is that counts. She may have approved her employer to take off $30 or $40 to pay things that have nothing to do with her work at all except that this is a debt that she wants paid in this way. I think what we have to talk about is the salary which the nurse is being given. However, this is not the vote under which nurses' salary should be discussed.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. I am glad you pinpointed the fact that you are only paying them $400 a month.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did not pinpoint any such thing.

Mr. Sargent: What did you say then?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I said this is not the vote under which to discuss it.

Mr. Sargent: All right. Thank you.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I want to revert to the interjection of the government Whip in relation to the Minister's possible misinformation from the deans of various medical faculties. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, as I understand the pre-medical schools in the province of Ontario graduated roughly 300 doctors a year without any variable at all from 1945 until 1964, and at that point the provincial government saw fit to grant extra moneys for rehabilitation of the existing plant and expansion at McMaster, so that roughly from 1968 or 1969—or after 1970 it would probably be—we might be in a position to be graduating 500 doctors per year in this province.

Now, I have the following questions, Mr. Chairman:

1. Why are we not, in fact, constructing medical schools in other universities?

2. If, in fact, we can see an expansion of the medical population to 500 graduates a year by 1970, surely we can see an expansion in excess of that, and what has the government done to facilitate that expansion?

3. How trustworthy are the figures which are given to the Minister and the Legislature via the deans of the faculty of medicine? Just how much rigidity and inflexibility and vested interest is there in the profession, and in the medical schools and in the university establishments, which has prevented the expansion of medical facilities?

One of the incredible things, Mr. Chairman, is that we should have been at a

stagnation point for fully 20 years in the province of Ontario, but in the year 1967 we are in the midst of a really serious crisis in medical manpower. I do not want to settle for the easy generalities of bursary money being available, and no money being available and the best intentions of government. I would like to know rather more completely from the Minister what precise plans he has and what confidence he has in those who are to see the plans through, namely, the university medical teams and their associates.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I really cannot understand—there are times, you know, when I could really get to like this fellow, then he makes some sweeping, irresponsible statement as he has just done, and he knocks all my good intentions completely out the window.

If I am not going to believe the deans of our health sciences centres, sir, who am I going to believe?

My friend, the hon. member for London South, knows perfectly well that the dean of his own home university called him in and talked to him about the matters that he brought up in this House—and I have a copy of the letter which he wrote to him—and I think it was pointed out to the hon. member that the association of medical colleges had done a study in depth of applications for enrolment in every health science centre across the country in the previous year —that would be the year 1965—and that fewer than 100 students all across Canada who had the standards of education appropriate for the entrance into medicine were kept out because of lack of space. Now, in a country of 20 million people, that was not very many.

I am not saying this to defend, in any way, the fact that we do not have enough places here. The only medical school to be opened in this province in this century was in 1954 at Ottawa, because there was no orderly planning. Nobody was responsible for the development of the training and the education for an adequate flow of medical personnel. There is abroad a misconception that the medical profession in responsible for this. May I make it absolutely clear now, sir, that I am carrying no torch for the medical profession. As long as I occupy this chair I am speaking for the government of Ontario in the interests of the people of Ontario. Not until this government came into power under the present Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), did any government seek a method of the orderly development of health manpower, and it was this Prime Minister who, in October, 1964, presented to the province a concrete, well thought out, well laid plan for the development of health sciences centres in which could be trained adequate numbers of health manpower.

My hon. friend, the member for Scarborough West, asked why we were not building more medical colleges. First of all, you do not build a medical college just because you get the urge to do so. There is more to medical education than a building in which a student is taught the basic sciences. There must be adequate clinical facilities and these are not available in every centre where one would like to build a medical school. Every hospital cannot be converted to a university hospital or a teaching hospital, but in addition to the new school at McMaster, the University of Toronto is expanding its intake by 75 students a year. This is the equivalent of another school the same size as Western, and just a little larger than Queen's. So this is the equivalent of another medical school.

As I have already pointed out, sir, the health council manpower committee is already applying itself to consideration of where the next medical school will have to be. McMaster has received approval for a building; Ottawa, London and Queen's each can take a few more, but they are limited not by desire, but by the number of hospital beds available for the clinical side of the teaching. Toronto, with its newly acquired Sunnybrook hospital, as I have stated, plans to add 75 students to its freshman year and is in the process of building a new medical school.

These are the steps that have been taken, and for the first time in Canada, Ontario leads again in laying down an orderly, well-reasoned plan for the production of adequate professional health manpower.

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, the Minister was good enough to refer in his remarks just now, to a speech I gave a year ago in which I described the number of graduates from Canadian medical schools in the past seven or eight years, and you may remember that the numbers had dropped annually progressively, from a peak 870 to, I think, 822. I was rather interested by the way, to pick up the county year book, dated December, 1966, and to see that the most recently reported figure was 780.

The Minister was quite right in saying that I met with the dean of the medical school and, in fact, the vice-president of medical health services, and seven other senior professors of medicine in the University of

Western Ontario medical school, to discuss this troublesome matter. I did that in the home of the dean of medicine, at his invitation, following the remarks that I made here in the Legislature.

The initial discussion in the dean's home had to do with the number of suitable applicants to medical schools, and the position held initially by these nine illustrious medical educators was that there had not been sufficient numbers of suitably trained applicants. After perhaps 10 or 15 minutes, the doctors let go of that idea, and we agreed that perhaps four or five or six years ago, there had not been sufficient numbers adequately trained and suitably prepared applicants, but we all agreed that in the last few years, at least, there were ample numbers of adequately prepared applicants.

Now, sir, I want to mention this: I was told last fall that there had been 800 applicants for the 75 places in the University of Western Ontario medical school. I queried a member of the staff thinking that this ratio was very high—that is to say 800 people seeking 75 places—and I was told by the member of the staff to whom I spoke, that my information was incorrect; there had been 800 Canadian applicants, plus 300 American applicants, making a total of 1,100 applicants for the 75 places in the University of Western Ontario medical school.

I think that everyone is agreed, including the nine prestigious medical educators to whom I spoke, that there is now an ample supply of applicants to the medical schools in Canada, which there was not five years ago—

Mr. S. Lewis: I applaud the remarks of the chief Whip. I am glad that he is getting into the spirit of the Opposition benches and I feel—

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Minister of Health has done more to advance the profession of medicine in this province than any other single person. My remarks in no way disparage his heroic efforts —I use that word advisedly—his heroic efforts to move the profession ahead. But he is handicapped by a number of features including the insidious efforts of the socialist party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: If the House has another moment for an insidious socialist, Mr. Chairman; I could get to like the Minister of Health, you know, if it were not for the things that were said about him by the member for London South, otherwise I could find him almost heroic, if not heroic.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Do not try, let us get on with the estimates.

Mr. S. Lewis: I find what is emerging here this evening very, very interesting and I must say, Mr. Chairman, I am having difficulty jumping the credibility gap.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, there is no credibility gap.

Mr. S. Lewis: The Minister has asserted that for the first time in this century, if I read him correctly, in the year 1954 a medical school was built at Ottawa. Am I correct in that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right! Well, may I remind him, sir, through you, that the Tory government came to power in this province in 1943. It took them eleven years to build their first medical school; it took them, according to the Minister's words, another 11 years to formulate a plan, and working on their basic ratio of an 11-year interval, it will mean that at some point in the year 1976, we may conceivably begin to think in terms of sufficient graduate spaces in our medical schools.

What the present plan constitutes—and I cannot emphasize this too strongly—is roughly 500 graduates from the year 1970 on, at most, per annum. The present ratio is 300, and that increase is so paltry as to be inconsequential in terms of the needs of this province. If, in fact, the member for London South is right, Mr. Chairman, and 1,100 applicants are seeking 75 spaces, then somewhere there is something so profoundly wrong with this plan of perfection promulgated by the Prime Minister, that the Minister of Health had better step in and take hold and shake the Prime Minister gently and suggest to him that his health centres or health resources programme will not in any sense solve the problem.

Obviously one requires a graduating class of something in the vicinity of 1,000 doctors a year from 1970 onward even to begin to break through. I hear the Minister muttering under his breath—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I am not muttering under my breath, I am just saying the member is talking nonsense.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, will the Minister tell me where the nonsense is?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am just telling the member it is nonsense.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me ask the Minister, is there a doctor shortage in this province or is there not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The member can go and make his speech—

Mr. S. Lewis: Let me ask the Minister a specific question then. Is there a doctor shortage or is there not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not choose to answer—

Mr. S. Lewis: All right, then I take his answer to reply in the affirmative.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The member does not take my answer for anything.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I am putting that interpretation on the answer until I get another answer.

Mr. Chairman, if there is a doctor shortage in this province of major proportions then graduating 500 practitioners a year from roughly 1970 onward is not going to make any appreciable dent whatsoever. And it is incredible that the Minister of Health will stand in his seat and say—

Mr. Dunlop: Stand in his seat?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will get up off my knees.

Mr. S. Lewis: I say that only because I would wish to elevate him, the man has some difficulties.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): He does not need any elevation.

Mr. S. Lewis: That he will stand in his place, Mr. Chairman, and admit that in one medical faculty in the province of Ontario we were 1,025 places short in one year and, in the next breath suggest that we are doing anything about the medical manpower problem. We are losing our doctors—

Mr. White: The member is trying to crucify the medical profession.

Mr. S. Lewis: We are not trying—

Mr. White: The member personally and his party, that is one of the problems.

Mr. Bryden: They crucified this government a few weeks ago.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if I may relate the interjection directly to the subject at hand, I remember that committee meeting which the member for London South and the Minister of Health and I shared, when we were discussing the increase in the fee schedule, and the Minister said at the time—and I quote from the minutes—"My hope is that the great majority of doctors will accept what OMSIP pays of the total bill. I have nothing more than hope on which to base this." His hope was unfounded and the doctors turned around and scuttled the Minister's intention. His hopes are unfounded in this instance again because the medical profession is not playing square with the public.

And I do not care whether that is true in the universities, Mr. Chairman, or whether it is true in the behaviour of the profession itself. I say to the Minister, you cannot make a dent on the doctor shortage which is so grave as to bring into peril the lives of ordinary citizens in this province; you cannot make a dent in that shortage by the plans which the Minister has revealed to the House tonight, not at all.

Until the Minister comes forward and tells us of his precise negotiations with individual universities, to build medical schools, and his precise negotations with American universities and other jurisdictions to bring the teaching specialists into this province, and until the Minister sets out the precise financial allocations which this will involve—rather than having that vague and friendly phrase in the estimate book, "to be apportioned as the Minister sees fit over time"—until he shows us that the plan has some substance and some specific content, then we know that we are destined for a doctor shortage in perpetuity in the province of Ontario with very unhappy results indeed.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister has any idea what percentage of Canadian students who apply to our medical colleges and are turned down, go to the United States? For example, we all possibly know of personal instances where Canadian students have applied to go to medical schools, and have been turned down for one reason or another, probably for lack of space, or sometimes the excuse is used that their average is not high enough; they then apply to an American college and seem to be accepted and they are gone. Has the Minister any idea what percentage that would be?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I have no precise figures nor have I any knowledge of where precise figures might be found. I do know that it is commonly accepted that the other way around obtains, that American students

seek to enrol in Canadian universities, particularly Ontario universities.

Mr. Trotter: Well, is that not a result of so many Canadian educated doctors now living in the United States, who are now Americans, but whose sons want to come up here? Is the Minister aware of that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I am not.

Mr. Trotter: Well, this is very common.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: What figures is the member citing?

Mr. Trotter: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: What is the source of the member's information?

Mr. Trotter: Just generally from the doctors in the profession, because, you see, there is a certain amount of competition in order to get their sons into medical school. I am not using names but I know some people involved. There is a certain amount of ill feeling because if a graduate of Queen's, for instance, has a son down in the United States, the doctor also being in the United States, he gets priority because he is a graduate of Queen's University, and it angers many people.

Hon. Dr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, as a graduate of Queen's I have to deny that absolutely. He will get a priority if his son is worthy of priority, and on that basis only.

Mr. Trotter: Right. I am not arguing that, but if a doctor has a son whose standing is worthy and is equal, he gets the priority, whether he is an American or Canadian or anything else, it is a priority simply if one's father is a graduate of Queen's and if you have the marks. I admit you have to have the marks. But the unfortunate part about it is that, because his father went to Queen's and now is practising medicine in Cleveland, he can actually get in over a Canadian or one from Kingston, Ontario or Toronto, simply because his father went to Queen's.

This holds true of the University of Toronto and this is where literally the deans of the colleges are apt to be a very close group. I think when the member for Scarborough West questions the figures that the deans of the colleges give you, he is perfectly justified. Because the facts are extremely obvious that we are very short of doctors and not only are we in Ontario and Canada called upon to produce doctors to serve our own community, but the situation is growing so fast, that we are now called upon to produce doctors to serve various parts of the world through the various schemes that we are in.

I think these schemes are justified and I am all in favour of them. We have a certain responsibility to the so-called underprivileged part of the world. But this also means a greater drain on our medical resources and it is overwhelmingly obvious that we have not been taking this into consideration.

The Minister mentioned that he had a manpower committee looking into this whole situation and I do not know how far this committee has looked into things, because sometimes, if you ever want to shelve a problem, give it to a committee. So often you know, businessmen would not run things this way, because usually it gets lost some place down the line. But the Minister, as Minister of Health has a very basic personal responsibility. It is political, it is moral and it is medical, and it rests on the Minister and you have to face up to the fact that whoever has been giving you information has not been giving you correct information.

All you have to do is read the newspapers. Even at various conferences, it was recently reported in the paper, and I asked a question of the Minister as a result of it, that certain medical authorities are even questioning whether our top universities will be considered grade A medical universities because the standards of the teaching staff are being watered down. Now this is being brought into question, it has been in the press. The Minister denies that this is the case, but certainly if you have a group or a committee going into this fact, you should also examine the teaching standards of our universities. Not so much as of today. Today our universities, our top medical universities are evidently grade A. But because of what is going on there are authorities who consider that we are being—if I can use the expression —watered down.

So here is an obviously tremendous shortage of doctors and yet we still have no answer as to the Indian doctors who come to Canada, or particularly to Ontario. This is one more bit of evidence that the medical profession from the time a young student even wants to apply—it is not even the time he gets in there, but from the time he wants to apply—the medical profession is very tightly controlled by themselves. This is a fact, a political fact, and a medical fact, that we simply have to face. The Minister is putting on blinkers, he simply is failing to

look it in the face because he does not want to look it in the face.

But because of the stubbornness of the Minister of Health, because of his blind, wilful refusal to face facts, we are going to be saddled with a very serious medical shortage—a shortage of doctors—which is here now. The full import of it we have not felt and will not feel probably for another six or seven years. But it is building up and it is one more instance where the government will not act until there is virtually a crisis upon us. Well, the crisis is here now and all the Minister is attempting to do, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, is wait until the crisis is that much worse before we do take any action.

I do not know if the committee on manpower will solve this problem. I doubt it, but I think it is up to the Minister, and from what I have seen of his performance here this evening, he is evidently just going to abdicate any responsibility he has whatsoever, to see that we have the proper medical staff here in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the Minister about his plans. We have the four medical schools with a fifth medical school in the process of construction. Are there plans for other medical schools in the formative stages, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not at the present time.

Mr. Newman: Do you not have any planning on a long-range basis for the needs of medical personnel?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have just stated that a few moments ago, sir, that we do.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that we are getting through with the need for more doctors for the outlying parts of the province. This is a problem that will not go away. You must do something about it, because a doctor friend of mine got back from Russia and there is no doctor shortage there.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have got to tell my friend differently. I was in Russia myself three years ago and they are crying out exactly the same as I am because they cannot get doctors to go to the outlying parts of their country.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, but your submission is that you have not got the training facilities or training personnel. Now any solution that we can toss out here cannot hurt, because you are not doing anything anyway, and so anything will help, I think at this point.

My information is that they have lowered the specifications there to have women doctors and it is answering the need. Now I am not suggesting—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh no, they have not.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you are thinking what you want to think, to back up this submission at this point, but the facts are that in 1963, no less than 49 per cent of Canadian medical graduates moved to the United States for study and permanent residence and this trend seems likely to increase rather than diminish. So we are reaching a point in this country, as the member for Scarborough West said, where any further thinning of our medical manpower will make impossible the provision of even the most basic health services.

We have got OMSIP, we have got everything else under the sun, but we have not got the manpower to back it up. In total, the United States count on an annual permanent flow of 200 doctors from Canada. This points up the immediate need for more medical schools.

Sir, even the most backward of the states to the south of us are spending millions of dollars on the subsidized incentive programme for doctors. We have none here. We offer $1,000 a year for four years, but we have not got the training facilities. In London, Ontario, the home of the Prime Minister, eight of the 11 graduates of the medical school there left to train in Detroit. One does not have to search far for the reason. Through our OHSC we pay the junior interns $3,000 a year and in the general hospital in Detroit, they pay them $5,000 a year. Now this loss of 200 doctors annually, sir, represents to us here in this province a cash drain of $10 million. But too many of these 200 doctors are medical teachers in which this country has a stake of $100,000 to train a medical teacher, instead of the $50,000 it costs to train a doctor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, the loss of a useful graduate is acceptable, but to lose a teacher is a calamity and it is reflecting itself in the whole breakdown of our machinery here to produce medical personnel.

In summary, the need for doctors in small centres throughout this province is an emergency situation. A crash programme is needed and there is no programme at all here.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 803 carried?

Mr. Sargent: I am talking. I suggest to you that this is too serious a programme for politics, Mr. Chairman. I think that the Minister will have to come forth with some other reason than that he has not got the money, because he has money for everything else and this is the most important thing. You are taking money for this hospital programme across this province, but you are not giving them the personnel to back it up and we must have more doctors in the outlying parts of the province.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I thought I sensed a little mellowing in the attitude of the Minister over the last couple of years and I did not realize he had returned so recently from the Soviet Union and it finally explains itself to me.

I want to say to the Minister, through you Mr. Chairman, that one of the problems in sorting this matter out, is knowing precisely what the details of the plan are.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, the details are not ready for presentation publicly yet.

Mr. S. Lewis: All right. Now we are beginning to get to it, Mr. Chairman. This is what I was trying to sort out with the Minister, that it is very hard to impose this bill of goods on the House. You said that in 1964 the Prime Minister announced a master plan for the medical manpower to solve the crisis in Ontario. Thus far that master plan has resulted in the expansion of three medical faculties which presently exist, the construction of a new one and the increase in graduate numbers to 500. That will carry us roughly through this year. What does the plan consist of after the year 1967? Surely this Legislature has the right to know.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is the immediate plan, Mr. Chairman: The immediate plan is that the next school to be established is McMaster. Coincidental with the development of health sciences centres is the development of back-up facilities. There is a very large programme of expansion at teaching hospitals. The establishment of schools for the training of para-health personnel will be presented, if it is desired, at the time the OHSC estimates are before the House. The planners are working upon the development of further health sciences centres but they are not yet at that point in time where the plans are ready to be revealed.

Mr. S. Lewis: With the greatest of respect, Mr. Chairman, I just have no conviction about the success of the plan at all and I suspect that none of the members of the Opposition have any such conviction. What the government has done in a desperate gambit, it had no other opportunity, is to expand the medical school facilities. It has nothing concrete beyond that and its present expansion of facilities simply does not amount to any significant dent in the present crisis. I cannot believe that we can go year after year, from 1943 to 1967, and our total output be the construction of two new medical schools. I find it very difficult to conceive, Mr. Chairman, particularly when the federal government has finally made a major amount of money available for the whole field of medical manpower.

Again it is exactly like the HOME programme, precisely similar. You have the grandiose pronouncement and no content whatsoever consequent to that pronouncement. It is a demoralizing business the way this government, and particularly this department, conducts the affairs of the province.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Minister very strongly that he must simply sit down with the universities and talk to them. I suggest that he do it in concert with the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis). It took the youth committee only a very short time to realize that the reason we did not have undergraduate schools of social welfare in this province was because the universities have not been talked to directly about it. The reason that we have such a desperate need for clinical psychologists is because the universities would not develop specialties in these areas, and the willingness of the Minister to allow the university fraternity to continue in this way, without providing the necessary medical manpower expansion, is simply not acceptable to this Legislature.

The crisis is overpowering and the Minister must step in and I appreciate the problems. I congratulate the member for Forest Hill, whose intervention – both interventions tonight, if I may say to him—were dead on. The intervention about research was dead on, but I have the sense that somewhere something was missing, that somewhere we are just not coming to grips with meeting the problem, that we are entirely frivolous about it, totally cavalier, that we assume it will solve itself. It is not solving itself, Mr. Chairman. It is even more acute.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 803 agreed to?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I cannot let that pass, Mr. Chairman. The poor fellow is so

demoralized he does not know whether he is standing or sitting.

Mr. S. Lewis: I was standing, I am now sitting.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, he says that we have got to sit down with the presidents of universities. We started this as soon as the programme was announced. You do not get—

Mr. MacDonald: Three years later you have not got a plan.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: My dear friend, you know better than that. You do not get instant universities like you get instant coffee. I wish there were many fewer instant socialists.

An hon. member: Instant solutions—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we have been regularly sitting with The Department of University Affairs and the chairman of the hospital services commission, under the chairmanship of my Deputy Minister. The senior coordinating committee has been sitting and has spent more time on developing this programme than perhaps any other phase of our total departmental programme. The plans are made, but the plans beyond the ones that are building now are rightly not ready for revelation to the House because there is no money in these estimates for them. This is long-range planning. But I ask you sir, and I ask the hon. members of this House to take my word for it that there is planning going on. We are not sitting by idly watching a crisis build up. We are just as keenly aware—more keenly aware—because we are close to the matter.

It is very easy for this socialist to stand in his place and say that this must be done and that must be done, knowing full well, sir, that he will never be called upon to do it. The government is in power and the government is called upon to do it and has continued to take responsibility and will continue to take responsibility to do it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Saskatchewan was a nice mess until the Grits got in. It took the Grits to shake it up out there. They did not do too bad a job.

An hon. member: The right wing yet!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: But even he is closer to the Conservatives than he is the socialists. But I can assure you, sir, and again I repeat to this House through you, that constant long-range planning is going on and we have met the recommendations of the Hall commission report, in respect of the building of health sciences centres. We are apace with that now. If my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Chairman, I have not the report here, but I think the Hall commission report recommended three new medical schools in Ontario. One is building, one has been approved for building and the planning is going on on another. This is keeping pace with the so-called gospel according to health needs in the dominion of Canada. We are up with it now and in certain things I think we are quite a little way ahead of it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to that because what the Minister is saying is that you started meeting with the committee in 1964. It is now three years later and you have established one medical school. Indeed, you have not established one medical school. You are still building one medical school, two years later.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Two.

Mr. S. Lewis: Where is the second?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The addition to Toronto is the equivalent of another medical school.

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh, that was an expansion programme which everyone anticipated.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I deny that. They did not, because the then dean of Toronto told me in 1964 that Toronto had reached its maximum size.

Mr. S. Lewis: Precisely, and everyone knew that the medical schools which presently exist would have to expand. That went without saying. But you have one new medical school underway, and that is all in three years. These mighty minds of your committee sitting for three years have come up with one partially completed medical school and you cannot reveal to the House, because it is not in these estimates, what the future long-range plans consist of. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Minister there are no long-range plans. That is simply a pipe dream, and he should not—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is not true.

Mr. S. Lewis: If it is not true, let someone stand up and disabuse us of it and give us the particulars.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The Minister has done it for you already.

Mr. S. Lewis: He has said nothing at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: All the Minister has told us is that he cannot reveal it.

Mr. MacDonald: The Treasury is blocking it.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister without Portfolio): He has not got his hands on the report yet.

Mr. S. Lewis: If the Minister has behind-the-scenes reports to which he is not privy—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You are the one that is not privy.

Mr. S. Lewis: The Minister without Portfolio may have the report.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member—

Mr. S. Lewis: The Chairman is right. The Chairman is quite right. All the Minister has done is hurl unfriendly and adulatory efforts at the socialists across the floor. I have not reverted to terms like Neanderthal. However I think the policy is aptly described to that phrase and by this government. But I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that there is no long-range plan. I challenge the Minister to stand in his place and give us one hint of a long-range plan. What we have tonight is the expression of inevitable failure on the part of this government in the field of medical manpower, and as long as it is on the record, and everyone in the province knows it, then at least we have had some small success this evening because the people will know where they stand.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow this member to put on the record—

Mr. Sargent: Oh, you can allow it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Why do you not sit down?

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not listen and get something done and get some doctors?

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Oh, yak, yak!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I want to put on the record clearly and unequivocally that I give my word to you, and through you to the members of the House, that there is long-range planning but I am not at the present time prepared to reveal details just because my socialist friends demand it. The time is not right to reveal these details.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: When that time comes this government will put the plans, the detailed plans, before the Legislature.

Mr. Dunlop: Mr. Chairman, I was shocked some 20 minutes or half an hour ago, as I have been shocked before, at one of the assertions of my friend from Scarborough West. In talking about training of doctors he said the medical profession is not playing fair. The first group in this country that ever recognized a problem of medical manpower was the medical profession, and it spoke on this with great regularity and nobody would listen to them. The medical profession does not determine the number of people in medical schools. It is not a closed group as suggested by the hon. member for Parkdale. The medical profession spoke, and yet people, editorial writers and others, people in the socialist party, constantly said that they were just complaining about a possible shortage of doctors as a means of setting aside medicare. The Toronto *Daily Star* said that just a year ago when we were talking about the shortage of doctors, they said it was just a plot of the medical profession to stand against medicare.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has been talking about a long-range plan. How do you tell a mother who cannot get a doctor for her child that you have a long-range plan? We are talking about putting a man on the moon, in this economy of ours, and you cannot divert proper people to serve our people. The Minister must know, he must know. What amazes me, Mr. Chairman, is the cackling and laughing from what are supposed to be very intelligent men about a very urgent problem.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): It shows they are not interested in helping—

Mr. Sargent: It shows the stupidity and how they get elected I will never tell you. Some of them sitting their cackling like a bunch of kids.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Do you want some lessons? You should see how your front row is laughing.

Mr. Sargent: They are probably looking at you, that is why they are laughing.

This resolution comes from the federation of agriculture in my riding and says:

> Many rural areas not adjacent to urban centres have no resident physician.

The Minister must know that there are many, many small centres that have no resident physician. How does he account for the fact that we must tell them that you have long-range plans? I suggest to you that you are the one that is vulnerable in this case, blaming the government for not having the money. But it is the government's fault or it is your fault, either one. I think it is a shocking thing that this House can sit and laugh about a thing like no doctors for rural Ontario.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of other questions on this vote. But first I want to pledge to this House, on my honour as a member, that there is no long range plan. Okay. Does that make any sense to the Minister, my saying that? Does it make any sense to him? Well, just as much sense as his remarks made to me and I wanted him to know it. Now let me go on, Mr. Chairman, and ask some other questions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member please put the questions that he intends to put on this particular vote?

Mr. S. Lewis: May I ask the Minister what is meant by item 2 in the vote—clinical—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I am endeavouring to put the questions, I assure you, sir. Item 2—clinical, applied, operational and other health research in amounts that may be authorized by the Minister. To what does that refer?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to make a little comment if I may.

Mr. MacDonald: Why? The question has been asked.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, maybe while he is getting the reply. Well, all right, I am sorry, I will wait.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, a moment ago you wanted everybody to be quiet. I think some of the chair's directions should be to that side.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: That is okay. Just keep your direction in the House to both sides of the House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do not get excited.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: May I point out that every member in this House has an equal right to address the House, and no member should be shouted down.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, maybe you will rule that these red herring comments are out of order, too.

Mr. S. Lewis: What kind of herring?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Red herring. Red, Red. R-E-D, a colour you are very familiar with, by the way.

Mr. S. Lewis: Is that so? In what way does the Minister mean that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Exactly. A colour you know very well.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order now, Mr. Chairman. Why do you not listen to what happens on that side of the House? I just wanted to get that on the record, "a colour you are very familiar with".

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Sit down and listen to your leader.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am rising on a point of order and I am not through yet. Wait until I finish.

Mr. Chairman: Is there a point of order?

Mr. S. Lewis: Yes. I want to make sure that the Provincial Treasurer's remark gets on the record. I just want it in *Hansard.*

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I want it on the record, too. R-e-d. Do not worry about the record, I want it there to.

An hon. member: Would you rather have it pink?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have almost forgotten the question.

Mr. S. Lewis: It is a long session. I have waited weeks for that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The amount of this item allocated to alcoholism and drug addiction, $650,000 for research; to the Ontario cancer treatment research foundation for research—$1,250,000; to the Ontario mental health foundation for research—$450,000; to the Ontario heart foundation for research—$150,000; new and unallocated amount—$500,000, this is to be held in abeyance to meet projects for which we have not yet received application but which will be sought we are quite certain.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, on that particular item if I may. I have only one very brief observation to make here—

Mr. Sargent: Speak to the vote.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But I am back to this red herring bit and I think it should be challenged. If there is one very, very good and ample reason why the medical profession are concerned it is the extremely remote possibility that is proposed, the almost impossible position that may develop that is constantly expounded by the socialist element in this province, that state medicine may come into Ontario and this is—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh nonsense!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Absolutely not nonsense. I think it is time that this red herring nonsense was exposed for the complete, absolute truth that is associated with it because there can be no question about the fact that if the socialist party ever, ever—which they never will and I spelled out "never" before—became the government of this province, there would be state medicine and I assure you the doctors concern themselves about regimentation.

Let us get these facts on the line once in a while. Why do we have to sit around here and hear all this socialist nonsense without challenging it? I suggest that this is an absolute and truly fatuous statement.

Mr. MacDonald: When you regiment it, it is fine.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is no regimentation here.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, there were two items that were brought up. One was under the grants in vote 803 as to the "clinical, applied, operational" and so on, for health research. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could give us some idea of what the overall policy is in this type of grant. I ask this question for this reason: Research, particularly doctors who are in research and who have a great deal of difficulty planning their research over a period of time.

For example, there is one research project going on in Toronto now where a doctor receives grants from five foundations and they expire at different times. These research projects have to be planned sometimes five years ahead and it is impossible to do the work properly unless they know for a period of three years, in some cases, or five years or longer, where the money is going to come from. I noticed when the Minister answered the question of the member for Scarborough West, he seemed to split these items up, at least the major grant of $3 million, into a number of items. I wonder if he has an overall policy or is this going to go helter-skelter from year to year?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is no helter-skelter policy—

Mr. Trotter: I am asking, that is all.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am commenting on the ridiculous title you give to the policy and on the ridiculous way in which you tried to explain or describe the policy. I named three foundations, each one of which is an agency of this government, dedicated largely to research and in two cases, to treatment. The great bulk of this grant is given to them and the amount that is provided by Ontario is to complement the moneys that have been coming to these foundations from federal health grants. Up until now, federal health grants are on a year to year basis and are still continuing, I believe.

As you pointed out, many researchers cannot carry on a project with any certainty or any security on that basis. This is why Ontario has gotten into this programme, not only to augment, but to complement the support derived from the national health grant in order that they can inject an element of security and certainty into their programmes. It turns their programmes more into a block grant than a stated year by year grant.

Mr. Trotter: Despite the fact that we have to vote this money year by year in our estimates, are these various researchers who are receiving these grants, given any undertaking that this money will be forthcoming not just from year to year, but at least over a three-year period? Is there any continuity—this is what I am getting at.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, the continuity occurs when the project is approved by the foundation. We do not have anything to do

with the approval of the research projects. They go through the appropriate foundation. Their medical research or scientific research committees screen every application and on the basis of their recommendation approval, or partial approval or what have you, the grant is allocated. Then new grants will come on the next year, and so on, on the new projects.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, there is one question I want to ask that has to do with the educating of medical students. I think what is needed—and I mentioned this before—is an overall look at the medical students that are in our universities and I would be naïve if I believed that there is an overall plan for the education of the medical profession for the next few years. There is one thing that can be done in the immediate future, even starting next September, or whenever they enrol. It goes back particularly to this matter of the sons of American doctors coming into our universities. I know that in Ontario and in Canada, we have a certain responsibility to educate foreign students from different parts of the world, in the hope that they will go back to the countries from whence they come—certainly they are needed in India and in other countries—but our first responsibility is to the students who are in the province of Ontario.

I think that, as taxpayers, particularly when there is a shortage of space for medical students, we should take a very hard look at where our students come from. In other words, I think that if they are from Ontario they should have priority; if they are from other provinces of Canada, they should be the second priority, and this business of worrying whether or not your father was a doctor from Canada, or particularly from Ontario, should go by the board.

If our students in the province of Ontario got the marks, and particularly if they show any indication of staying here, they are the people who should have priority, and if the Minister's manpower committee is looking into this problem, or if in any other way he is looking into it, I think that this point should be brought home.

Even though students pay in some measure their expenses, they are in large part subsidized by the Ontario and Canadian taxpayers. I think that the time has come when we should stop subsidizing the number of Americans who come over here. These Americans are in a position to subsidize themselves. The one exception to that should be the students who come here from underprivileged countries and we should face up to our responsibility to help these countries.

This is a point on which the Minister can do something now, regardless of what his plans are for the future. We simply have not taken enough notice of the number of students and from whence they come, who are in our universities taking a medical course.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would be misleading the House if I said that this we are going to do, but this is the kind of thing that comes under the heading of "operational research," and this might very well be a suggestion worthy of adopting as a research project. I am not saying that it is, because this would be the responsibility of our research committee under the council of health, but this is the kind of thing that is included under the heading of "operational research."

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister aware of the number of students involved in this situation, because I have mentioned before—I forget what year—that this has been going on. It is obvious that there is a shortage and a crisis in the medical profession, yet this keeps going on and on. Regardless of what the future plans are, this is something that could be done now with the next class coming along in September. I hope it is not going to gather dust, like the pollution committee, for 10 years.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what incentive programmes are there now to get new doctors? Is there a recruiting programme on behalf of the medical staffs? Is the recruiting programme by doctors, and is there an incentive programme payable to doctors for getting new recruits?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not exactly certain what the hon. member means by a recruiting programme. We have gone overseas on three or four different occasions in the last eight years, to my knowledge, but we have been unsuccessful on each trip. That is, essentially unsuccessful. We attracted a very small number of doctors, but each time we go and in each place the question is, "What are you doing here, taking our doctors? We were thinking of going to Ontario to attract doctors to our shores."

We have done everything, I think, that is possible in the establishment of our own new and expanded facilities to attract doctors to come to our province to practice. This is

really the only thing I can say about a recruiting programme. It is an outright advertisement—although we did advertise in the British papers on two occasions and we got some applications, but they were not really very anxious—

Mr. Sargent: My point is that the city doctors, those who grow up in the city, plan to locate in cities when they become doctors and a rural doctor tends to locate on the farm when he becomes a doctor.

An hon. member: Not any more, they do not.

Mr. Sargent: Maybe not any more when they become specialists, but it seems to me that in other industries we have incentive programmes, and if a doctor can be instrumental in getting a youngster to go into medicine, then there should be some incentive to recruit that way.

I do not know whether it is practical or not. I think we must go into the universities, into high schools across the province, with recruiting teams and do a crash programme on this need, because it is getting progressively worse.

On this vote, I would like to ask the Minister—a news release recently stated in the United States there were one million abortions annually.

An hon. member: Is this under this vote?

Mr. Sargent: Under this vote, under research, yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that this does not come under the vote.

Mr. Sargent: A renowned medical authority says that the criminal abortions exceed legal abortions by a ratio of 100 to one.

Mr. Chairman: One moment, please. Evidently this is not the appropriate vote.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I think we are talking about grants and research, and so on, and I think this is a very important—

Mr. Chairman: I think the Minister may be able to advise the member of some place in the estimates where this could be discussed.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, it is not under any vote. If he is asking about research, that is okay.

Mr. Sargent: Well all I want to know is: Does the Minister agree that there is need for legislation in Ontario on abortion laws? What is the Minister doing about it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, criminal abortion comes under the criminal code, it does not lie within the purview of the province.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about legal abortions, what is the plan for legislation here?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, as I stated in the House in answer to a question a few days ago, abortion is a matter that is within the purview and the authority of the criminal code. I stated then my view as a physician and as Minister of Health, that where a therapeutic abortion is done in the interest of the mother's life or health, then this is a medical decision which in my opinion is the physician's duty to his patient and that again, I repeat, I believe transcends everything else.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The point I am trying to make is that the facts show that the criminal abortions exceed the legal abortions by 100 to one.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton East): Where is this, Canada or the United States?

Mr. Sargent: Again we are hiding our heads in the sand. What is the Minister going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is completely out of order, it has nothing to do with this vote.

Mr. Sargent: Who else can we talk to about it, Mr. Chairman, if we cannot talk to the Minister about it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It has nothing to do with my estimates.

Mr. Sargent: We are talking about public health and we have a problem there and no one is solving it.

Mr. Chairman: We are not talking about public health under this particular vote.

Mr. Sargent: I do not know when we can talk about it, Mr. Chairman, if we cannot talk about it under health.

Mr. Chairman: This has to do with the grants.

Mr. Sargent: We have the problem of a 100 to one ratio of criminal to legal and the Minister hides his head and says, "I cannot help it."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to get back to the supply of doctors again. The member for London South for more than two years now has given us a series of very important statistics which show that the number of graduates from our schools not only has not increased in proportion to the population but has decreased. The graph line has gone down, the population line has gone up, so we are getting fewer doctors per head of population or whatever calculation you use, every year that goes on.

The Minister has just explained to us about the recruitment programme in England and in other countries and has told us it has not been too successful. But the thing that puzzles me was the recent exchange that took place beween the member for Scarborough West and the Minister about plans. I just cannot understand for the life of me why, if the Minister has plans to expand the supply of doctors, those plans should be secret.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Singer: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will state my point of order when the member sits down, sir.

Mr. Singer: I have been sitting down for 20 seconds now.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have already stated that McMaster University has been given approval to build a new medical school.

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh, that was last year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is a bad moan, the member must be in labour.

I also stated that the University of Toronto has been given approval to build a new health sciences centre which will accommodate, in addition to its freshman class, equivalent to another medical school. These are the immediate plans, sir, these are the plans which are going to produce doctors within the foreseeable future.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, that is not the answer and the Minister knows that. Those are plans that have already been announced and apparently are under way. The University of Toronto is nothing new, it was a normal growth anticipated in that university, but what happens after 1967? Those are the secret plans, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They are not secret.

Mr. Singer: —and surely if the Minister has some reason for not revealing them to us, let him tell us. This is not a state secret. The enemies of Canada, if Canada has any enemies, are not going to be able to take advantage of us if they find out that we are going to build another medical school somewhere in Ontario in 1968. The walls of Ontario are not going to come crumbling down if the Minister begins to tell us how we are going to have some more doctors. If the Minister has any plans, and I think it is just as simple as this, let him tell us what happens from 1967 on to produce more doctors. The member for London South, for two or three or more years successively in this House, has quoted statistics. No one has stood and challenged those statistics, least of all the Minister of Health. The Minister admits a dismal failure in recruiting new doctors. Why then can the Minister not tell us the plans if he has any?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How many times does he have to answer the same question?

Mr. Trotter: I see the Minister does not want to answer that. Here is one suggestion, but I do not know what the Minister would think of this as to solving the shortage of medical students. It is made by a man by the name of George Hees. I do not know whether the Minister is familiar with that man or not, but this man George Hees made the suggestion to the Brantford Progressive Conservative association and he said that the government should pay medical students to keep them at university all the year round. He told the party meeting that medical care insurance will be a major failure unless Ottawa undertakes crash programmes to train more health personnel and expand medical research. Those in training to become doctors, dentists, nurses and technicians must be paid and trained on a 12-month-per-year basis. And, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister thinks it is possible to keep medical students at school all year round?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I myself have thought it possible but I have talked to educators and they do not agree with me. They have said that for a time it may appear to work but they are not agreed that on the long haul it is a good thing. Nonetheless, this is one thing that is being very actively studied at the present time. But I would point out to the hon. member and to George Hees, that the commission that the government of which he was a member set up to study these matters

recommended that this was the federal government's responsibility and it should provide the money to pay medical students to stay at school all year.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, what reasons do the university authorities give for not using the universities all year? This does not apply just to medicine, it applies to other things. This has been brought up so often. What reason do they give to the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not think the reason for not using the medical school all year round is the matter. They claim that fatigue begins to show very promptly and undermines the student's ability to concentrate on his studies. They have no objection to using the university for summer students and other proper students, but to keep the same students going 11 months out of the 12, this, they claim, is one of the important factors in a programme of this kind. However, they have not stated definitely or decided definitely that it cannot be done. This is a matter that is actively under consideration.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, what about the method of providing financial incentives to placing doctors in rural areas? Is there a government policy on that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is not one stated yet but it was stated at the close of my opening statement that this is one of our projects under very active study and consideration by the department. We believe we can develop a programme and we hope that it will have some success in attaining the objective that many of the members appear to have in mind, as well as ourselves.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on this point, would your scheme of encouraging doctors to go to a rural area be similar, for example, to how a company pays a lawyer a retainer and then the lawyer will charge fees for anything he does afterwards? Could a municipality or the provincial government pay a doctor a flat amount like a retainer to go to a certain community and then anything he makes after that he keeps? Is that the idea behind it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is part of our thinking. I said this afternoon, if I recall my words exactly, group practice will be prominent. The team will include doctors, dentists, nurses and basic public health staff, good levels of remuneration will be guaranteed and we hope to include a bonus principle on bursary assistance as well as the regular additional generous benefits. These centres should be valuable for the training of general practitioners. We have been able to note some fair amount of interest in this on the part of the medical schools as part of their training programme. Now, there are still a great many kinks to be ironed out of this kind of a programme, but it is not an impossible one by any means.

I would point out on the matter of income, there are very few areas today where a doctor cannot make a good living. Again, to come back to a complaint I often hear, not only in Canada but in ther places, where there are outlying areas, the people complain about the professional isolationism.

This is why we look upon our programme as part of the training of a good family physician and we would not be disposed to leave a man long at one time in an area, we would keep them on a rotating basis and encourage them to continue their education, encourage them to take further education, but not keep them in a place where they get into a rut because we fear also that the quality of their practice might deteriorate as well.

Mr. Trotter: You would have the same problem, I suppose, if you convince a doctor to go out into a certain district. Then there is the problem of convincing his wife to go.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is the biggest problem.

Mr. Trotter: In actual practice, it has happened in various areas where a doctor will go but his wife will not. Maybe it helps the doctors get rid of their wives if this occasion arises.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member want to bring a motion to that?

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, we hear an awful lot about regional development from the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), and occasionally from the Prime Minister, and it would seem to me that if the regional development plan means anything, you are not going to get any of these regions under way unless you are going to be able to surround the region with an amplitude of services, including medical services.

I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, to what extent the Minister is participating in the whole programme of regional development, whether he is taken into consultation insofar as the development of these regions is concerned and to what extent his planning

goes hand in hand with the Minister of Economics and Development or the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) or anyone else who is interested in regional development.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Our plans, Mr. Chairman, go very closely, hand in hand, our health regions coincide almost exactly, geographically, to the 10 economic regions. I say "almost" because there is some cutting across boundaries, but very little. We recognize too that the regional concept is very valuable in health, the regional concept is also equally valuable and essential to regional planning on an economic or other basis.

We are in constant consultation on these matters and we work very closely together. This is the ultimate objective to which we are aiming in health, regional services.

Mr. Singer: Well, I am glad you are at least in consultation, Mr. Chairman, but to listen to the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Prime Minister or the Minister of Economics and Development, they are moving ahead just as rapidly as possible. Now this Minister tells us he is just still in the thinking stage. He repeated to us the remarks he made when his estimates were introduced and he seems to be either dawdling far behind them in the way he expressed it or they are adding words to their success which really do not properly belong.

Are they moving faster than the Minister or is he moving faster than they? Which is leading? To what extent, for instance, does the Minister sit with this committee that is chaired by the Prime Minister which deals with regional development? To what extent does the Minister intermingle in these regional development conferences; to what extent is he concerned with the surveys that Mr. Jones did in the city of Ottawa or that was being done at the Head of the Lakes or in the Niagara peninsula or around the Kitchener-Waterloo area?

To what extent does the Minister concern himself in these various studies that are going on so that the health point of view can be presented in regional development?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, my technical staff is part of the technical planning. They make very clear to those involved in technical planning where the health matters are, but the hon. member apparently has not been listening to what we have been saying. After all, we announced the other day when we introduced an amendment to The Public Health Act a new concept of districts within regions, the region broken up still further into districts for public health purposes. This is part of the programme which is moving ahead equally rapidly with other phases of the regional planning programme.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, drawing circles on a map does not solve the problem.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is not a case of drawing circles.

Mr. Singer: It is putting doctors in those circles and that is what we are trying to get at. How are you going to get doctors to go into these regions? Are any of the efforts of the Minister's colleagues going to be at all successful unless a method is devised of producing doctors and inducing those doctors to go into these regions that need development? These are the answers we want. And it is not just enough to say we have grandiose plans or we have drawn a new map or we have re-designated new areas that might or might not coordinate with somebody else's new areas. How is the Minister going to get doctors into these areas, because the Minister of Economics and Development is not going to be able to develop them economically with people because people are not going to go unless they have medical services and these regions do not seem to attract doctors today?

The very simple question is, Mr. Chairman, how is the Minister going to get medical services into these regions that his colleagues in Cabinet seem to want to have developed?

Mr. Trotter: Lorimer lodge, Mr. Chairman, it is item 21, under grants. I think this is an important item, Mr. Chairman. I think it is an important item because it proves it could be used in two ways, first of all we could encourage such grants to private organizations such as this or the government itself could develop this type of care centre for retarded adults who are probably between 50 to 80 IQ.

When I was speaking earlier today, I mentioned about Cobourg and many of the patients at Cobourg were advanced retardates and it was found that more could be done for them than for example the male retardates that you have at Aurora, but Lorimer lodge has about 18 patients there and in the long run this type of treatment, particularly when you have volunteers helping, is far less expensive for the government and gets far better results.

Again I use averages but I think under the private volunteer groups they can take care of a patient at about $1,000 a year; it is

costing the government approximately $3,000 a year.

What is most important is that these people have had far better results. The truth of it is because they have a smaller operation, only 18, they can do a far better job than, let us say, up in Cobourg where in one dormitory they have 36 patients. Now, no matter how dedicated or how able the staff is, they simply cannot properly give the care to a person who can receive training, they cannot give that proper care to the same extent that those who run Lorimer lodge can. Now, when I see the patients at Aurora hospital, I wonder where the male patients are in Ontario who have an IQ of around 60 or 75. Certainly there are very few of them at Aurora.

But the female patients that have an IQ of 60 to 75, a great number of them are at Cobourg and yet there does not seem to be any facility in Ontario unless it is Edgar, which has recently been constructed, for the male patients.

We simply are going to have to have more of this type of units and I was wondering if the government would not encourage such groups as the Metropolitan Toronto retarded children's association to open more and to encourage them to get the volunteers, or in lieu of that, the government itself should directly operate such units as Lorimer lodge.

My own feeling is that for a beginning, if the government put up most of the money and insisted that these private organizations even put up from five to ten per cent, that the government itself, in saving tax dollars would get a tremendous amount of value out of these volunteer organizations.

These people are dedicated, they are able and in most cases they have been able to retain and hire well informed and well trained staffs. When we look at the overall picture of the plight of the retarded in the province of Ontario, we have got a long way to go. This $5,000 to Lorimer lodge is well spent, but the difficulty and the problem is that it is but a beginning, a very small beginning with the problem we have at hand.

I have laboured away at the Minister for a number of years about the lack of space for retardeds and I have emphasized that there are going to be a certain percentage that are going to require institutionalization. But there is evidently a large number that can be trained and can be helped. Dr. Barry has shown that in Cobourg. These people who run Lorimer lodge have proved that. But the facilities are not in the province to the extent that are required to meet the problem and this item of $5,000 shows how little we, as a government, in coming to grips with new ideas, are actually doing in practice.

I know in London we have a good research centre started and something is being done, but we need to put more funds into this type of thing. I was wondering if the Minister would give us any comment about whether there is any hope in the near future of either encouraging private organizations or the government directly to open more lodges or residences, such as Lorimer lodge.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that this item for Lorimer lodge rightly belongs in here. This is a grant and it is again just a token grant. It is not a payment for services. It is supported through The Department of Social and Family Services rehabilitation branch and grants for other agencies, of course, are coming through The Department of Social and Family Services right along. I am sure the hon. member must remember that the department last year amended the legislation. Again, the new Homes for Retarded Persons Act just passed, permits the government through The Department of Social and Family Services to provide up to $5,000 per place capital grant and 80 per cent of maintenance costs.

This $5,000 here is, I think, perhaps just a little misleading. The job that Lorimer lodge does for us in return for this largely is to counsel girls who have gone through there. They go back there and look upon it as a kind of home away from home. They are home for a weekend, perhaps, or for overnight, and they find that they are insecure or in a little difficulty and go back for a little counsel and help. This they have done very well over the years. But if they were carrying on a programme—and we welcome that kind of thing, as we have done when we encouraged our colleague, the Minister of Social and Family Services to introduce this legislation—there is a substantial capital grant and maintenance support as well.

A very large number of these places have been opened up since this legislation was passed. The Minister of Social and Family Services will be in a better position to give statistics than I am.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, Lorimer lodge is a halfway house for retarded girls. They are pretty well advanced. They have an IQ of around 75.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I know that.

Mr. Trotter: But whether this goes through The Department of Social and Family Services or through the Minister of Health, it in essence will affect the Minister's budget tremendously because if the girls who attend Lorimer lodge cannot keep themselves in society, then they end up in one of the Minister's hospitals for retarded adults. Regardless of the humanitarian element, but budget-wise, this type of item is highly important to the Minister because it is obvious he has got no place to put these people and house them in a decent fashion, unless he wants to cram a few more into the dormitories at Cobourg. So there has got to be a great deal of cooperation between the Minister of Social and Family Services and the Minister of Health. This is the difficulty in some of these departments that are split. The right hand does not know what the left hand is doing, and as a result, a lot of people suffer unnecessarily and a good many tax dollars are wasted and need not have been wasted.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have two or three other points on this vote before it passes.

One is that I would like to say that I thought the comments much earlier on in the debate, very much earlier on in the debate, of the member for Forest Hill about the place of the voluntary agency and the amount of money one gives by way of a token grant and how that agency develops, was really a very precise sort of definition of what the situation is and how it should evolve.

The only thing that bothered me about it was that there comes a point with these voluntary agencies where if the government is certain that they are doing substantial work, that they are making a major contribution, then it is important that the government step in with an increased dollar contribution and give them some greater substance. They always reach the point of no return, where they have expanded to the limit, the programmes are worthwhile and then they are totally frustrated by the financial impasse.

I want to add my voice to the member for Parkdale and suggests to the Minister that that is exactly what has happened to the Canadian mental health association, that it has reached the point where it can do no more until government recognizes that it should give some extra money. I quite appreciate the original token nature of the contribution, but I think once the agency has proved itself as dramatically as the arthritis society has, or indeed as the mental health association has, then there is some very real substance for government saying, "If you are asking for $20,000 instead of $10,000 then obviously your request is not an exorbitant one. You must have reasons for your request and we will view it in a favourable light." I think that that rationale should govern the granting of these sums of money in addition to the original tokenism. This government is given to tokenism. I would suggest a different kind in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister arising from item 3 under the grant, some questions about alcoholism and in particular what situation obtains in the Ontario hospitals for the treatment of alcoholics and what plans does the Minister have in the Ontario hospital system in conjunction with the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation for the treatment of alcoholics?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I wonder if the hon. member would hold that quesiton over until we are discussing mental health division estimates, please?

Mr. S. Lewis: Yes, I would.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Any matters directly related to the foundation by grants, I would be glad to try to answer.

Mr. S. Lewis: I had raised it only because I was under the tentative impression that whatever was being done in the OH's was in some way tied in with the foundation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Coordination and planning, but it would be better—

Mr. S. Lewis: Fine. So be it. Mr. Chairman, the last question then on this vote is the cystic fibrosis grant which—no there is one other—but first the cystic fibrosis grant. I think if memory serves me, it was $250,000 last year. It has gone up to $300,000, and yet as I understand it, when the parents have the children at home and the children are being serviced in the tent and there are a great many medical expenses attendant on that home care, is there any government money for direct grants to pay parents in the home subsequent to periods of hospitalization?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We do not tie any strings to this. This money is administered for us by the Ontario society for crippled children. They act as our agents in this matter and they are given a free hand to use their judgment in this regard, as they would in their own field directly related to crippling in children. This budget is their proposal;

the increase was made at their recommendation because they believe that they will require $300,000 for this year. How they apportion it or whether they consider direct money grants to parents, I cannot tell you. I only get an audited statement of the money that is spent, but for what projects it is spent, so long as it is for cystic fibrosis, we do not interfere in any way. I could ask them for more particular information if the hon. member would be interested in it.

Mr. S. Lewis: As a matter of fact, I am Mr. Chairman. If the Minister could get it together I would appreciate it. The $300,000 is the figure which the society itself requested and the government met the request. Do you know if the society arrived at the figure in conjunction with the hospital for sick children, or did it do this on its own?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think it would have been done in very close consultation with the hospital for sick children, because I believe it is through this hospital that the largest number of children are contacted. I think that the hospital has the largest single clinic and is, therefore, the best source of information on this problem.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me how this list is compiled? Is it a matter of application in the traditional way by the various associations which are listed as eligible to receive these kind of grants, or does the Minister make a survey of the various groups that may be interested in grants, and do the grants bear any relationship to the amounts which may have been requested by the various associations?

Mr. S. Lewis: It is not like the hospitality fund—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No—it is a queer kind of hospitality, it is a combination of both. I think the grant originates from application. Many of these are coming to be more or less traditional; I inherited quite a number of them and have added some to them. I have added arthritis, for instance; I have increased mental health and I have added haemophilia, multiple sclerosis and learning disabilities. I have added quite a few.

They originate on the basis of an application and then we seek advice to whom we turn for advice in various fields to help us assess the merit of the cause or the need of the cause. On the basis of that, insofar as the resources available to us will permit, we grant or reject the grant.

I have to emphasize that when we give a grant in the first instance, to voluntary organizations particularly, it is in an attempt to help them get their cause going. Oftentimes they need a little stimulus and when they go to private donors for support, they will often be asked if the government is helping them in any way, or if they have gotten any money from official sources. Oftentimes we grant them a certain amount for a year or two or three or five, and we are attaching now, insofar as we can, a time period to each new grant. This seems to give them the impetus they need and they can encourage private money.

These large amounts—the bursaries and the research, alcoholism and drug addiction and the Ontario cancer treatment—these were all separate items previously under "main office" and they are programmes that have been developed and are agencies of the government to carry on certain work.

The convalescent summer camps were recognized at one time by the province of Ontario as hospitals for the purposes of grants. When the federal-provincial agreement came into effect, the federal government pointed out that in the interpretation of their Act, they were not hospitals but because of the work that they were doing and because of their need, the government, through The Department of Health, continued to provide this support.

There is a formula. We provide a certain amount per diem per bed, but it is related to the funds that the organization has and on the basis of its audited statement, we raise or lower the grant accordingly. It is largely to help them meet the need that exists and that cannot be met in any other way.

That, in not very broad generality, is how these come about.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my remarks were prompted by the fact that my colleague noticed that there is no reference in the list to the Ontario epilepsy foundation, or association, and I know that it is a very active association. Would that indicate that they either did not request the amount or some allocation of funds or that they are now sufficiently self-financing that they do not need this assistance from the government?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, they did request assistance, but instead of giving them money we seconded a staff member who we support and he helps them organize

the cause and carries out rehabilitative efforts for the members of that association. This is in lieu of a grant, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, is that member on the staff of the Minister's department or is he a roving person located some place in the province from time to time?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We maintain him; we pay his salary and we provide him with space, but he is free to do the work of the epilepsy association wherever they need it done at the time. This, we believe, is actually more valuable to them than giving them a grant of perhaps $2,500.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to tell the House just what the situation is across the province in regard to epileptics. I remember—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, with respect, that this be left until the mental health estimates?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this may not be the place to ask this, but instead of loading our jails—a goodly percentage of arrests are made for being drunk—and under this vote of $4,500,000 for research into alcoholism is there any thinking on the part of the Minister or of his department as far as the trend in the United States for detoxification centres to take the criminal part away? Sickness instead of a charge in jail—what is the treatment along that line?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the province of Ontario accepted alcoholism as a public health problem some time ago. The first detoxification centre opens this year at the Hastings wing of Riverdale hospital. This is the first one. There is a good deal of study and consideration necessary, however, in this matter with respect to the laws of our land and a knowledgeable committee has been working on this law. I think they have the first draft of an Act now ready for further consideration and this is on-going.

There will be certain necessary changes in the existing law, I am told, before the programme can be fully developed as a public health programme. It is our belief, as I stated in the House when this policy was first announced, that putting people in jail has not solved the problem and it has not really helped the problem in any way. This is an attempt to see what we can do from a health standpoint and thereby we adopted it as a public health problem.

In addition to that, of course, I believe that tenders are now being considered for the building of the new centre on the Toronto campus which will be perhaps the most modern facility for the treatment of alcoholics in the country. This is all part of the programme in this matter.

This is also being done in other centres. There is a 50-bed in-patient unit in Hamilton, a university-based hospital in London and consultation centres at several other places throughout the province, but the intoxication centres to which you make reference are very definitely beyond the planning stage now—they are coming into being.

Mr. Sargent: I think this is wonderful. This is a pilot programme you are running. When you work out the legal problems you will have an active programme that you can put in the hopper.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: When we work out the legal problems we hope to be in a position then to see the last person go to jail for being drunk alone. Now these legal problems —the lawyers will understand these far better than I—but I am advised that they are certainly not easy to deal with.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to tentatively pursue this question of alcoholism and the law a little bit further and I appreciate what the Minister says about the difficulties of the problem. With the number of dollars the government is allocating for the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation work, would the Minister simply explain to the members what should be done in the case of a member being approached with, or recognizing a problem of, alcoholism in a person who wants assistance, or in some way needs assistance? Just what steps does, say, a member of the Legislature approached in such a way take to facilitate the entry of that person into some kind of a treatment or rehabilitative process?

This has posed something of a problem for those members that I have talked to about it and to myself in the case where—I have just been at a little bit of a loss as to how to get the person within the framework of the facilities which the government is providing with the funds which are available.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I believe that there was distributed to the members of the House a fairly complete directory of facilities. Are they repeated in the annual report which I tabled today? We will get into the hands of every member a directory of the facilities that now exist. I will go over them rather

quickly now and I would suggest the best way when you are so approached is simply to get in contact by telephone—if you cannot get anywhere else—with the foundation head office. They will either take the matter in hand or direct you to where it should be. The foundation headquarters is at present located at 344 Bloor Street West.

They have had to move about from place to place and I find difficulty in keeping track of where they are myself, but the new home is now on the road, I hope, so we will know exactly where to get them.

There is a small in-patient hospital on Harbord Street, a central out-patient clinic; there is a new halfway house; there is a social rehabilitation centre; there is an east Toronto outpatient clinic; there is a small day treatment unit. These facilities can be contacted, I repeat, by phoning the foundation office and then they will tell you. Outside there are regional centres at Fort William, Hamilton, Kitchener, London, Kenora, Ottawa, Sudbury, Metropolitan Toronto, Welland, Windsor, and Sault Ste. Marie. Those are centres for alcoholism and it is simply a matter of telephoning and putting the problem before them and I would expect that it would be taken over by their staff from there on.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, again quite tentatively, because I do not purport to be knowledgeable in the matter at all, the problem that I have run into, and other members that I have discussed it with have run into, is that if a person is an alcoholic in the sense of being ill with the disease of alcoholism, the point of time which only occurs at particular points in time where that person is prepared to undergo the treatment, or to enter into the treatment process, is the crucial point. The difficulty that I have run into, and this is not by way of criticism, is that you go through this, you get in touch with the alcoholism and drug addiction foundation or one of the offices of it, and then the person is given an appointment some considerable time in the future. The precise peak of his urge to enter into a treatment process or to gain some assistance in the illness from which he suffers, passes.

Is there any way in which a person can at least make the initial contact, or is there some kind of staging place where he can come into contact with the treatment system almost immediately—say in the metropolitan area on a 24-hour basis, so that if the psychological point is reached at which he wants to attempt to do something about the illness, he can be received and at least incorporated into the treatment system?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That one may be a little harder to answer. I will have to get some information from my staff about that. I recognize the problem and I can understand too it is not always easy just to arrange an appointment at the time. Yet I recognize too that this is a most important period in the experience of the alcoholic, because it is not easy to get him to recognize the fact that he is sick and needs treatment. I am just advised by my staff that with the opening of the in-hospital service, I presume it is, when these come into being in this current year, an emergency 24-hour service will then be possible in Metropolitan Toronto.

I should have added, of course, that oftentimes you are faced with a problem from a family when the patient is seriously and physically ill as a result of alcoholism, and I think the only place for that patient is a very grave emergency in the general hospital because that patient needs emergency treatment and he needs it immediately so that it would be a waste of time going through the addiction foundation offices at that time. The best thing is to get his doctor and get him quickly.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister comment about the extent to which the facility at Kenora has provided any information about the problem of alcoholism within the Indian community in that area which was the original reason, as I understand it, for the opening of the centre in Kenora?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The information I have is that the experimental unit now operating in Kenora, where a community consultation centre was opened last fall, offers an overnight detoxication service especially adapted to the needs of Indian people who had previously been stranded in the town and lodged in jail to sober up. Most of the persons are not sick in the sense of requiring hospitalization but they do need shelter and care. We have been successful in holding them. One of the great difficulties in the treatment of the alcoholic, of course, is that you must continue keeping in contact with him and this I presume is one of the greatest difficulties you have had to face. This is one of the things we are aiming toward—or seeking, I should not say aiming toward. We must aim toward it, but in the meantime we have to seek for a way to get the law written so that this is possible.

One is drawn between two forces. The first, you know, is really the only way to get and keep the patient—the only way you can do the patient much good is to get and keep him. On the other hand one hesitates to say, "Do not throw them in jail but let the courts give us the right to keep them"—a sort of indeterminate sentence if you will. I am not sure just how this can be resolved, but this is one of the knotty features to which the legal and medical people have been devoting their time and attention. There were 1,200 seen in the last six weeks. The clinic was opened in Kenora on February 1, so it is a popular clinic and has apparently a large clientele already.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, again in this field, and again very tentatively, I get the impression that the extent of alcoholism in the province, and the figures which have been quoted to me in the ranking of it as a disease, would indicate that it would fall probably about number three as the principal disease afflicting the population of the province. If it is relatively true that there are probably 100,000 people in the province suffering from alcoholism, is there any consideration within the framework of the research work which is being done to establish a pattern of social attitude toward alcoholism?

Let me illustrate, Mr. Chairman, what I would like to get across. I think it is fair to say we tend to tolerate drinking and driving. It is quite true that it oscillates from time to time so far as penal punishment is concerned in the courts, and people are charged with impaired driving and so on, and the process then goes on. But by and large, impaired driving is not considered to be a socially disastrous offence, the way that other offences are, and yet it is as dangerous, if not more dangerous than many other offences which are punished much more severely.

If it is true that in Ontario one of the complicating problems of this question of alcoholism is the conflicting attitudes towards the consumption of alcohol rather than a general social attitude towards the problem, then it would seem to me that one of the areas of concern of the alcohol and drug addiction foundation should be related to alcoholism as a part and parcel of the society in which we live and what is the social attitude towards it.

It seems to me that when people speak, for example, as is often done, of England, these who tend to have a social attitude towards alcohol which prohibits by and large people being intoxicated in the streets or publicly, that it is the social pressure which contains the use of alcohol within an acceptable framework.

There is not going to be prohibition, we had that disastrous experiment, and yet on the other side, we have a government which by and large—and again this is not in any critical vein—tends to promote the sale and consumption of alcohol. It is very permissive of the sale and consumption of alcohol within certain restrictions which we have inherited by tradition.

For example, the sale of beer and the sale of liquor in the stores through which they are sold, it all tends to the proposition that alcohol is a necessary part of the society in which we are living. Yet you find among—if I may use the dreadful term—the ethnic groups that one will have a different attitude towards alcoholic consumption than another. The Anglo-Saxon community has one view of it, the Polish community has a view about it, the Italian community has a view about it, the various communities seem to me to produce a very conflicting pattern of reaction to the acceptance of alcoholism.

I am saying this very poorly because I am trying to find some rationale as to how we get beyond the medical treatment of alcoholism and get into the context where it really belongs, namely a social problem. I think it has been designated as a psycho-social problem; alcoholism as such is a product of an environment in many ways.

The person who uses alcohol to an unusual degree, indicates a very real sense of dependency on alcoholism to get him by in the society in which he lives. The treatment that a person tends to need, if my observations and limited knowledge are correct, is the kind of supportive facilities which extricate him from the necessity of depending on alcohol so that he can be more at home in his own environment, more mature in the way with which he deals with his surroundings.

Again, and I speak from a great lack of knowledge in the subject, I get the impression that alcoholism tends to be treated more as a purely medical problem than as a problem which is related to several disciplines, including the sociological disciplines, psychological disciplines, as well as the medical disciplines.

I wonder if the Minister could give me some idea as to whether or not the alcoholism and drug addiction foundation is enlarging its field of operation into the broader social aspects of this question of the general

attitude of the public toward liquor in our society.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is a most interesting subject and I would like to point out that some of us have been concerned that the orientation of the foundation has not been enough medical. But I think the consensus is that the orientation as it is, is the better way to approach alcoholism and it is not specifically medically oriented by any means.

Indeed, the advisory committee which in the first instance was, I believe, only medical, was changed two or three years ago to make it a scientific advisory committee and I think the representatives of the other social and behavioural sciences are in greater numbers than the medical people.

I think there is recognition that this is largely a social and behavioural problem with medical overtones, or undertones, put it as you like.

Now the question that the hon. member brings up is a most interesting one, a very important one, and part of the basic research programme of the foundation itself is to establish precise data on the matter that the hon. member has mentioned, particularly in attitudes to alcoholism as such, and to drinking. The educational programme being conducted by the foundation I believe reflects this attitude very clearly.

I have just been looking over the list of the research projects undertaken and I believe the social and epidemiological studies and the psychological studies outweigh all the others almost by two to one, so that the attitude of the foundation is very definitely geared, or at least shows clear evidence of recognizing the fact that this is far more than a medical question.

Perhaps one might wonder why it is under The Department of Health, because we believe health in its broadest term, its broadest context is involved and this is one place where the hon. member for Scarborough West and I do agree, that medicine, or disease in the narrow medical context, is really one of man's lesser troubles.

But health in the broad context of course is a very great and a very important question, and I think again the evidence over the years of the research which the foundation itself has done and is doing and the research it has supported and initiated in many cases, is clearly indicative that they recognize the problem in the broad context of health rather than as a narrow medical problem.

A short time ago, they published a book "Abstract of Papers" from the result of work done by their own staff and if I recall, and I am dredging up from memory alone, the majority of papers there were directed toward social and psychological studies rather than purely medical ones.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the member for Grey North raised the question of the treatment in the courts of persons with alcoholism. Does the Minister anticipate that this report or study is going to be available soon and can he indicate the position of his department on this question as some sort of a guide or indication to The Attorney General's Department, and through that department to the magistrates throughout the province, as to what the up-to-date, most knowledgeable way is of dealing with persons who come before the magistrates for sentencing?

It is still quite common in the courts, as the Minister probably knows, for a person to come up charged with drunkenness with a record of being drunk 25 times and the standard penalty is, well, five days or 10 days, and it obviously is a severe case of alcoholism or chronic case of alcoholism where the magistrate should have available to him whatever limited facilities are available for referring persons out of the penal system into The Department of Health System.

It seems to me that the time must be now past where we need to await definitive study, and a definitive procedure as to what course the magistrate should take and that they should start in a very pragmatic way, under the best advice which the government should give, to ask the magistrates when these matters come before them or when the particular cases come before them, to treat them or deal with them in a specific way, rather than to wait and to worry about some broadly definitive procedure to be followed in this field.

It must now be agreed that alcoholism—I am not speaking about just simple drunkenness where an occasional charge is laid—but alcoholism, if it is recognized as such by a magistrate, should be treated in a totally different way than it has in the past. I think we could get on with it if the magistrates were definitively advised by the government, if necessary through The Attorney General's Department, as to what facilities and what the most up-to-date view of this problem may be.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I neglected to advise the hon. member that his

statistic was right, that alcoholism does rank third in the list of diseases.

The foundation, in its discussions on changes in the law which they believe are necessary, is in constant consultation. Part of its consultation involves the Deputy Attorney General, and I have been very encouraged to recognize that certainly the Attorney General and very obviously his staff and many magistrates believe that we are on the right track. I do not anticipate difficulty but I recognize too that they must operate within the laws that now exist. For that reason, my staff is emphasizing to me the necessity of changing the law.

The first draft of an Act is actually on my desk now. I have not had a chance to look at it or discuss it with my staff or get any further legal opinion on it. Unless it is most unusual that the first draft is totally acceptable, I do not expect that we can develop it to bring it before the House and give it the proper treatment it should have within this present session, but I certainly do expect to have a bill to present to the House at the next session.

I have done a little kite-flying, if you will, myself, and others in the field have done it. I spoke to an AA meeting some months ago and suggested in that speech that the time had probably come when the courts should give us control over an alcoholic, one who was harming himself. Again I might very well be accused of inconsistency in this, because when somebody asks me to have legislation introduced that would give the authorities the right to go in and take one from his home who was ill and who refused to submit to treatment—this offends every principle I held dear. Yet I have to say because of the nature of alcoholism, it puts the alcoholic in a somewhat different category. Oftentimes he is not only harming himself very greatly without realizing it, but he is very definitely in many cases harming his family and harming society thereby, and may not have the judgment at the time to decide.

I often wonder if the severe alcoholic is mentally as stable as he might be, at least at the time when he is drunk. Perhaps somebody should take charge and impose upon him, if you will, the treatment which might very well have a chance at success. These are some of the thoughts that have been in the mind of the legal people. A while ago the medical-legal society did propose a bill to me, but as I read it, some of the provisions in the law seemed to me to be so drastic that I could not in conscience present them for the consideration of the House and sent it back for further study. Now out of this has come another draft which I have not yet seen.

But I think the majority of people are coming to the realization that the law must step in and give the treatment authorities the right and the power to hold the patient for the time when in their judgment he is able to face the world again on his own.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, may I say hallelujah to that last statement. For the eight years I have beeen here I have been battling away at various Attorneys General and at The Department of Health on the same topic. This is the first time that at least somebody has said there is some consideration being given to bringing in an Act. I am not going to repeat all the ills that exist at present in the magistrate's court system, in the amount of time that we waste in our courts dealing with alcoholics, and the amount of space taken up in penal institutions in imprisoning alcoholics because we have no proper system of treating them. But I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that somewhere along the line as we are beginning to talk about legislation, the Minister is going to tell us when he is going to have the facilities to do this properly.

It is encouraging that the grant for the alcoholic and drug addiction centre has been increasing over the years, but still they do not seem to have the facilities available to take this problem on in a meaningful way. How many beds are available for alcoholics, for instance, in Metropolitan Toronto? Supposing you had your statute, supposing it was in final form, how many alcoholic beds could you make available to the courts out of Metropolitan Toronto for this purpose? The two things just cannot be separated, they must go along hand in hand. I said hallelujah as I started off these remarks because at long last we are getting something just a little bit more than the bland assurances that yes, this is a serious problem and we have it under active consideration. Maybe when somebody is talking about looking at draft bills, something more has happened.

But what are the facilities, Mr. Chairman? How many beds do we have for alcoholics? Supposing the statute was ready tonight for its third reading, how many beds could be made available to the magistrates just in Metropolitan Toronto?

Mr. Trotter: Of course, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kelso Roberts, when he was Attorney General, indicated on one occasion that they were going to have a farm for alcoholics, but like

so many promises from this government, we have not seen it. Then legislation was passed whereby alcoholics can be sentenced, and under certain circumstances they can have treatment. But I know that when I was through Mercer on King Street about six weeks ago, I was told that the magistrates were either unaware of the legislation or just had not used it, so it takes a long time to make any progress in this field.

I hope there is more substance to the Minister's indication that there will be legislation than that given by Mr. Kelso Roberts a few years ago.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we have a farm at Elora—

Mr. Singer: How many beds are there?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think it is quite wrong to expect that there should be special beds set aside for alcoholics. When an alcoholic needs a bed, he is a sick person. The bulk of his treatment does not require a bed, other than for him to sleep. Much of the on-going treatment of the alcoholic is done on a day care or out-patient basis. He does not have to be hospitalized. I think about five days is the usual drying-out period and only when he is acutely ill does he need that.

The report of the Indian project in Kenora shows that it is usually one day—maybe overnight—just until he sobers up. But then the on-going treatment to keep him on the straight and narrow path can be done on an out-patient or on a day-care basis. We have 76 beds—48 in Toronto, 18 in Sudbury and 10 in Kenora, a total of 76. In addition to that, there are still quite a number of alcoholics treated in our Ontario hospitals. The number of these I cannot tell you until we come to the estimates as I do not have the information right at hand.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I used the word "beds" in too technical a sense. How many units of treatment facilities do you have, including beds and out-patient facilities? Can you come anywhere close today—and I suggest that you are not even within sighting distance—can you come anywhere close to handling the number of alcoholics who appear daily in our Metropolitan Toronto magistrates' courts?

At what time in the future are you going to be able to do that, because all you have to do is to look in any of those courtrooms and you will see that that is the problem. You can look in any of the institutions run by the Minister of Reform Institutions and you will see that that is the problem. Look anywhere you want and you will see that that is the problem and we are just not able to cope with it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, if I may—I think there has been a misunderstanding here. Surely the hon. member must appreciate the fact that the magistrates are, in fact, sending a considerable number of these people to the A. G. Brown memorial clinic, where there are, I think, 108 beds and where they have had a fair amount of success.

I would say that a fair number of the alcoholic population are being looked after properly and a great deal of success is being had with them. The only problem is—and I agree with the principle—that most of them should not have to go through the courts. I do not think that they should be made criminals, but in the meantime, a great number of these people are being looked after, being treated and, as I say, with a fair amount of success.

Presumably, when the new system comes into effect and has been in effect for some time—as a matter of fact, as soon as it begins and more beds are needed, presumably, a portion of the A. G. Brown clinic could be used for that purpose.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is late and some of us are getting a little weary, but surely the simple point is this, that the method of treating alcoholics as criminals is as out-dated as the horse and buggy. This is the point that I have been making for eight years and this is the point that many other members have been making for far longer than that.

I began my remarks by saying "hallelujah" to the fact that maybe there is a meaningful statute beginning to be drafted, but you have to provide facilities which you do not have.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 803 carry?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this, if we are talking about the topic which is the third ranking disease in the province, I think we can afford the time for a little relaxed discussion about it.

I would like to say that, so far as I know, this is one field where I do not have any strong criticism of the government. I think that the government, in fact, is to be commended on the amount of money that they are devoting to this topic. We can always say that there should be more and there should be better solutions to the problem, but I think that this is an area where the government is making some very real progress. There will

always be areas where it can be criticized and where the people can have different views.

I was interested in the Minister's remarks about the proposed Act and I would ask him if he could give us some indication as to the framework of the Act and how the Act is designed to cope with this problem. I suggest that this is one Act which—even though it is not in final form, unless there is some real conflict in principle within his department, might very well be read the first time and allowed to be circulated amongst the public for any comment that the public may wish to make about it.

I think the important thing in this field is to keep advancing on it, keep dealing with the problem and let the public know that it is being dealt with, because the general propositions are now accepted and we are really talking about the procedures that can be substituted for existing procedures.

The Minister touched upon the one area where he said that it may well be that this is the kind of social problem where a degree of force or a degree of coercion unacceptable in other fields is going to have to become an acceptable pattern of treatment in this field.

I think there is another aspect of it which is a correlative part of that. If the theory, with all its ramifications of the concept of a person who becomes dependent on the chemical intake to support him in his everyday life, is a correct analysis of the kind of problem that is faced by this foundation, then I would like to know whether or not the bill envisages the establishment of, say, sheltered workshops for persons who, through alcoholism, have become detached from a kind of useful routine. I am not talking about being economically productive to other people, but a useful routine from his own health point of view.

Would that type of sheltered workshop be envisaged within the framework of such a bill, because it is not just sufficient to sort of pass a mandate which says that it is going to be taken out of the magistrate's court and dealt with another way. I think the bill should, in a very broad framework, set out the total policy of the government for dealing with this specific problem and the general framework of the on-going facilities for treatment which could be established as a statute of the province of Ontario and as a declaration of policy and attitude toward this problem by the government.

I would ask if the Minister would give us some indication of the framework of the bill, and some indication of the possibility of it being introduced for first reading and circulated to the public for their comment. There are many, many societies which are interested in this problem.

I would ask, too, whether I am very wide of the mark in suggesting that it envisages within its framework a sequence of treatment through to something akin to sheltered workshops so that person could be re-established into society as a result of the policy of the government.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the hon. member any personal knowledge of the terms within which the framework of the bill is drawn, because I have not yet read it myself. It just came to my desk and I have been busily engaged otherwise.

However, quoting from the annual report, the intention or the aim of the committee which has been dealing with this to date; they have been seeking legislative approaches to two main goals:

> (a) to provide that the chronic drunkenness offender, that is, a person now punished repetitively under the law against public drunkenness, should instead be dealt with as a sick person and directed into treatment; and
>
> (b) To provide some way whereby persons not normally arrested who are nonetheless by reason of their alcoholism doing excessive harm to themselves or others may be subject to some form of civil commitment for treatment, not necessarily involving any involuntary confinement.

I think I should emphasize "not necessarily", because I think it is the view of some of my people that this may on occasion be necessary and that they should have the power. Now the matters that the hon. member mentioned are very interesting but I submit to you, with respect, that they need not necessarily be spelled out—certainly not in this Act—but they do not need to be spelled out in any other Act because the foundation has complete freedom to establish any programme it believes is of value in its work.

Its Act, the Act under which it is set up, gives it this power and indeed I think this is not unlike some of the things that are in your thinking, and the farm deal is part of it. I believe it is their thinking that quite a number of these folk who have been in constant or repetitive conflict with the law need

some type of sheltered or protective environment.

There is not much sense in just putting them in a place to live—I think they have to be kept active in one way or another or they would deteriorate from boredom alone. I think that workshops or work milieu of one sort or another are very much in the thinking of the foundation people and again I repeat, they do not need any further law to allow them to do this.

Mr. S. Lewis: Just before this passes, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could make the observation at this stage in the discussions which I had intended to make earlier. The Minister asked that it be held over and it is much more relevant here. I wonder if, when the committee is meeting, when the legislation is being discussed, whether some serious thought could not be given to the predicament of the treatment of alcoholics within the Ontario hospital system, and the necessity of establishing the lines of communication between the alcoholism foundation and the OH system.

I had the sensation when discussing it with some superintendents, and it was certainly confirmed by the experience of the Toronto OH that something like 15 per cent of the intake population comes in for alcoholism with or without psychosis, and in the Toronto Ontario hospital there were about 260 people in the year 1966. The question arises as to the possibility of rehabilitation, and their contention is that they could succeed in four-fifths of the cases if they had just a little more time and little more specialized assistance from the alcoholism foundation, instead of which they succeed in only 20 per cent of the cases because they are limited to a two- or three-week period and they have very little by way of a coherent programme to cope with the alcoholic who comes to them, often with an underlying psychosis.

So I just put it in at this point, Mr. Chairman. I realize it is a difficult area. It has been a most interesting discussion but I put it in at this point, because I think that curiously enough—if the Minister will remember, and his civil servants will remember better than I—that major report which was done on the state of alcoholism in the province had in the centre of it, I believe in the year 1963 or 1964, a drawing, a most peculiar drawing of a pump system showing the different locations from which the alcoholics came and to which they were referred. The one area in the province which was totally omitted in the drawing as the Minister will remember, was the Ontario hospital system, which deals with 15 per cent alcoholics in its patient population. So I mention it as a factor of some considerable importance and hope that the foundation can direct its interests in that area.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have one further comment on this matter. In the broad field of the use of chemicals as solace in our society, what particular work does the alcoholism and drug addiction foundation do in the field of addiction to tobacco? Does it rule that out or does it deal with that as a part of its work? If so, does the government have any particular view on communicating to the public whatever the up-to-date information is about the deleterious effects of tobacco as distinct from other types of narcotics?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, they have not formally undertaken anything in the area of tobacco. Mr. Archibald, the director, and I have spoken about this from time to time. We believe, however, that this lies more rightly within the purview of the public health people. However, this may not be a valid argument because as you point out it is a substance to which people become addicted. Of course one could argue the same about obesity—an equally, probably a much more serious disease—which in our view lies within the purview of public health. Yet it may very well be found necessary or wise to turn this over to the addiction people who have certainly built up a great deal of knowledge and experience and attracted many skills in this broad area of addiction.

However, they have not started on tobacco yet. I am really not in a position to say whether they will or not. We have given them quite a platterful now. I would like to give them an opportunity to digest some of the things we have thrown at them. We have thrown a great deal at them over the last few years. We gave them drug addiction and then we asked them to tackle this whole problem of dependence upon alcohol as a public health programme.

The hon. member for Scarborough West spoke about the numbers admitted to the Ontario hospitals. There is growing co-operation between the two, because here again the foundation, in its terms of reference, is given responsibility for the overseeing and coordination of all programmes in the province aimed at this problem of addiction. Our hospitals very definitely come within this frame of reference, and there is now, and there will be, growing coordination

and cooperation between the two. We have at two of our hospitals, at least—I believe there are more—but at Kingston and Lakeshore active research programmes or projects are under way in this matter, and I believe in some other hospitals too. Those two, anyway, I know. But the foundation will be the coordinating body for all programmes in this area of health care.

May I take this opportunity to direct your attention to this annual report. It has a great deal of most interesting information pertinent to many of the things that have come up tonight. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that if that vote is passed, I have appappreciated this discussion perhaps more than anything I have ever had anything to do with in my estimates.

Vote 803 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will deal with some bills and will continue with the Budget Debate. If there is any time thereafter we could go back to estimates, but from the look of the list that I have seen of available speakers I think the morning will be fully occupied with the Budget Debate.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to,

The House adjourned at 11:40 o'clock, p.m.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Friday, April 21, 1967

No. 72

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, April 21, 1967

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 21, 1967

Question to Mr. Wishart re organized crime, Mr. Sargent 2481

Question to Mr. Wishart re wiretapping and electronic bugging, Mr. Sargent 2481

Questions to Mr. Haskett re survey of transportation habits in Metro Toronto and region, Mr. Sargent 2481

Question to Mr. Rowntree re penny stock operations in the Timmins area, Mr. Renwick 2482

Questions to Mr. Robarts re Smith committee report, Mr. Nixon 2482

Niagara Parks Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading 2483

Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2486

Hospital Services Commission Act, bill to amend, reported 2487

Human Tissue Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, reported 2487

Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, bill to amend, reported 2487

Township of Cornwall, bill respecting, reported 2493

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. W. E. Johnston, Mr. Whitney, Mr. White 2493

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Racine, agreed to 2504

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 2504

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 1967

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, Ridgeview public school, Brampton, and in the west gallery, Page Avenue public school, Don Mills, and Ryerson senior public school, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart).

In view of the news release this morning that the Royal commission on crime in Quebec revealed that the Cosa Nostra is operating in Ontario—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: What about you clowns here? This is important and—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Listen to who is talking.

Mr. Speaker: The member may proceed.

Mr. Sargent: 1. Would the Minister advise the House if he plans to consult with Mr. Ralph Salerno, the witness before the Quebec Royal commission on organized crime?

2. Would the Minister advise what plans he has to commence wiretapping and bugging controls in this province?

Another question that I have, I better leave and see what happens.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member, I would say that the Ontario police commission is fully aware of all the facts which are known to the Quebec commission, as related by the newspaper article and will take such action as it may advise.

On the question of wiretapping, and bugging, as the hon. member describes it, I made my views known in this House on previous occasions in answer to many questions by the same hon. member. We presented those views to the federal government at the conference on uniformity of legislation and at the conference on the question of amendments to the criminal code. This is a matter where action would be required to be taken by the federal authorities.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister advise whether he knew of the Cosa Nostra operating here before the Quebec Royal commission knew of it?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Some of us were talking about this threat in 1960, years before Wintermeyer got on the thing.

Mr. Sargent: A question to the Minister of Transport. What is the purpose of the current survey of transportation habits being undertaken by the Metro Toronto and region transportation study?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the current survey being carried out by Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study is part of the overall study to determine the impact of GO-transit on the transportation habits of the commuters in the area. This particular survey is what you would call the pre-service study, and the results of it will be compared with similar studies or surveys made periodically after the GO-transit has been in service for a while.

Mr. Sargent: Could the Minister advise what firm has the contract and was it let on the contract low-bid basis? Would the Minister advise that, please? Does he know the answer to that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I cannot just recall the name of the survey firm at the moment, though I have said it several times in the last few days. I will give it to the member.

Mr. Sargent: It is let on a contract basis; a low-bid basis?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, Mr. Speaker, the contract was let to people who had been doing some of this work and have the process and the procedures that we will be following and have been following, so that it will dovetail with other data compilations that we are doing. It just was not one job that admitted a shift in the firm doing the collection.

Mr. Sargent: They are likely to continue the study at their own price? They set the price and you pay it?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) directed a question to me with respect to an inquiry and study into penny stock operations in the Timmins area by the securities commission. I have inquired about this and I am instructed by the securities commission that this report is expected before the end of June.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the House leader was good enough to take as notice a question of mine to the hon. Prime Minister yesterday. Perhaps the Prime Minister might comment on that at this time, if he has been made aware of it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Will the hon. leader of the Opposition ask the question again? I am not certain of the contents.

Mr. Nixon: I think it had reference to a news report yesterday that the Prime Minister had told the Ontario municipal association that he did not expect the Smith report before summer, and I wanted the Prime Minister to either confirm that or comment on it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think perhaps the position of the Smith report is exactly where it was when I last commented on it in reply to—

Mr. Nixon: When the hon. Prime Minister said he knew nothing about it?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have not any more information concerning the time of the Smith report than I had when I answered the question last time in the House. I presume this newspaper report to which the leader of the Opposition is referring arose from some comment made by a member of that delegation—

Mr. Nixon: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —in my office and they may have placed an interpretation on my remarks that might not be so. But I could tell the House that I have nothing further to add. I really do not know when this report will be available.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): But there will be a report some time?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would hope so. That is the purpose of the operation, and when I do know I will certainly inform the House, because as I have said many times, no one wants it more than I do.

Mr. Nixon: We are to assume then, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. MacNaughton's) prediction that it would be available in May is erroneous?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No. Of course, the Opposition's eternal effort to pin me down to a date is rather ridiculous because I cannot give it to them. I cannot make it any clearer than that. The time of the report is entirely within the hands of the commission itself. Therefore it is rather fruitless for them to try and force me to say that it will be May, June, July, August, or September, or any specific date, because I simply do not have control over the time the committee will report. I told the hon. members that I had been in conversation with the chairman of the committee last week and he was not able then to give me a specific date, and therefore I am unable to give this House a specific date.

Mr. MacDonald: On February 1 the Prime Minister said it was imminent.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course, but if the Opposition does press me, I am going to have to give some answer. I give all the data available—

Mr. MacDonald: We were not pressing, you volunteered that opinion.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I give all the information that I have. I share with the hon. members completely and fully all the information that I have.

Mr. Nixon: So what the Prime Minister is reported to have said to the municipal association is not correct?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have not read the report. I do not know what was said, but I am telling the House what I have said before—I wish I could be more explicit—

Mr. Nixon: He told them it was not going to be ready before summer.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I directed a question yesterday towards the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. I gave notice of the question. I am just wondering if he has an answer this morning?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, I am not ready with the answer.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Prime Minister a question on another matter with regard to government House business?

Last week the Prime Minister indicated that the second volume of the Confederation material would be available this week. Today is Friday.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Here again, I am glad the hon. member asked the question. These volumes, I think, will be available the beginning of the week and it may very well be we will postpone that debate until the House has had an opportunity to read them. I would hope both the subsequent volumes will be available on Monday or Tuesday, but it is not my intention to sort of put them in hon. members' hands and then call the debate. I would like the members to have an opportunity to read them. Therefore, I think I am free to tell the House that those reports will be tabled here on Monday and then we will call that debate some time later. But we will not call it on Tuesday as I had planned because perhaps the members would like to see these reports before debate is called. So, as the business of this session unfolds, we will call that order.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE NIAGARA PARKS ACT

Hon. J. N. Allan (Minister without Portfolio) moves second reading of Bill 74, An Act to amend The Niagara Parks Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the bill before us was already referred to during our discussion of the no-confidence motion a few days ago. I hope the Minister who is sponsoring this bill will take the opportunity on second reading of this bill, which has far-reaching and valuable reforms of the Niagara parks commission, to give us some information associated with the need for this reform and his own experience over the past few weeks with his responsibilities as chairman of the commission.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that there is information associated with the workings of this commission that has brought the government to the view that these reforms are necessary. I would say we favour the fact that after many years the commission is going to be made directly responsible to a Minister, to this Legislature, and in fact we will be able to get from the government the information associated with this operation, which we should have had these many years.

But today we are deeply concerned with a report from the present chairman, who is responsible for this bill, as to the difficulties recently experienced by the commission and which doubtless would have been one of the factors leading to the changes that are presently before us.

I would say very definitely that it is a good thing that the commission is going to have its personnel appointed in a different and more responsible way so that the various municipalities associated with the parks will have someone who can also report to them. The need as well for the extension of the park, if it is in the view of the government that the whole escarpment may eventually come under its jurisdiction, must give us the thought that further amendments extending the commission personnel would lie in the future.

My own feeling is that the Niagara parks commission might very well have the general jurisdiction of the escarpment which could be a developing park from Niagara right through to Tobermory and be an area of recreation and a source of pride to citizens all across this province.

There have been many articles recently that emphasize the immediacy of decision associated with the development of the whole escarpment as a park or under public control. These I would favour, having had an opportunity to talk to a good many of the people concerned when they presented briefs to the conservation committee over the past many months.

This is a development which Ontario, I believe, would greatly benefit from. I hope that the Act before us has sufficient scope to permit the government to assign to this commission, as it is newly constituted and as it is responsible to this House through a Minister, a broadened responsibility for parks that would include the development and in fact the acquisition of a large area associated with the Niagara escarpment.

We have commented on the government's inability to provide us with sufficient information pertaining to the difficulties experienced by the commission in recent weeks, but now the Minister himself, if anyone is responsible, is putting before us a bill of substance and importance and a bill that we support.

This is surely the appropriate and responsible time for him to tell this House, and through it the people of Ontario, what was the cause of the difficulties associated in recent weeks with the resignation of the six members of his commission.

Certainly, we are not prepared to accept their view that the present chairman has shown any arrogance, we know this is not in him. We are not prepared to accept their view that he is simply the mouthpiece for the government, because he is independent enough that we know that is not so.

We have been assured by the Minister of Highways that their objection concerning the establishment of a new highway through Victoria park is in fact without substance, so surely the time has come when the people who are concerned with the Niagara parks commission as a source of pride and also as a means whereby $9 million of public funds are at least managed, should have a report from the responsible Minister. I would look for that this morning.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at first that the bill that is before this House has nothing to do with resignations of the members of the commission. This bill is following the policy of the government with respect to appointment of such commissions. It is felt that it provides for flexibility in the appointment of personnel to the commission, and for that reason such legislation is proposed this morning.

I would say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that this government is as anxious as he has indicated he is, to do everything possible to develop the area covered by the Niagara park. We are willing likewise to cooperate with the groups who are interested in the Niagara escarpment and perhaps at some time I may have the opportunity of outlining our plans in this connection.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed in what the Minister has just told us. He has not answered any of the questions at all put forward by my leader and I think we are entitled to get those answers. The fascinating suggestion that this is part of the policy of the government to bring commissions under control of the Legislature through a responsible Minister is an interesting sort of a pronouncement but I think it is as meaningless as many of the pronouncements we have already had.

For instance, is the pension committee that the member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) is a member of responsible to a Minister and reporting to the House? The liquor control board, well, we have had great trouble and occasionally we get from the Provincial Secretary some sort of partial answer, but he really says "I don't know anything about it".

The St. Lawrence parks commission; what Minister is responsible for that? The Ontario Northland Railway, again no Minister, but an individual member; the racing commission; the St. Clair parkway commission, the hospital insurance — all these things, Mr. Speaker.

So if we are embarking on a new kind of policy, Mr. Speaker, then I think it should be made meaningful and we should get an explanation as to why this is going to happen. The Minister has given us an explanation but it is no real explanation at all on what has happened. It must be obvious to every person in the province of Ontario that the Niagara parks commission faces a crisis.

To overcome that crisis, we have a new bill. As my leader has said, we support that bill in principle but we are entitled to know why that crisis came about. We have six members of the Niagara parks commission who resigned, one of whom is a member of this House, and we have not heard one word of explanation from anybody as to why this crisis took place.

We all know Mr. Daley and we all know that he is an honest and an able gentleman and he gave forth certain views about what was going on and expressed opinions as to why he had disagreed and I think we are entitled to know whether the views that he put forward are correct or are not.

And it is no excuse, sir, it is no excuse to have this Minister stand up in his place today and say, "This is a part of general government policy." It is an excuse that rings hollow, just as he says it.

If the government is not prepared to explain and is prepared to hide behind the cloak that the Prime Minister used, private and confidential letters about matters of public concern, well—so be it. We cannot force them to explain, but the longer they refuse to explain, the more obvious it is that they have something to hide, and the more obvious it is that they are not prepared to take

this Legislature and the people of Ontario into their confidence about matters of public interest and about matters which concern the expenditure of public money.

I say, sir, crisis legislation such as this with the pallid explanation of this Minister, is quite useless and does not hide for one moment the government's record of refusing to disclose what goes on in the public interest.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the motion carries, there is one aspect of the comments of the leader of the Opposition that I might comment on. I was in the peninsula yesterday and I was discussing the future of the policy that was set out in this House in March, dealing with the escarpment. I told a group of people to whom I was speaking that it was the intention of the government to call in the regional development councils of the various areas through which the escarpment passes, to meet with the Cabinet committee on regional development which is presently functioning, in order that we could deal with such questions as the preservation of the beauty of the escarpment and the question of mining and the quarries in the escarpment and the question of utilization of agricultural land.

In other words, this is the first implementation of the policy that we set out in the House here some weeks ago and the first step that we will follow will be to discuss these broad questions of what we are to do with the Niagara escarpment with the various regional development councils that are functioning along the whole stretch of the escarpment, because it is a big area and involves a good many different jurisdictions reaching from Queenston to Manitoulin.

When you ask as to whether this would fall under the aegis of the Niagara parks commission, I rather doubt that it will, because the Niagara parks commission is concerned with the southern end of the escarpment. It certainly is not concerned with the portion of it that goes through Bruce county nor with the portion of it at Manitoulin Island, and we propose within the immediate future to bring together all the local authorities who will be interested.

I would not minimize for a second the magnitude of the task facing us in trying to deal with the Niagara escarpment because it involves a great many varying interests and it is not going to be an easy task. But that is the first step that we will take and I think I could, in answer to the question that was raised on this bill, say that I do not think that this will really fall under the authority of the Niagara parks commission, although the commission will undoubtedly be interested in the southern end of the escarpment.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister a question? Is he aware of the importance of involving the conservation authorities? I would say even before the development councils? These are the people who have the interest of the escarpment more closely in their realm of jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, of course, and this is exactly what I am referring to when I say that there are a great number of jurisdictions involved. It involves the regional development councils along the escarpment's whole length; it involves something like nine conservation authorities, I believe, that are concerned with various parts of the escarpment. These conservation authorities have not been working in any area of cooperation in the matter because each deals with its own portion.

Now we are going to refer this whole thing to the Cabinet committee on regional development. This is precisely why that committee was set up. This is—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now do not be so completely ridiculous. If I had not had my time cut off completely in your famous non-confidence motion the other day, I had quite a lengthy statement to make to the House concerning—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If you will go back and read my remarks in February, you will find I laid out very completely how far the organization of our plans for regional development have gone. I was aware at the time that nobody in the House was really paying any attention to what I was saying, but nonetheless, it is all there on the record, if you choose to read it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I have read it since and it is a little thin.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is the first comment I have heard except one that claimed we had not done anything. We really have done a very great deal.

Mr. Nixon: The government always plans to do things.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course, and this is where one starts.

Mr. MacDonald: You start every year, but you never get beyond the start.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: As long as this is the only criticism that I get from the other side, I always feel confident that we are doing the right thing.

So this is the way we propose to handle the question of the Niagara escarpment policy that we laid out in this House and I just say to you in reference to this bill that I very much doubt that it will be given to the Niagara parks commission to control the whole development of the Niagara escarpment.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SURROGATE COURTS ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill 85, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on this Bill 85, the object of this is to raise the salaries of some county court judges. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It does not cost the province a cent.

Mr. Singer: It does not cost the province a cent? That is good. Does this compensate for the complaints the Attorney General made a while ago about the new salary scale that they had in Ottawa which was doing some of our judges some harm?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think I made a complaint, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: Well, you were concerned.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I had some concern. The amendments in the Parliament at Ottawa with respect to judges' salaries provided that with respect to county and district judges across the land, their salaries would be raised by $5,000, from $16,000 to $21,000 and then the Act went on to say that in those provinces where judges were paid additional amounts by the provinces for extrajudicial services, that they would not get $2,000 of that $5,000.

In other words, this seemed to be—I would almost say—directly aimed at Ontario, or at least at the Ontario judges. They would get $19,000; they would not get the $2,000.

Then there was a saving provision—and I do not have the Act before me—that if they were receiving these payments under legislation or under an Act which was in existence by a certain date, if it went back to 1929 or something like that, they could qualify for the $2,000.

A great many of our county judges do surrogate court work and by simply qualifying the payment we make to them under The Surrogate Courts Act rather than under The County Courts Act, they qualify for that $2,000, which will then be paid to them by the federal government. It does not cost us a cent to do this and I think our judges are entitled to the same treatment as such judges in Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick, where for $21,000 I suggest they do much less work than most of the judges in Ontario.

Mr. Singer: I compliment the Attorney General on his ingenuity. I was sure that when he put his mind to it, the county court judges of Ontario were not going to suffer. By the time we finish adding it all up what is a county court judge in Ontario going to get and more particularly a county court judge in the county of York? Because as I read this bill I know all the county court judges in the county of York are surrogate court judges and I would be interested to know what the end figure is.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The judges in Ontario—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is this the committee of the whole House?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I am just wondering how far I should allow this particular question and answer period go but I will allow the Minister to answer this further question.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The judges in Ontario—county court judges, district court judges prior to the legislation in Ottawa a few weeks ago, received $16,000 as a federal payment for services. In Ontario by our Extrajudicial Services Act we paid them $3,500, so that they got $19,500. Now they will get the $21,000 from Ottawa and the $3,500—we are not changing our payments—they will get $24,500.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The seventh order; committee of the whole House; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

THE HOSPITAL SERVICES COMMISSION ACT

House in committee on Bill 69, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 69 reported.

THE HUMAN TISSUE ACT, 1962-1963

House in committee on Bill 75, An Act to amend The Human Tissue Act, 1962-1963.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 75 reported.

THE MUNICIPAL UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

House in committee on Bill 80, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

On section 1:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, the Minister will recall back in 1951 that I was party to the launching of unconditional grants when I was president of the Ontario mayors' association. The motivation at that time was to give equal grants to municipalities across the province with no strings to them—unconditional grants. The motivation at that time was equality, and somewhere along the line this has, as all things do, ended up with the metropolitan areas getting a large share of the moneys of this province.

The principle of government is the allocation of resources. The money comes in to this government from all over the province, and as we see in this bill it is distributed very unevenly. Toronto will end up with an amount of $7 per capita and the outlying parts of the province will receive—I have not checked the final figure here, but as low as possible—$4.50 per capita, a differential of $3.50 per capita.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): $2.50, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: $2.50, I am sorry; a difference of maybe 50 per cent, Mr. Chairman. Realizing that all parts of our province should have equal and just treatment, we have had the discrimination against the outlying parts of the province by the government insofar as rapid transit is concerned. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) have told this House that they would give like moneys of $3.50 per capita to all parts of the province for transportation, for rapid transit. This has not happened. This a complete case of having control of moneys and putting moneys where they will do you the most good, and this will reflect itself in the forthcoming election when the people of Ontario know that you are taking their money and spending it where the population is.

Mr. Chairman: I would remind the member—

Mr. Sargent: I am speaking on the allocation of this money, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Under the circumstances I should remind the member for Grey North that most of what he has said would properly come under the second reading when we are discussing the principle of the bill. Now we are discussing the bill, clause by clause, and we are dealing with the first clause.

Mr. Sargent: I object very strongly to the fact that you can take moneys from all over the province into the Treasury and you can distribute it as you see fit when the motivation at the outset was equality of unconditional grants to municipalities. The federation of mayors and municipalities does not go along with this at all. It does not know where you got the authority to change all this; and it is a matter of record, you can talk to the association. You seem to think you have the power to take money out of the Treasury and distribute it any way you see fit. When you can give the city of Toronto $7 per capita and give the outlying parts of the province $4.50, a loss of $2.50 per head, that will mean to us in Owen Sound $50,000 less on the same ratio than Toronto gets, and it will mean to Ottawa close to $1 million.

Mr. Chairman: I must remind the member that we are not dealing with the principle of the bill at this time.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand what you want. I am talking about the schedule as outlined in clause 1.

Mr. Chairman: I think the member was here and discussed this under second reading, did you not?

Mr. Sargent: I did not have a chance to, no.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, on the second reading of the bill, the House discussed this matter.

At the present time we are dealing merely with the clause by clause discussion and we should not be dealing with the principle of the bill at all.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking clause 1 of the schedule, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, but this would be in the form of repetition; things that should have been said when we were discussing the bill on the second reading.

Mr. Sargent: Would you rather we did not discuss this at this—

Mr. Chairman: These things were said and there was an opportunity at the second reading. This is not the time to say this, that is all I am saying.

Mr. Sargent: What do you want to do on this reading now?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): If you cannot talk about the figures what can you talk about?

Mr. Sargent: What shall we talk about?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Nothing.

Mr. Sargent: I think that is a wonderfully good idea, to have a silent prayer for the outlying parts of the province.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Yakabuski: Speaking for your party?

Mr. Sargent: You bet your boots I am. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has had 14 or 15 years to jockey these funds. I do not suggest that he does it himself, I think he is told —I will qualify that too, I do not believe, I do not know where you get the right, sir, to give outlying parts of the province 50 per cent less than the city of Toronto gets and I would like to hear from the Minister why he can do that.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): I would like to ask a question on the population figures in there. I notice under this schedule item 1, "to a metropolitan municipality or city". If the Metro area but not the city has over 200,000 population, would that step them up to a different category?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): That is correct.

Mr. Newman: That is right. Then in the city of Windsor the population of the suburbs would be added to the city's population to step them up into the $6 category.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh no, just a minute now. Do not get yourself all confused now. A metropolitan municipality must be so established as a municipality, and the only place where that occurs at the present time is in Metropolitan Toronto. There, the unconditional grant is on the basis of the metropolitan municipality or city having a population of 750,000 or more.

If there were to be established in the Windsor area a metropolitan corporation, then you would add all the population together and put it into that category. For instance, I can see some changes in municipal government in the Ottawa area that might involve all the population of the county of Carleton and the two cities, in which case then the total population would be counted and put into the proper category, instead of the category as now established for each individual municipality.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, as you look at the differential here, there are four million people living outside the city of Toronto and we are talking about four million people getting $10 million less than this area.

I want to qualify this in saying I spoke for my party. I have nothing whatsoever against Toronto getting all it can get in subways, or anything you have, but I submit that we should have like treatment for the rest of Ontario. You have given the city of Toronto as outlined by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) yesterday, a $15 million subsidy on its subway. The rest of the province cannot get that subsidy for subways.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well, you have no subways.

Mr. Sargent: I have nothing against subways at all.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Well, build a subway.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I agree that these fellows have got to stand up for Toronto. That is their job. My job is to look after my town too. But you lent the city of Toronto $20 million, unheard of before. You gave them $20 million outright capital gift for subways, and you give them a $15 million subsidy.

Mr. Chairman: All of this is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: All right, it is out of order, but it is part of the picture. I want to make my point very clear.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry. Unless the member stays with this clause by clause, I am going to ask him to take his seat.

Mr. Sargent: I am staying by clause 1 of the schedule. You are giving the rest of Ontario $10 million less than the city of Toronto is getting by this bill and you have no right to. When the people of Ontario know what you are doing, there is going to be back to pay.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to lodge a protest against this persistent attempt to play the people of different parts of the province off against one another. That is all this is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: We hear this time in and time out. I would merely like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that if you take the grant system of Ontario as a whole—I am not a supporter of it, but at least this can be said for it—in the overwhelming majority of cases, the rates are higher for the less populated areas, as they should be.

It should, however, be borne in mind, Mr. Chairman, that these great urban concentrations have some extremely difficult and expensive problems that less populated areas do not have to face. This unconditional grants programme is a recognition of that fact—in my opinion, a most inadequate recognition—but it does recognize that there are peculiar costs of government in the heavily populated centres that do not arise in less populated areas.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think it is regrettable that attempts should be constantly made to refer to Toronto as if it was getting some special privileges. It certainly is not. The fact that Toronto gets an inadequate subsidy for a subway is in my opinion a most ridiculous issue to bring to this House. If Owen Sound wants to build a subway, I am sure they will get a grant for it, the same sort of an inadequate grant as Toronto gets. But we have to face the fact that this great concentration on the western end of Lake Ontario does have special problems that have to be recognized. This Act, I may say, is a most inadequate recognition of those problems, but it is at least a recognition.

Mr. Chairman: Now get back to the vote, clause by clause, please.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something here. I spoke about this on second reading and I want to emphasize that I think this is discrimination. I have nothing against the city of Toronto and my friend from Grey North has nothing against this great city of Toronto at all.

Mr. Bryden: Just against us getting any money.

Mr. Whicher: We have nothing against it. We are happy to see this great city, one of the greatest cities on the North American continent, one of the greatest cities in the whole world, as a matter of fact and you—

Mr. Bryden: But you want to kill it by attrition.

Mr. Whicher: We do not want to kill it. What we want to do is to have equal rights for our people that we represent in the province of Ontario, that is all.

Now then, my hon. friend from Woodbine said that if they want a subway in Owen Sound, he was sure that the government would subsidize them. Well what ridiculous nonsense. We do not want any subways in Owen Sound. What we want—

Mr. Bryden: What are you complaining about?

Mr. Whicher: What we want are schools and hospitals and roads and sidewalks, that is what we want, and we cannot afford them.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I must ask the members please if they will stay with this clause by clause. We have dealt with the principle of the bill. We have heard this previously, I think by the same member, and also by the member for Grey North. Let us stay with the clause-by-clause discussion and not get into the principle of the bill, please.

Mr. Whicher: I just want to emphasize this, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): The principle has been established. The bill has had second reading. We are now in the clause-by-clause discussion, House in committee of the whole—

Mr. Whicher: Well I am talking about the—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member knows the rules of the House.

Mr. Whicher: I am talking about the schedule which is in clause 1.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, what is your amendment?

Mr. Singer: He does not have to move an amendment. He can talk about it without moving an amendment.

Mr. Whicher: The schedule should be—Mr. Chairman it has been correctly stated that in so-called rural Ontario we get substantially higher grants than Metropolitan Toronto. But the schedule and percentage of rates were formulated many years ago, long before The Unconditional Grants Act came into being. It was established that for our schools we would get a percentage and this has been going on for the last 50 years. But The Unconditional Grants Act has been in effect for probably not more than 15 years. So all these percentages had happened long before this Act came into being.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Not so.

Mr. Whicher: Yes, that is true.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not to the degree they are in effect now.

Mr. Whicher: The same percentage. Exactly the same percentage.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The formula has been changed year in and year out.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Whicher: Well, in any event, we need this money in rural Ontario, in the small towns and villages. The city of Toronto needs it and I agree with the hon. member for Woodbine they should get more, but the fact is that we want equal treatment. I cannot understand the rural members of the Conservative Party who sit on their haunches and will not stand up and fight for their rural people.

We need sidewalks just as much as you do in this great city of Toronto. We need roads to travel on. We need hospitals, and Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have not got sidewalks on my street.

Mr. Whicher: You are getting them. You cannot afford a $31 million city hall but you have got one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Whicher: May I respectfully point out the great assessment that you have—for example, the great new Toronto-Dominion tower. We help finance that thing too, you know.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We are paying for schools up in your area.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: We help finance it. You are not the only people with money in this country, you know, and we have money in the Toronto-Dominion bank too. But you get all the assessment. And that assessment goes to build your schools and your hospitals—

An hon. member: And your schools.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: We have not got any of that money. And if you do not believe me, check the assessment rates, check the mill rates all across the province of Ontario. As far as mill rates are concerned you will find that the great huge municipality is one of the lowest in the whole province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: Now I will tell you that in one municipality in the province of Ontario the mill rate is going up 40 mills. The mill rate in Wiarton that I have the honour to come from, this year is going up 17 mills for education alone.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Whicher: Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I must ask the members to stay with clause 1 of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We will wait to hear what the member for Downsview has to say about which has the lowest mill rate.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Whicher: It is too high. It has gone up.

Mr. Singer: You are right. It is far too high.

Mr. Whicher: Far too high. You should get more. But it is not as high as in other areas of this province.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): How high is high?

Mr. Whicher: Now Mr. Chairman, I just ask one thing. We all have got many friends among the Conservative rural members. Let us see you stand up and fight for your people just for once. Do not let this government

kick you little fellows around, stand up and let them know who is boss. Do you not need the money down there in Chatham? How about in Dunnville? Do not they need the money there?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Whicher: How about in Carleton county? Stand up and fight for once and do not let these fellows—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member to stay with the discussion. Clause number one of this bill, please.

Mr. Sargent: On the first section, section 1, and in the schedule, it is subsection 1, "To a metropolitan municipality or a city." And then subsection 2, "to a town or village." Now, the Minister of Municipal Affairs will remember, at the inception, when we set this up, he was a member of the executive that set this up along with the then Prime Minister, Mr. Frost. And he will recall that the reason for this was that every grant a municipality was getting or is getting now had strings to it. There were conditional grants, that the municipality had to spend so much money to get so much in grants, but there were big inequities.

The municipalities were losing their autonomy and they had control over only 15 cents on the dollar at that time. What they have control over now, the Minister knows, is probably less than that. So the amount set at that time was $2.50 per head and this has climbed progressively now to $7 per capita. But as the member for Bruce says, the assessment base in these outlying places is on a ratio of industrial as low as 10 per cent in that field to 90 per cent residential. So we have great inequities.

The Minister knows that. The Minister can tell you the industrial base for Toronto is possibly on a 50/50 basis for industrial assessment against residential. And therefore—I think this pretty true, 50/50—for anyone to get up and say that the need is not there in the smaller places and that they give him equal treatment, is very wrong. I suggest that clause 1—I do not know how you go about this, but to get some intelligent debate on this thing as far as it affects people is concerned, we should change subsection 1(a) of clause 1 where it says "Toronto, from $7 per capita"—well, leave that as it is, but change subsection 2(a) to $7 on the same basis as it is in Toronto. I do not know if it is worthwhile wasting the time of the House but I would like to make a motion to that effect.

Mr. Bryden: The member cannot make it, it is out of order.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It is an amendment.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I do not know, I think it is a lesson in futility for the members representing rural Ontario to be sitting here going along like a bunch of puppets on a string, voting for this, is wrong.

Mr. Chairman: I will have to advise the member that he would not be able to make an amendment to that effect.

Mr. Sargent: I appreciate that, I am sorry.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned a while ago that the city of Ottawa or the metropolitan area of Ottawa would eventually be entitled to this higher grant in section (b). Now, I wonder, is it too much to ask the Minister whether it is necessary to wait until this metropolitan government is set up? The problems exist, the area is there, the population is well over 400,000 in the Ottawa area. They have all the same problems. I wonder whether it would not be appropriate at this time to consider the city of Ottawa as eligible to be in category (b).

Hon. Mr. Spooner: If that is the member's question, the answer is "no."

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may—and if I am out of order I would ask you to so indicate—the manner in which these grants are allocated under this Act is based on certain municipal requirements. If you will go back to —your year, the year 1951 is not correct, the unconditional grants began quite some years later than that—the preamble to this bill indicated what these unconditional grants were supposed to cover at the municipal level. Now, some years later, because of the advent of the Ontario hospital services insurance scheme, certain references with regard—

Mr. Sargent: Could the Minister tell us the year they did start?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I think it was 1956.

Mr. Sargent: I think the Minister is wrong, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am not going to argue that; it is not relevant to the discussion.

Mr. Sargent: Why did the Minister say it then?

Mr. MacDonald: In answer to your irrelevant question.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: In answer to your relevant question, yes. Another amendment was made to the preamble to the Act some years later so that municipalities would not be restricted in the allocation of these funds. The schedule as set out in the Act since its inception was based on very thorough research undertaken by officials of The Department of Municipal Affairs and The Provincial Treasurer's Department, which indicated quite clearly, as has been supported by the member for Woodbine this morning, that the larger communities had greater expenditures in connection with certain social welfare costs and other allied costs.

Mr. Sargent: This was the Minister's idea.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Now, just a minute, it was not my idea, I just got through the same sentence, telling the member that there had been considerable—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Give up.

Mr. Sargent: I want to set him straight.

Mr. Chairman: That is no point of order.

Mr. Sargent: He is saying things that are not correct.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, he is wrong in his statement.

Mr. Chairman: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister knows I do not want to bring myself into this act, but I was president of the Ontario mayors at this time and we met with Bob Saunders, Hiram MacCallum and with the government, and we put through an unconditional grant system study at $2.50 and the motivation was for equality. And it has been changed, Mr. Chairman, it was changed by the government, not by the mayors of the municipalities. We started the motivation, I was president, we put this thing through—

Mr. Chairman: What you have to do is state your point of order.

Mr. Singer: He has made his point of order.

Mr. Chairman: No, the member has interrupted the Minister and stood in his place on a point of order. I would ask him now to state his point of order and sit down.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: This is really entertaining, Mr. Chairman, but we are not making much progress.

As a result of some further research and study in this very matter, I, as the Minister responsible for this piece of legislation, consulted with my colleagues in the Cabinet and came to the conclusion that instead of increasing the amount of the unconditional grants on a percentage basis, after I had been able to obtain an allocation of some $12 million from the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), that research proved the point that at this time an increase in the unconditional grants should not be on a percentage basis but should be on an across-the-board basis across the province.

Mr. Bryden: The smaller municipalities get the better deal.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: So that the smaller municipalities which have been improving their social welfare services and other services that are not completely covered by provincial grants would be able to gain some considerable revenue. This means that the municipalities in the county of Grey, for the sake of argument, are going to lay hands on almost $95,000. I suggest to you some of the municipalities did not think they were going to get another dime out of the unconditional grants this year.

Mr. Sargent: Oh! How can the Minister say that?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh! Just a minute, there are some of these municipalities who have already set their budgets and they paid no attention to the statement that had been made in the Throne Speech by the Prime Minister that there would be an increase in this.

Mr. Sargent: What is the Minister talking about?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I cannot hear the member while I am speaking so he can be quiet like a good fellow.

Mr. Sargent: I do not have to be quiet.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, yes, you must refrain from interjections.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The city of Ottawa will receive an extra $432,000 this year out of this increase of unconditional grants. Now, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that as far as

the principle of the bill is concerned, that has been established for many years. Insofar as the authority that you say I have taken away from somebody—I do not know what you are talking about, but the authority is here in the confines of this Legislature. That is why the bill is here this morning in the committee of the whole House and in due course of time, you will be asked to vote the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs which provide the funds to pay to these municipalities.

Mr. Chairman: On section 1 of the bill.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the Minister made a very interesting observation there. He was criticizing, as I understood him, municipalities that had fixed their tax rates without bearing in mind some phrase that was in the Speech from the Throne. Could the Minister tell us how, if he was a municipal budgeter, he could take some quite innocuous phrase—and I have been quickly looking for it—I have read that speech several times and I listened to it when it was recently delivered. Certainly it did not come through loud and clear to me that there was going to be any increase—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It has come through loud and clear from me, I can tell you that!

Mr. Singer: Well, all right. Then let the Minister tell me—and he is a man with great municipal experience—if he were budgeting today in the city of Timmins, he could take this Speech from the Throne and budget on the basis of it.

An hon. member: Budget speech!

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the members if they would stay by the clause by clause discussion of the bill. I know that the member for Downsview realizes now that we are in committee dealing with a clause of the bill. I feel that the members want the information from the Minister dealing with the principle of the bill, but I do not think that we should continue on the principle of the bill.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, the Minister introduced this subject and he said that there was something in the Speech from the Throne that would allow municipal budgeting to be rearranged, and I want him to tell me how he would have done it if he—

Mr. Chairman: I am suggesting that this is out of order, and because it was out of order there, it does not make it in order now. I am now going to ask you to stay with the principle, the clause before us now.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 80 reported.

TOWNSHIP OF CORNWALL

House in committee on Bill 81, An Act respecting the township of Cornwall.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule included in section 6, agreed to.

Bill 81 reported.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The third order: resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am particularly happy to begin my speech by complementing you upon the outstanding job you have done and continue to do as Speaker of this House. Your sense of fair play and dispassionate execution of the rules governing this House are something that I view with great admiration. The dignity and human warmth you bring to your office reflects great credit upon all members through our association with you.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to represent the historic county of Carleton, whose people I regard as an attractive cross-section of the average Ontario county. We have the farmers who make their living in the lovely Ottawa valley. We have many people who make their living in our fine federal civil service. We have a large number of small businessmen and professional people in the rapidly expanding suburban areas of the city

of Ottawa, which includes the great township of Nepean and Carleton county. We have many industrial workers in numerous industries that are growing by leaps and bounds.

The citizens of my riding are good citizens of Ontario and good Canadians whom I am proud to represent in this Legislature. In fact, I think of them as the "cream of the crop".

As the member for Carleton, I have a keen interest in the question of regional government. One of the first special area studies in this field covered the Ottawa, Eastview and Carleton county area. Popularly known as the "Jones report", the study was launched to determine possible changes in the functions and responsibilities at the local and regional government levels. We all know there is widespread agreement at the municipal level that periodic annexations and year-to-year special service agreements between neighbouring municipalities are no longer satisfactory. Such arrangements do not answer the needs of development nor do they offer the most effective methods of meeting the ever-mounting demands from the public for services.

As our Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) pointed out, the success of our regional development programme hinges on the question of regional government. As he said, "Although regional government and regional economic development are separate compartments in Ontario's design for development, they are closely interrelated." It is a case of one not being able to succeed without the other.

Following the government's receipt of the Ottawa area study, the recommendations of the commissioners, and most importantly, the various briefs submitted to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), the final report is distributed to municipal councils, other local authorities and interested organizations and individuals. As a result, I am happy to report that on the evening of February 1, this government's proposals for the Ottawa area were unveiled in the national capital by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Some 300 community leaders were in attendance and gave the government plan a generally favourable reception.

The plan for the Ottawa area study calls for a two-level municipal structure in which municipalities would keep their present councils and municipal boundaries, but would transfer much of their power to a central or regional body of government. Although an allocation or representation has been proposed, I believe the municipalities themselves can best arrange this with regard to a fair system of representation. The plan is similar in a basic sense to the Metropolitan Toronto formula, but has a new and very important difference. It is called "differential taxation".

This new concept would prevent citizens of rural municipalities from paying heavy taxes for services which they do not need. As the Minister said, "Many of the municipalities in the proposed regional government are agricultural areas which neither need nor desire certain costly urban services." Put simply, different tax rates would be struck for built-up rural areas to reflect the fact that certain services are not available, or required, in largely undeveloped townships.

Differential taxation is a unique method of fairly uniting areas as different as the city of Ottawa, with 300,000 people, and Marlborough township with 1,000 people, under one political roof. Assuming the success of this new approach it could be adapted to other regional government areas in the province.

The proposed Ottawa area regional council would be responsible for building and maintaining all major roads and have the power to control access and land use along such roads. Local streets and bridges would remain with existing municipalities. The regional council would control welfare services, as well as administration of justice, supply of water and major sewage works.

A major responsibility for the regional council would be the all-important task of preparing a comprehensive land use and development policy for the entire regional area. As proposed, the council would establish uniform assessment for taxation. Special attention would be paid to the problem of large tracts of property held by the federal and provincial governments in the district. There is little doubt that a regional government would be in a better position to negotiate with the federal authorities for higher grants in lieu of taxes.

The regional council would have sole authority to borrow money on debenture for capital projects, whether regional or local. At the same time, provision would be made for protection of local municipalities which objected to construction priorities set by the senior council.

This brief outline will indicate to you the imaginative and yet practical approach being taken by this government in the complex field of regional government. I would add that this government has no intention of forcing acceptance of regional government on our

municipalities. The government will do everything in its power to encourage a cooperative attitude and will treat every regional area as an individual case that will require individual solutions.

Before moving on to other topics, I would add that as a member of this government, I am particularly proud of The Department of Municipal Affairs' progressive and practical proposal for the Ottawa area.

I am sure they will prove to be a rewarding stepping-stone to municipal progress in my riding of Carleton and its neighbouring municipalities.

I want to take this opportunity to commend our new Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) on his first Budget of February 14. It is a Budget we can all take pride in for its good sense, sound policies, and stimulating economic effects.

One particular aspect of the Budget interested me greatly, although it did not receive much attention at the time of its presentation. It concerns the province's net capital debt. At March 31 this year, it will be $1,429 million, only $49 million higher than the same date a year ago. However, the important fact is that today only 10 months' revenue would be needed to retire this debt. Eight years ago it would have taken 17 months to retire it. This I should say to the hon. members must show progress in the way our province is being handled from a financial point of view.

That fact is a significant reflection of this government's success in stimulating the Ontario economy to the highest point in the province's history.

Another topic I wish to mention briefly is the incidence of rabies. My home county of Carleton, along with York county, are the two most rabies-infected districts in the province. You will recall that recently a young girl from Carleton county died of rabies infection.

Fortunately, I can report to my constituents that The Ontario Department of Health and The Department of Lands and Forests are conducting a vigorous and continuous campaign against this scourge. In addition, as the member for Carleton, I am personally pressing The Department of Lands and Forests for an increased bounty on foxes, which are prime carriers of the disease.

As a farmer and a representative of many farm constituents, I would be remiss if I did not refer to some of the current agricultural problems. I am deeply concerned that Ontario farmers have not shared as fully as they should have in the prosperity of recent years. At the same time, I realize that in this regard, Ontario farmers are in the same position as farmers in other provinces, and in other countries as well.

One of the basic problems is that the food production industry is not limited to the provincial horizon. Not even national boundaries restrict the horizon in the business of food production. We seek to provide programmes to provide our efficient farmers with a good standard of living and a fair return on their investment. At the same time, we are conscious of the limitations on our efforts because of the interprovincial and even international nature of the situation.

In Ontario we provide marketing legislation designed to ensure the producer control over the marketing of his product and the best possible price for it. However, we are immediately faced with the fact that such legislation is limited to our own provincial boundaries. It is frustrating to say the least, to a commodity marketing board which stabilizes prices, only to find the same commodity flowing in from other provinces to take advantage of the stronger price in the province with the marketing board authority.

I feel strongly that if producers are not to destroy each other, there must be either coordinated marketing plans among the provinces or a national marketing commission to deal with these highly complex problems.

Ten million dollars has been included in the estimates for capital grants for Ontario farmers. The programme will involve a total of $129 million, spread over a 12-year period. This extended period was set so that farmers will not be forced to make hasty decisions on how best to use the funds available.

These grants will be available for farm drainage, erection or renovation of farm buildings, paving barnyards, liquid manure, storage tanks, grading, packing and storage buildings, greenhouses, silos, grain storage and milk houses. Grants are to be paid up to $1,000 per farmer, based on a third of the cost of any one or any combination of the items listed above. The Minister stressed the fact that, with the addition of this latest programme, every farmer in the province is eligible for a total of $2,500 in capital grants.

Solutions must be reached in situations such as this if our farmers are to have their fair share of the good life provided so abundantly to many of our citizens. I heartily endorse the statement of our Minister of Agriculture

and Food (Mr. Stewart) when he said, and I quote:

> It should be the business of government to provide the authority which farmers can use to improve their economic position.

I would also like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture and Food on the recent programmes introduced in this province. I do not care to take the time of this House to go into detail, in view of the fact that a day or so ago, perhaps it was a couple of weeks ago, these programmes were dealt with adequately by the hon. member for Middlesex South (Mr. Olde) and also in the resolutions presented to the House by the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hamilton). I refer, of course, to our ARDA projects, increased drainage grants, the field enlargement programme, the Ontario food council which was established, the importance of the consumer section of this council, and lastly and most important, the capital grants for Ontario farmers.

I would like also to congratulate the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) on the highly efficient manner in which he conducted himself during consideration of his estimates. His great knowledge of the department in the short time in office suggests he is well equipped for the ever increasing growth of a department, so demanding and so important. Personally, I would like to congratulate him on the announcement that the Ottawa Queensway will be extended for five miles westerly during 1967-68.

In closing I want to draw the attention of this government to the problems faced by the Ottawa transportation commission. The commission pays sizeable taxes through deisel and vehicle taxes to support provincial highways which it does not use. An efficient public transit system for our growing national capital is essential, just as essential as it is in the case of the Toronto subway system which has received a large amount of provincial financial assistance.

Ottawa's public transist system has been totally supported since 1958 by its own passengers. However, expansion and improvement of the system to meet increasing demands requires additional money if fares are not to be raised to an impractical level. I strongly suggest that this government give urgent attention to the possibility of some form of subsidy to public transit in Ottawa.

I am sure the Ottawa city council would be quite ready to agree that "What is good enough for Toronto is good enough for Ottawa." Admittedly, the assistance to the Toronto subway was for construction, but in the case of a system dependent on buses, assistance toward the purchase of new buses meets the same principle.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question?

I wondered if the member had given any consideration to the fact that the federal government could take care of that? You know those French sittings in the B-and-B commission, which has gone out the window?

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I want to add my personal approval of all the congratulatory statements that have been said about your conduct of business in this Legislature. I am sure that you have been conscientious, diligent, fair and ever endeavouring to do your very best to carry out the very important duties. I also want to congratulate the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) for the efficient way in which he has conducted his duties as Chairman. He certainly has shown a great deal of patience and devotion to duty as well.

I want to briefly refer to the very fine Budget speech that was given by our Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) on February 14. I had underlined the same remarks the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Johnston) had made in regard to the fact that when our present Provincial Treasurer assumed office it would have required only 10 months' revenue to retire our debt, whereas when the previous Provincial Treasurer assumed office, it would have required 17 months' revenue.

I think that that statement is most important, because for years I can remember Opposition speakers criticizing the fact that the provincial debt was ever increasing, without taking into account the fact that our revenues were increasing at the same time, so that the relative position of our finances was not simply a matter of a sum of money, but rather the relationship that that money had to the income of this province.

Even though the debt was being criticized, we also noticed through the years that whenever any expenditure in the Budget showed a decrease from the previous year, they were inclined to be somewhat critical of it. So I do not see how one viewpoint can be reconciled with the other, since we get proposals for many things the government should do, and yet at the same time, criticism for the debt rising; yet certainly there was criticism when sales tax was introduced and

just how the various viewpoints can be reconciled, is very difficult, indeed, to arrive at.

I want to commend the Provincial Treasurer when he states that a great part of our over-expenditure this year, the main part, is an investment in the welfare of our people in the years to come. Certainly education and many of the things that are being provided must be regarded as an investment because it is manifestly unfair that the people living here today should pay beyond their means for the benefit of the future.

Consequently, by a combination of judicious use of the revenues we have, plus conservative borrowing in relation to our capacity to borrow on our native investments and our capacity to repay, I do feel that the government is on the right course and that the very rigid attitude, sir, of balancing one with the other is the only effective way in which this province can prosper.

I would like to refer briefly to agriculture. I believe that last year our hon. Minister (Mr. Stewart) took the right attitude in regard to milk subsidies, since, as our previous speaker has so capably pointed out, it is impossible for a provincial government to control the price of products entering this province either from foreign countries or from sister provinces. Consequently, I would say that as far as subsidies are concerned in agricultural products, they are strictly under the jurisdiction of the federal government, and the federal government alone.

Our Minister has gone out, along with his department, in an effort to try to help people to help themselves and we believe that that is the proper way. You give a man a fish, you many feed him for one day, but if you teach him how to fish, he can perhaps support himself for many years to come. We, on this side of the House, I believe, are committed to that policy of helping people to help themselves. Certainly hand-outs only encourage people to ask for more.

Again we do hear criticism about agricultural policy, but in regard to the milk situation, and we turn to it briefly, our local farmers at the present time to appreciate the stand that has been taken by the Ontario government and I can assure you that I have not heard one farmer suggest that it is Ontario's duty to contribute subsidies in that regard. They are all of one accord, and in agreement, that this is a federal matter.

I know that in my own riding of Prince Edward-Lennox, are people who have suffered droughts for three years in a row. Some two years ago they greatly appreciated the assistance that was given in regard to the purchase of feed, and last year they appreciated the very generous loan policy that was adopted to enable them to carry on and to continue their operations.

Likewise, many farmers have appreciated the opportunity to retrain and, all in all, I agree with the previous speaker that they will appreciate the capital loans that are going to be made available, the new system of testing milk and certainly, I feel sure, that they are quite well pleased on the whole, with the efforts being made by The Department of Agriculture and Food under our most capable Minister.

I would point out one thing, that while we hear all the criticisms of our Department of Agriculture and Food, at the Ontario stock markets here in Toronto we have one of the greatest livestock markets on the continent, if not the greatest. I observed this from time to time, but a few months ago—for example, the date was actually January 30, and this situation runs fairly constant—on the Toronto livestock market choice steers sold from $28 to $29.80. At Montreal, they sold for $28 to $29 that same day. But in Montreal they received 421 cattle and in Toronto they received 1,930 cattle. In Chicago, steers sold for $26.25 to $26.75—almost $2 a hundred less. In Buffalo, steers sold for $26.50.

Choice heifers sold for $26 to $27.50 on the Toronto market, whereas on the Montreal market, they sold from $23 to $25.75; in Chicago, the price was $25.50 to $25.75 and in Buffalo, there were no choice heifers offered.

Now here is a very interesting thing. In regard to hogs—which are an old source of contention as it was thought that such a bad job was being done selling them, but here in Toronto on the aforementioned date, hogs sold from $32.60 to $33.35, whereas in Chicago, they sold from $20.75 to $21.25 and from $20.25 to $21 in Buffalo. There were no hogs offered on the Montreal market on that day. I presume the price there would have been competitive with Toronto.

I believe that this is something of which the farmers who are engaged in the production of livestock, have reason to be proud, and that is in the Ontario stockyards and the efficient way in which they are managed and the efforts made to carry out their operations as fairly as possible. I do know, that in regard to lambs, there are times when, as a specialized product, the price is better in Montreal than it is in Toronto, but I can assure you

that in bringing my lambs to the Toronto market, I have been impressed by the efficiency of the whole operation.

I refer to another matter in regard to agriculture, and would say that the farmers at the present time are having to do a lot more book work than was previously the case. They have to carry workmen's compensation for their farm labourers, and I think that is a very good thing, both for the protection of the labourer and for the farmer. I do not feel that they can afford to be without that protection. In fact, many farmers did carry it with private carriers before last year when it became compulsory under The Workmen's Compensation Act revisions.

Now, of course, they are required to make deductions for the Canada pension plan which, likewise, is a very good thing. I do not object to that, because I think that it is well worthwhile and I think it is quite proper that they should do so. However, in regard to income tax, many farmers engaged in the production of fruits and vegetables and various commodities hire a lot of part-time help whenever they can get it and I do know that sometimes this helps. It works simply to accommodate the farmers to prevent their crops from spoilage and while it is true these part-time workers accept wages and are pleased to receive them, the federal government has now made it compulsory that T-4 slips be filed for income tax purposes for all of these people who receive $25 or more. While it is right in principle, I am concerned that many of these people who did without holidays and helped the farmers rather than go fishing, or something of that kind, will now feel that the few dollars they make doing that work are going to put them into a higher income tax bracket, and they will go fishing instead.

I feel that some consideration should be given in that regard, because it may make things very difficult for some of our farm people to operate without this part-time help that they were able to obtain in the past.

By the same token, with regard to unemployment insurance, I think that is very good for the part-time farm workers who go from one job to another, but there are other people who have a steady job in agriculture and who are very good workers—excellent employees—and who would never be without a job, unless they were ill or injured. In which case, they would be taken care of in another way. As far as they are presently concerned, I feel that those people should have a choice as to whether they want unemployment insurance or not. I would hope that our friends on the other side of the House would use their good offices in Ottawa to try and bring these things to the government's attention so that if they can devise a means whereby they can ease the situation for the farmer to a degree, I know that the people who engage in agriculture would appreciate this very much.

I want briefly to mention highways. As you may have heard, later this summer—we do not have a definite date, but we are assured it will happen this summer—that great new bridge, the Quinte skyway, between Prince Edward county and Hastings county across the bay of Quinte and near Deseronto, will be completed and opened for traffic. This is the most historic achievement of the area because I read a clipping from a paper provided to me by Mr. Clayton Metcalfe of Deseronto, an old Deseronto *Post*, which stated back in the 1890's that prosperity would not come to that area until a bridge was constructed between Hastings and Prince Edward.

I know that my good friend, the hon. member for Hastings East (Mr. Rollins) and I were respective wardens of Hastings and Prince Edward counties in 1950, and we carried on efforts at that time to have a causeway built. Through the years efforts were made and studies were made, but a causeway proved to be impractical because we did not have federal government support. The demands for the swing span were about twice the size of the one that is at Belleville—and the boats had to go through a narrower channel still before reaching Belleville. The demands they made were absolutely unreasonable. So finally, during the time when the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Cass) was Minister of Highways the construction of this great bridge was agreed to and plans were formulated from there on. It has taken a long time to accomplish this but I do feel that with the great growth coming to our area this will be a wonderful benefit to industry, tourism and in many other respects.

I know that in Prince Edward county there is a great appreciation of our improved highway and the development roads that have been built. And I feel, all in all, that a great many of our rural areas have no quarrel with subsidies or help that Toronto is receiving in regard to the subway and so on, in regard to additional per capita grants, because they themselves have received a great deal. I can well remember when the former member for Bellwoods, a Labour Progressive member,

argued that since there were more motorists in Toronto than any place else, the far larger percentage of highway revenue should be spent on Toronto streets. So I think the whole picture has to be looked at from an all-inclusive point of view rather than just piecemeal.

I would say that along Highway 33, when you proceed through Picton and into Lennox and Addington county, you have one of the finest drives there is any place. We are very proud of the Adolphustown historical park and we are pleased that secondary Highway 133 was constructed north to help relieve the traffic and that this year eight miles of Highway 33 is going to be resurfaced.

We are also pleased that the traffic and planning studies division is considering what can be done to improve conditions and plans for the future. Also, the Lennox-Addington county roads committee and county engineer are giving a great deal of study to what is going on in that particular area.

We have a huge plant in the CIL terylene plant. We have a Canadian Liquifuels depot. The federal government plans a new federal penitentiary near Bath and already traffic congestion in that area going toward Kingston is certainly something to cope with.

I might say that I would like to quote briefly in that regard from an article which appeared in the *Whig-Standard* written by Don Boswell, who is a reporter living in Odessa, in my riding. He says:

> After a "sleep" of over a century, the township suddenly sprang to life in 1952 when Imperial Chemical Industries of Canada Ltd., (now CIL) acquired 1,500 acres of land near Millhaven for an industrial plant. More than 1,000 persons, many of them township residents, are employed there today.
>
> Population of the township has more than doubled since the plant located here. In 1951 the population was 3,200, compared with more than 6,700 at present.
>
> Over the years the population has fluctuated greatly. The first Canadian census in 1871 showed 4,233 persons, whereas 70 years later in 1941 only about 2,750 persons resided in the township.
>
> Communities such as Millhaven, Morven, Wilton, Violet and Switzerville have remained fairly constant in population. Biggest result of the increase is Amherstview subdivision. In the past 12 years since the first homes were built there, the subdivision now has 2,000 residents. This is expected to increase to 5,000 in the next 10 years.
>
> Odessa, presently plagued by water problems and a restriction on building, has about 1,000 inhabitants.

I bring this to the attention of The Department of Highways because I do feel that a lot of these people travel to work. They travel into Kingston, and a great deal of consideration needs to be given to try and bring about adequate planning to take care of the present heavy traffic and the heavy traffic that is certain to come in the future.

By the same token, in the Prince Edward section of my riding, at Belleville there is the Belleville Bay bridge, which was built many years ago. It has been improved considerably, a lot of money has been spent for repairs, and certainly it has served a great need for our people. However, with increased boat and vehicular traffic, there are great traffic holdups and these are going to continue in the future, they are bound to increase. At this time, Belleville is planning an overpass over the CPR railway crossing and I am sure that The Department of Highways, which is assisting them in these costs, will give consideration and look to the future to see to it that whatever is done is done in a way that will join up with the new high-level bridge, will come in the fullness of time.

I believe the Minister has looked into this and I know he will see that his engineers do keep this in mind in regard to the future developments which will come.

Certainly we do not expect it to be done overnight because we know that the other high-level bridge took 17 years and even longer than that. We do know that in something of this kind alternate routes have to be considered and also permission from the federal government has to be obtained. There has to be justification, but in my own mind I am confident that both boat and automobile traffic will increase and that the time is not too far distant when an improved structure will be required.

Going back to Highway 33 again in Lennox and Addington county; in that area, people from Kingston and others have suggested more parks. But as I have said, we have highway needs and we do have an attractive area and whatever is done or planned should be done in a way to protect the interests of the people who are already there, and to see that a highway which has been paid for by the gasoline tax dollar is not taken away from the people who have paid for this highway.

One of my constituents, Dr. H. C. Burleigh, from Bath, has made a very interesting suggestion and this has been sent to the parks integration board for their consideration and I understand they are investigating the suggestion. Speaking of Barrel Cove, he says the area in question has many admirable attributes—parklands, nature trails, bird and animal sequestered sanctuaries, boating and above all, the site of the home of the first woman to own land in this broad province of Ontario.

If you should have any interest in this proposed site, you have but to travel the old Bath road until you reach the bridge at Parrott's Bay. As you stand on the bridge, which, by the way, is too low to allow free boating to and fro, to the south is Parrott's Bay and the Bay of Quinte. To the north a channel curves gently for a quarter mile where it enlarges into a small lake.

This last, a half-mile in length and a quarter-mile in width, is fed by small streams at its eastern and western ends. Its shores are well wooded with both deciduous and coniferous trees. Three hundred years ago, when the white man came, its waters must have been clear and free of growth. At present, however, after almost two centuries of cultivation in this area, this lake has slowly become filled with debris. Its shallows are being invaded by marsh grasses and cat-tails, although a large part of the lake is still clear of any growth. Here and there along its shores are ruins of early settlements. In our time it is completely isolated from the main current of human activities.

Only wildlife use this quiet spot as the sun's first rays break over the woods to the east. Indeed, I know no spot in this part of Ontario which is more isolated and more adapted to ready use as a quiet spot in the midst of this community's rapid growth.

What makes this spot even more desirable as a memorial is the fact that it was almost three centuries ago, a part of a seigneury granted by La Salle to Mademoiselle Magdalen de Roybon d'Allone. This seigneury stretched six leagues—two miles—westward to Toneguignon River—Collins Creek—in the direction of l'Anse au Baril—Barrel Cove. Thus its western limit lay to the west of Parrott's Bay and the little lake beyond the bridge must have been known as Barrel Cove.

Artifacts which have been recently discovered tend to confirm that our lady's home was located at this quiet spot. As the tale is told, our lady was captured here in 1687, her home, stock and buildings were burned, and she was carried off a captive. This story has been told in the *Mid American* magazine in its copy of September, 1948, as well as *Historic Kingston*, 1965, the annual publication of the Kingston historic society.

It is my sincere hope that I have interested you in a desire to make every effort to preserve this little lake and its shoreline before it has been engulfed by the rapidly approaching subdivisions. Its preservation would serve so many purposes—a quiet spot within a very short distance from a busy road, a game preserve, a part of a nature trail following the low-lying area to the south and west of Westbrook and along Collins Creek to the bay at that village, as well as a memorial to Ontario's first female landowner. A very particular appeal should go out to the ladies of the area with the suggestion that they take this opportunity to honour this brave and intrepid woman.

Certainly I am in support of that suggestion and I do want to say that indeed we in Prince Edward-Lennox have had a very great history. Perhaps you might be interested in a clipping from the Napanee *Beaver* which is headed "1867 politics: They Meant Business in Those Days".

> The first election after Confederation in 1867, just 100 years ago was a hard fought one, certainly in Lennox and Addington county, which itself had just come into existence three years before. At any rate, it was bitterly fought by Napanee's newspapers, the *Express* and the *Standard*.
>
> A copy of the Napanee *Standard* from the collection of the Lennox and Addington county historical society, dated August 22, 1867, reports on the nomination of Richard Cartwright and John T. Grange in Lennox and the nominations for the Legislature as well, with B. C. Davy, Mr. Casey and John Stevenson being the contestants.
>
> A small paragraph noted that in Kingston, Maxell W. Strange and J. Stuart were the combatants for the local Legislature. Mr. John A. Macdonald and Dr. John Stuart were contesting the federal election, to be held on the following Tuesday, August 27.
>
> "Vote for Grange" said one ad and "send Cartwright back to his Masters, John A. Macdonald and Alexander Campbell and let them find a place to shelve their humble and servile following".
>
> At the nomination meeting its was reported, Mr. Grange's nominator, E. Mal-

lory, had said Mr. Cartwright had "probably never honestly earned a dollar in his life, which might partly account for the extravagance he had favoured both in his own canvass and in Parliament".

A writer in the *Express* had evidently attacked the publisher of the *Standard* who, in reply, said among other things: "This scurrilous attack was as unprovoked as it was mean and contemptible and as void of truth as the foulest slander ever invented outside the pale of pandemonium."

After almost a half column of attack, the editor of the *Standard* concludes with:

"No subscriber to the *Standard* has come to our office and stopped his paper on account of the low abusive character of its articles—a statement that the publisher of the *Express* cannot truthfully make."

In keeping with the great historic tradition we have in that area the Lennox and Addington historical society had a Centennial banquet some time ago at which Dr. Allan Walters, a native of the area, presented several paintings by Mr. Orville Madden, also a native, who is a very famous artist, depicting local scenes of blacksmith shops and the river, with river boats that are no longer in existence. I mention this only briefly because I have often felt that in our tourist advertising we have been lax in that our people copy the names of dishes in the United States like Kentucky fried chicken, Virginia ham and so on.

Now I just want to quote a few names from the menu they had at this dinner which we enjoyed very much. I can assure you that the food was excellent and there were some things that most of us had never eaten before: hominy block corn soup and croutons; smoke house ham; Midland district haunch of beef; glazed fish of Kente waters; Lennox boiled potatoes; Hay Bay turnip pot; mecklenburg sauer kraut; big creek apple aspic; Amherst Island cranberry mould; Bay of Quinte salad; Mary Fisher's homemade pickles and jellies; the Laird's favourite scones; Addington blueberry pie; Loyalist apple pie; tipsy cake; rhubarb fool; China tea; ground chicory root; milk; and Henrietta's after dinner treat.

I am only suggesting that the thought behind that was well worth while and I do feel that many of our tourist places in Ontario could copy some of these ideas and give appropriate names, native to their own particular territory. I feel that this is the sort of thing that can create atmosphere. Certainly some of these dishes were exceptionally delightful, I can assure you.

I want to commend the Ontario water resources commission for the recent meetings they have had at Napanee, Bath, Odessa, and Cataraqui, in an effort to help these people resolve their problems in connection with water and sewage. Also I feel that The Department of Reform Institutions did a great job in selling to our four counties—Hastings and Addington, Frontenac and Prince Edward—the idea of a regional jail which will be located adjacent to Napanee. I believe that this is one of the first times, if not the first time that something of this kind has been done, and no more central location in the four counties could have been obtained, being served as it will be by the new Quinte skyway of which I spoke earlier.

In our service with the select committee on aging many problems were discussed and one was in connection with tax rebates to elder citizens. Some private bills have been passed which have suggested that rebates could be given on educational tax alone. I do not believe that these rebates should apply to educational tax alone. It is my opinion that a senior citizen has an interest in every way —right across the board—in whatever involves his municipality. Some of our senior citizens are among the best who are serving on our school boards. More than that they have an interest in the education of their grandchildren, and furthermore, going back to the original statement of our Provincial Treasurer, the senior citizens of today are benefiting from the education that was paid for by people of an earlier day—for instance, in medical attention; the services that are given; and the type of health services, and so on, that are becoming available. Someone paid for the education of the people who have been trained to give this service and it is my feeling that while it is desirable that our senior citizens be given help, I do feel that they should be made to feel that they are a part of all of their local setup and a part of our province and that their opinions are necessary, rather than saying, "Well, here, we will give you a rebate on education alone."

More than that, by taking it across the board, it does not result in so much detailed book work having to be done. In other words, we do not have to go back to individual educational rates; they can put it straight across the board, and for instance, if municipalities know that rebates on taxes are going to be made, that can be taken care of as a percentage adjustment of the whole tax roll

rate. However, I would hope that the Ontario government would come along and perhaps make a contribution in this regard. I do feel that it would be welcomed alike by our senior citizens and by our municipal councils.

I might say that our commercial fishermen have been having difficulties. There has been a decline in the angling as well, but I know that The Department of Lands and Forests is giving these matters every consideration and I do know that commercial fishing is essential in order to keep a balance. In one area where a particular bay was closed to commercial fishing for several years in an effort to improve the angling, the angling deteriorated because the coarse fish crowded out the game fish.

By the same token, I feel that the same principle should be applied to wolves because no one in this Legislature, no member has suggested to my knowledge, that wolves should be poisoned. No member has suggested that they should be exterminated. I do not believe it is possible to exterminate them.

In my own area ten years ago, a wolf was unknown and now these brush wolves or coyotes are very prolific. Last year, as some of you have heard, they killed 30 of my own sheep. In practice these depredations have become so widespread that the county of Prince Edward is now paying a bounty of $75 for a wolf of any age, providing they are assured that it has been killed in the county.

The Department of Lands and Forests does pay a portion of that bounty, but I understand it is only 40 per cent of $25 for a wolf over three months in age and 40 per cent of $15 if it is under three months in age and it is my feeling that when local people, aware of the situation, know these conditions are as bad as they are, Lands and Forests should pay at least 50 per cent of the cost that the local municipalities are prepared to bear.

The sympathy that is expressed for these animals! They talk about the balance of nature, well, hunters go out and shoot deer, the wolves attack deer. What is it that keeps the wolf or the coyote in balance? The wolf or the coyote has no predator whatever except man.

The statement, "survival of the fittest"—how many hunters have an opportunity to pick out the deer which is choice and what they want? I think they shoot the first one they see.

The idea that the hunters take the best ones and the wolves clean out only the poorest, I think, is another fallacy, because in my experience they do not take the poor sheep; they take the very best ones they can get.

I want, before concluding, to commend the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) for his suggestion of a Confederation for tomorrow conference. When travelling with the select committee on aging, I found a great friendliness and a great pride in people from Quebec to the west coast. The airline strike did prevent us from engaging in a meeting in the maritimes.

Manitoba is proud of its great water resources; Saskatchewan, of its potash; Alberta, of its oil; British Columbia, of its water power and just about everything else; Quebec, of its great history and its progress at the present time. Each of those provinces enrich Ontario and we, in turn, will play a great part in their potential progress of the future.

We do not gain stature as a nation or we do not get along with a neighbour by searching for the points on which we differ. First of all, we try to arrive at the points on which we agree and then we try to reconcile the points on which we disagree. I do believe that this bicultural and bilingual effort of trying to bring out the points of difference among us is not the policy that will bring about the unity in this country.

I do believe that the thought to help our people to help themselves is prevalent all over this country, by the people who have the governmental responsibility and in Saskatchewan the Prime Minister did tell us that "if we had crop failures two years in a row we would be in trouble." So that we do feel that our progress, whether it be in welfare measures, health or whatever needs for our people become desirable, should be progressive, sound and giving full consideration to the problems of all.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. J. White (London South): Mr. Speaker, I stand here now with a feeling of sorrow and a sense of outrage, to inform this Legislature that two evil men are defiling the streets and poisoning the air of London, Ontario: John Beattie from Toronto and Martin Weicke from London, Ontario, two self-avowed national socialists who have been distributing Nazi propaganda and hate literature on main intersections in London, Ontario for the past two Saturdays.

I will read a couple of paragraphs from the article in the *Canadian Jewish News* which describes this problem:

> This liberal, traditionally democratic home town of people of various ethnic and religious background is in a turmoil. Last Saturday, this city once again became the chosen operation ground of the notorious Beattie agitation against Jews and liberals when the leader himself distributed swastika tinted leaflets and pamphlets.
>
> The local Jewish community council has discussed this obnoxious manifestation with police and authorities. Harold Vaisler, council president, made clear that the Jewish community will not tolerate such provocations, as did Milton E. Harris, vice president. Mr. Harris went on to express support of the total mobilization of community effort against the emergence of Nazism in this wonderful city of goodwill and good neighbourliness.

Now sir, I stand to tell you of this problem and to enlist the unanimous support of this Legislature in condemning the action of these two hateful people. You will recall, sir, that we debated this issue in January, 1966, at which time speakers from each of the three parties here condemned hate literature and hate mongers. The first paragraph of the *Globe and Mail* of January 29, 1966, summed it up in saying:

> Hate mongers were attacked by speaker after speaker on the floor of the Legislature yesterday as members debated a pair of resolutions urging that their activities be made a criminal offence.

And the article goes on to say:

> that this Legislature urge the House of Commons to pass the legislation to curb hate literature,

which was then and is now being considered in Ottawa.

I am glad to tell you, sir, that manifestations of support are coming from every quarter of London. The Canadian legion, representing 12,000 legionnaires in the London area, has passed a resolution calling on the federal government to ban the dissemination of what it calls "these scurrilous and treasonable utterances and publications."

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Why do you not go and see the mayor about it?

Mr. White: The mayor and the city council have passed a resolution which was received by me yesterday, and which reads as follows:

> The council of the corporation of the city of London at its regular meeting on April 17, 1967, adopted the following resolution:
>
> that the federal government be urged to speed the passage of an Act to amend The Criminal Code of Canada with respect to the dissemination of hate literature and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Canadian federation of mayors and municipalities, the association of Ontario mayors and reeves, to the councils of all cities in Canada and the local members of Parliament and of the Legislature with requests for their support.

Today and tomorrow, sir, there will be a letter published in the London *Free Press* over the signatures of representative citizens. That letter reads as follows:

> An open letter to the citizens of London:
>
> We the undersigned citizens of London wish to publicly record our concern about the emergence of the ugly doctrine of Nazism in our community. We particularly deplore the fact that this should be occurring in our city where the many diverse groups comprising it have always lived together in peace and harmony. It is only 22 short years since our country fought to crush Hitler and his foul doctrines and many of our finest young men gave their lives to do so. This Nazi philosophy of race hatred and genocide has no place in London or any place else in the world. Let us all join together to declare to these hate mongers that they and their poisonous hatreds are not welcome in London.

That, sir, is being signed by 50 or more citizens and I have the privilege of being one of those citizens. The London *Free Press* has been editorializing and one of the editorials reads in part:

> We have tried to provide enough news to ensure that citizens are aware of the danger, and to express on this editorial page our disgust with such literature. The *Free Press* will continue to expose such ugly cancers in society, convinced that an aware citizenry will thereby be able to keep it from spreading.

I see this, my friends, as a challenge to all of the citizens of London and I would hope that there would be a positive reaction to the dreadful activities of these two madmen. I would hope, sir, that the citizens of London would open their hearts and their homes to people of every race, creed and nationality,

and I think perhaps we are seeing in this first week or two a reaction which may very well lead to a spirit of even greater tolerance and greater mutual regard and affection for our very fine city.

I personally bear witness to my Jewish friends in London; who were my classmates in school, my comrades in arms, my colleagues in this Legislature, and I condemn in the strongest terms the actions of the two men which upset the Jewish community in London, to no avail whatsoever.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, personally as a member of the Liberal Party and perhaps also as a member of an ethnic group that has not always had things easy in this country, I would like to say at this time that I agree entirely with the remarks of the hon. member for London South and I am sure all the members of my party also agree with him.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence and that of the hon. member for Ottawa East, I would like to say that the New Democratic Party gives its unqualified support to the comments just made by the hon. member for London South. I think it is fair to say that members of this House join unanimously in condemning the activities to which he referred.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, I wonder if it would be in order for me to adjourn the debate?

Mr. Racine moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we hope we will have time for work on some bills, and there is a private members' hour from five to six. The House will sit Monday night and we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Health.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:00 o'clock, p.m.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 73

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, April 24, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 24, 1967

Presenting report, Mr. Welch 2507

Public Lands Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading 2507

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Dr. Porter, Mr. Young, Mr. Singer 2507

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Bill 86, Mr. Paterson 2508

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Ontario Provincial Police, Mr. Paterson 2508

Questions to Mr. Davis re Humber college of applied arts and technology, Mr. MacDonald 2509

Question to Mr. Simonett re all-Canadian gas pipeline, Mr. MacDonald 2509

Question to Mr. Gomme re Highway 6, Mr. Worton 2510

Question to Mr. Stewart re advertising of meat, Mr. Gaunt 2510

Statement re volumes 2 and 3, "Ontario Advisory Committee on Confederation," Mr. Rowntree 2510

Questions to Mr. Gomme re Burlington skyway, Mr. Kerr 2512

Ontario Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, 1967, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, second reading 2512

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued 2526

On notice of motion No. 3, Mr. Thrasher, Mr. Gisborn, Mr. Paterson 2532

Recess, 6 o'clock 2542

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1967

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the east gallery, eastern high school of commerce, Toronto; in the west gallery, St. Rose of Lima separate school, Scarborough.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the 1966 annual report of The Department of Municipal Affairs of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC LANDS ACT

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Lands Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Attorney General, notice of which has been given him.

Would the Attorney General explain why Dr. Porter has been removed from the special study into traffic fatalities in the Toronto area?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which is exactly the same in implication. For what reason has the supervising coroner ordered alterations be made in the investigation, initiated by Dr. Shulman, of traffic fatalities in Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I would answer both questions at one time. I would like to comment on the language used in the question submitted by the hon. member for Yorkview. Dr. Porter, let me say at the outset, has not been removed from the study. In fact, the study has been enlarged and he has continued in it.

Dr. Porter, who is a junior coroner in Metropolitan Toronto, is continuing to carry out that study. But we are suggesting in the alteration or change that instead of taking every traffic inquest, as is the procedure now, other coroners also, senior coroners, take traffic fatality inquests. All the material from each of those inquests is being made available to Dr. Porter, who will carry on his study.

At the same time he is being assisted by consultation with the Crown attorney for Toronto and with Dr. Cruickshank, the acting coroner, and he will be assisted in the conduct of general inquests as well as traffic fatalities inquests. So he has not been removed; the material from the inquests is being made available to him for his study. He is being assisted with advice, and at the same time other coroners in Metropolitan Toronto—and we think this is desirable—are being given the opportunity to study the traffic cases.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept a supplementary question? Does this mean that Dr. Porter will have at his beck and call experts who can look in depth into the condition of the motor cars and the surrounding situation at the time of the accident?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Whatever coroner conducts the inquest will have available whatever experts are desirable and have some relevant evidence to offer. There is certainly no thought of circumscribing or limiting the study in these inquests. Experts who have something to offer will be called to the fullest extent that we can find them. As I say, the material from all the inquests will be submitted to Dr. Porter in order that he may continue his study.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? Would there not be some substantial advantage and consistency if, rather than having to gather a series of reports from various inquests, one man could do it and do the same type of research; would there not be a substantial advantage in that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, one man will still be doing the study of these cases, but we feel that other coroners as well should be aware of these traffic cases, particularly in Metro Toronto. All that material, as I say, will be made available for study and Dr. Porter is not being removed from the taking of traffic cases at all. The change is that he will not take every one himself.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions for the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). I would like to put them on the record.

Will the government furnish to the members of the Legislature the report of the federal-provincial tax structure committee, 1966?

Will the government introduce appropriate amendments to section 35 of The Municipal Act so that Mr. Collins, the former alderman of the city of London, will not suffer the penalty of disqualification from municipal office solely because he is an employee of the public transportation commission of the city of London and a member of the union which has a collective agreement with the city of London?

Having regard to the importance of immigration policy to the province of Ontario and to the coordinate jurisdiction of the federal-provincial governments in matters relating to immigration, will the government provide procedures by which members of the Legislature will receive copies of all white papers or other statements of policy made by the federal government on immigration policies?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we will take those as notice.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a two part question of the hon. Attorney General:

Is it the intention of the Attorney General to have Bill 86—an amendment to The Police Act—referred to the committee on legal bills prior to either second or third readings in the House?

If so, will representatives of the Ontario police chiefs' association, Ontario police association, the association of rural municipalities, Ontario municipal association, Ontario mayors and reeves, and various representatives of Ontario police commissions be allowed to state their views on this bill?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question, or the first part of the question, is "yes". The bill will be submitted to the standing committee on legal bills.

To the second part of the question, Mr. Speaker—I am sure that the chairman of that standing committee on legal bills will permit persons who are present at the committee to present their views. They will be heard. This has been the practice in the past and subject to the ruling and to the discretion of the chairman I would see no reason why this procedure should be changed.

Mr. Paterson: Might I ask a supplementary question on this? Has the Minister conferred with any of these recognized groups on this bill before introducing it to the House?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, has mentioned four or five. I have had interviews—not in the past month and a half or thereabouts but before that period. While we were considering the provisions of this bill, we met with the Ontario police commission and, I am sure, with the Metropolitan Toronto commission. We have had meetings with, I think, the associated police chiefs. I cannot be sure of all of them, but we have made it a practice to meet with these groups and to have them present their briefs and make their representations. Since the bill has actually been put into draft and perfected for first reading, which it has now been given in this House, I have not had any interviews with them but I would anticipate some of them will make representation and be present at the standing committee on legal bills.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Attorney General. This also is in two parts:

1. How many municipal police forces of three men or less have not been taken over by the Ontario Provincial Police? As a result of this move how many of those men employed on local police forces have left law enforcement work and how many are unemployed?

2. How many one-, two- and three-man police detachments are operated by the Ontario Provincial Police?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The answer, Mr. Speaker, to the first part of the question—the Ontario Provincial Police have taken over 57, one-man municipal forces and eight of the two-to-three-man municipal forces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not have the exact figures showing how many of the municipal officers have left law enforcement work. I am

advised that the majority have remained in police work as bylaw enforcement officers.

The second part of the question, Mr. Speaker. There are six one-man Ontario Provincial Police detachments in existence at the present time. These detachments are found in the very remote areas and in addition, there are 19 two-man detachments and there are 17 three-man detachments.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions, my first to the Minister of Education.

Did the Deputy Minister of Education receive a letter from Dr. A. G. Gillespie, director of education for the borough of York, with regard to the "paucity of representation" on the board of governors of the Humber college of applied arts and technology from the borough of York? If so, what does the government intend to do to provide a more equitable balance of representation between Etobicoke and York on Humber college's board of governors?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister did receive such a letter and as I pointed out in my answer last week to the member for York South, the situation is relatively simple.

There are four nominees from the two municipalities involved, two from Etobicoke and two from York, both of whom were appointed. The eight were nominated or recommended by the council of regents, and Mr. Speaker, as I said on that occasion, the council does not take into account the specific geographic location of each member of the board of governors. They recommended people to, shall we say, represent the occupational, the industrial, the professional members of the community as a whole to be served and these eight nominees were then appointed under the legislation.

I would suggest that if there were to be any changes in the future—if, say, there were to be a resignation by one of the members of the board, I am sure the council of regents would be quite prepared to look at the possibility of appointing somebody from the borough of York, but I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the two municipalities do have their municipal representation.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would permit a supplementary question?

Does he really believe that there were not people from these various groups available from York county, so that you do not end up with a ten-to-two split on the board of governors?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, the board of governors are developing a college to serve the whole area, and quite frankly I have no indication that there was any division of opinion on the board.

Now they are in the process of selecting a site and it may be that some of the people from York are concerned. But the prime purpose is to develop a college and I think the council of regents, when they are looking at nominees in the Metro area, perhaps do not relate whether a certain address happens to be in Etobicoke or York. They are representative people of the entire community and the community includes Etobicoke and York.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Concerning the announcement on Saturday that the National Energy Board will hold a hearing on May 23 to consider an application for a contingent certificate to Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited for construction of another all Canadian line in the event that the United States Federal Power Commission does not approve the southern route by that date. Is it this government's intention to make representations at that hearing (a) to support the contingent certificate and (b) to seek the National Energy Board's approval for a more southerly rerouting of the proposed new line in order to assure gas to those parts of northern Ontario now without it, instead of looping the existing lines to areas now supplied with gas?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take the hon. member's question as notice and give him an answer sometime later.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Highways, of which he has notice.

In view of the fact that the reconstruction and resurfacing of the Burlington skyway has resulted in a closing of two lanes of traffic on the bridge for the duration of the work, has the Minister considered the possibility of (1) requesting the contractor to increase the number of men working on this job or employing more shifts;

(2) requesting the city of Hamilton and any other department involved to agree to the temporary lifting of the ban on trucks using

the beach strip in Hamilton until the work is completed?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take the member's question as notice and bring the answer in later.

I have an answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) last week, which was, "Would the Minister advise the House when all contracts have been let for improvements to Highway 6 north and south of Highway 401? When are the improvements scheduled to be completed?"

On March 29, 1967, a clearing, grubbing and fencing contract was awarded from Clappison's Corners northerly 5.3 miles to Harper's Corners. Completion of this contract is expected by the end of June. Early in the five year programme of follow up, grading and paving contracts will be awarded. Last September a five and a half mile contract covering grading and paving of Highway 6 from county road 18 northerly to Aberfoyle was awarded. This contract includes the construction of a new overhead of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Puslinch. Work is presently under way and completion is expected late this year. Under this programme, clearing is planned for the 5.4 miles between Harper's Corners and county road 18. And upon completion the grading and paving contracts will be let.

Later in the programme urban construction will be carried out in the Aberfoyle area; this work will be combined with the rural section of .4 miles to the north of the town. Insofar as the balance of Highway 6 covered in the question is concerned, it is all in the planning stages and reconstruction will be undertaken within the next few years.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I believe last week the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) forwarded a question to the Minister of Health and possibly the Minister of Agriculture and Food and the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. The question was handed to me and it reads as follows:

> In view of the report prepared for the Ontario food council by H. E. McGill, Ontario livestock commissioner, which alleges the existence of misleading advertising and promotion in the marketing of meat, what action, if any, will the Minister take to protect the public against alleged deceptive practices in the area?

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I was quite alarmed when I read the report submitted by Mr. McGill to the Ontario food council, and immediately ordered a thorough and complete investigation of the charges that were made in the report. I have nothing further to report on at this moment but we hope the matter will be satisfactorily resolved.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for York South wish to place his question on record to the Prime Minister?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I find my question is really a duplicate of the one my colleague, the member for Riverdale asked, and I think one answer will cover both.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, you will recall last week, that the Prime Minister of Ontario tabled the first of three volumes of background papers and reports of the Ontario advisory committee on Confederation. And today on behalf of the government I would table volumes 2 and 3, which will be distributed and available to the members.

May I say that of course I have pleasure in tabling the second and third volumes of these background papers. I am sure that you and members of the House, and indeed the public, will find these ten papers both interesting and valuable in your and their consideration of the problems with which they deal.

The first paper in volume 2, entitled, "The modern federation—some trends and problems," was written by Professor Alexander Brady and deals with the changes in Canadian federalism since 1945 and with the problems that now confront us. Professor Brady urges all English-speaking Canadians to appreciate the subtlety and complexity of the problems that must be faced by a country with a large minority of another language who form the overwhelming majority in one particular region. Such an appreciation is necessary if English- and French-speaking Canadians are to work out the conditions under which they are both willing to maintain our federation.

The second paper of volume 2 is the report entitled: "The proposal of a federal capital territory for Canada's capital." The advisory committee commissioned Professor Donald Rowat to prepare this paper. The study was conceived as a result of the many briefs to the Royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism advocating the creation of a federal district in the Ottawa-Hull area

which would reflect the bilingual-bicultural nature of the country.

Professor Rowat has dealt with the federal capital district with three objectives in mind. Briefly these are:

1. The effective implementation of the national capital plan for the development of the capital area.

2. The development of Ottawa and Hull as an area reflecting the nation rather than as mere regional centres in Ontario and Quebec.

3. The creation of a bilingual-bicultural environment in the federal capital in which both English- and French-speaking typists could feel at home.

Professor Rowat's report has been a valuable source of information to the advisory committee in their discussions of this question.

The third and fourth papers of volume two both deal with civil rights and civil liberties. Dean W. R. Lederman, of Queen's University, has contributed a paper he wrote just prior to the passage of the Canadian bill of rights.

He concludes that justice can best be constitutionally guaranteed by means that "safeguard the democratic character of our legislative bodies, the high quality and independence of the courts, and the fairness of procedure in both". Professor Edward McWhinney's paper deals with the progress that has been made in the province of Quebec in the field of civil liberties since the beginning of the so-called quiet revolution.

Mr. Speaker, president T. H. B. Symons, of Trent University, has written a report entitled: "Proposals for an Ontario cultural and educational exchange programme and an Ontario-Quebec cultural and educational exchange agreement." In it he has recommended that the province of Ontario establish an extensive programme of cultural and educational exchanges between Ontario and Quebec and between groups within Ontario itself. President Symons' paper led to the establishment of the Ontario cultural and educational exchange programme in The Department of Education, a programme which has already begun to make its influence felt in the cultural life of this province.

The last paper included in volume 2 was prepared by the economic and fiscal subcommittee of the advisory committee as a guide for the government at last autumn's federal-provincial financial conferences.

Mr. Speaker, volume 3 contains four articles prepared by the staff of the federal-provincial affairs secretariat of the office of the chief economist and one paper prepared by Miss Elizabeth Way, a student at Queen's University who worked under the supervision of Professor John Meisel. I hope that the charts, the table and the summary will provide all of us with further background material for our debate.

I would also like to say that a great deal of effort has gone into the preparation of these three volumes and I hope that other volumes will follow. The advisory committee has worked very hard in the two years of its existence and has been most helpful to the government. My sincerest thanks must go to all the members of the committee, the chairman, Mr. H. I. Macdonald, and the co-secretaries, Mr. D. W. Stevenson and Mr. R. A. Farrell.

I would also like to thank the members of the federal-provincial affairs secretariat in the office of the chief economist for the help they have given in publishing these volumes. A great deal of credit must also go to the administration branch of The Department of Economics and Development for their excellent job in typing and printing these volumes in a short space of time.

May I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by repeating what I stated when tabling the first volume, namely: the papers presented represent the opinions of the authors and are not necessarily those of the government.

And I am pleased to make this statement, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House leader would permit a question?

In view of the tabling of these papers today, would it be reasonable to conclude that the debate on this Confederation matter will not take place this week?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not think it would take place early in this week. It might take place towards the end of the week.

Mr. Singer: Well, like what day?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: After you have had the opportunity of reading this material, you will have ample notice before the debate comes up.

Mr. Singer: Well, this is a very serious problem, Mr. Speaker, because there are 300 odd pages here and there are several of my colleagues who want to take a very active part in this debate. They would like to know.

Mr. Speaker: The House leader has said there will be ample notice given.

Mr. Singer: It is hard to interpret what he means by that.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I just meant exactly what I said, Mr. Speaker. Ample time. The Prime Minister indicated that this debate would not be brought on without due courtesy being given to the Opposition.

Mr. Singer: Six hundred pages.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: You have 23 members.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member for Halton:

1. The contractor was requested to step up his operation and has done so as much as possible. The amount of equipment and number of people working are consistent with the confined space for the operation.

As to employing more shifts, the contractor is working from dawn to dusk. The type of work to be carried out, which involves joint treatment and the application of protective materials, requires daylight and in the opinion of the engineers, should not be attempted under artificial illumination.

The second question, we did consider requesting the city of Hamilton to agree to temporary lifting of the ban on trucks using the beach strip while this work was under way, but since the residents, and particularly the children, on this section of highway have become conditioned to trucks not using the strip, any further thought was discarded in the interests of safety.

It is reported that there has been a substantial increase in the number of cars using the beach strip.

By way of general information, if we had not closed two lanes of the bridge for this operation, the construction operations would have to have been carried out over a period of many months. Progress to date has been excellent and our contractor is confident that the operation will be completed by the end of May, a month ahead of schedule.

While there are, of course, some delays being encountered, particularly in the morning and the late afternoon, these are not as serious as, say, the delays being encountered on the reconstruction of the Macdonald-Cartier freeway in the Toronto area, nor that which was experienced by Metropolitan Toronto when they found it necessary to construct guard rails on the median of the Frederick Gardiner expressway.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 26th order:

THE ONTARIO DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION ACT, 1967

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 97, An Act to amend The Ontario Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, 1967.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on the second reading of this bill. I find it what might be called a puzzlement as to how the Minister can bring in a bill dealing with an isolated topic in the field of investor protection, either on a federal basis or on a provincial basis, in view of the statement which the Minister made when he attended the conference in Ottawa just a few short days ago.

The Minister at that time made what to me appeared to be a short, succinct and very appropriate statement as to the position which this province should take. I might just quote, Mr. Speaker, what he had to say on this question of investor protection and the cooperation, or association of the federal government with the provincial government. He stated, and—without taking it out of context at all—I think this is an appropriate remark of his on an explicit agreement:

> that we hope that this conference will mark a milestone along the path to an explicit agreement on our respective responsibilities as well as ensuring that we can establish effective machinery to discharge those responsibilities.

He said:

> Therefore the first step must be the clarification of those grey areas surrounding the operations of near banks, trust and loan companies, and other financial institutions. In our view—and I emphasize this, Mr. Speaker—an explicit decision on the respective jurisdictional responsibility should properly precede changes in technical and administrative arrangements.

And he ended his remarks by saying:

> We also hope that we can move quickly to a comprehensive agreement on the proper role for each level of government in this broad area of common concern and shared interest.

Within a very few days of that statement—which I think is a most proper statement for the Minister to have made at that conference—we find that he has introduced a bill dealing in a piecemeal way with one facet of the problem. That is the matter which is of such concern to me, because the Minister will

recall that, when he introduced this bill originally in the circumstances as they then existed—whether the government would consider those circumstances as a crisis situation or not—in the circumstances then existing it was imperative that that bill be passed, and it was passed with the agreement of all parties, after debate and in a very short period of time. But that crisis is now over and we are now being asked to transfer and despite the wording of the bill, Mr. Speaker, which refers to "facilitating" the transfer to the deposit arrangements under the federal statute for practical purposes, it is a bill which will require Ontario companies and companies which are registered in Ontario under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, with one alleviating provision, will require those companies to come under the federal statute relating to deposit insurance.

What we had no opportunity to discuss in any great detail is whether or not the principle of guaranteeing deposits in such institutions as loan and trust corporations is a cure all, or even part of the cure all, for the problems which existed in that field. What makes it so difficult for us to understand the reason for this bill is that here we have a government which, so far as the administration of The Loan and Trust Corporations Act is concerned, are certainly subject to criticism.

I know we cannot debate the degree of criticism, but there is no one, including the Minister, who would not feel that there could have been a substantially better administration of The Loan and Trust Corporations Act over the years. The reasons for that are not now important. We have no assurance yet that The Loan and Trust Corporations Act is being adequately administered and enforced. In addition to that we have what I can only refer to as the refusal of the government to deal with the position of loan and trust corporations from the point of view of making them disclose information.

The public disclosure of information which occupied so much of the time of the House under The Securities Act does not apply to the loan and trust corporations in their normal operation. The government, therefore, treats loan and trust corporations as a special category where the public interest is served only by the supervisory and regulatory functions of the government under that Act, rather than by the disclosure provisions of a modern up to date corporations or securities Act.

It seems to me that by continuing to ignore those two areas as they relate to loan and trust corporations and by simply saying, "Well, we will now pass the problem over to the federal government because guarantee of deposits is the proper way to deal with it"—then I say to the Minister that this is an example of the piecemeal approach. Not only is it a piecemeal segment of the broader field of this problem, it is piecemeal dealing with the specific problem with which he is faced.

We find toward the end of the bill that in fact the bill will, for practical purposes, result in the emasculation over a long period of time of the administrative procedures which are set out in The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, because—if my reading of the bill is correct—there is a reference at the end of the bill which would indicate that the registrar of loan and trust corporations will examine the affairs of any loan corporation or trust company registered under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act at the request of the Canada deposit insurance corporation and on such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Minister.

In that particular way what, in fact, is happening by this bill is that the administrative, supervisory and regulatory control of trust corporations in the province of Ontario —despite the Minister saying that is not the intention—will over a period of time pass to the supervision of the federal government. Because, with the multitude of duties and obligations that he has under other statutes and the other areas of his responsibility, he will tend to say, "Well, the deposits are guaranteed under federal legislation; it is up to the federal body to do the regulation and supervision and I only have to act in my capacity if by chance I am asked by, and have a request from, the federal government operating through its corporation."

So what we are doing—what we are being asked to do—is for practical purposes to imbed for all time in this field, without due consideration of all the aspects of it, the principle of the guarantee of deposits. I am not suggesting the repeal of the existing law of the province of Ontario which was passed so recently. It has to remain. It has to remain as part of the law of this province until such time as the other aspects of the problem are dealt with.

But I am very much in disagreement with the principle under which the Minister, after his very clear statement to the conference of the need for an explicit agreement on our respective responsibilities and after his very clear statement that he wants an explicit decision on the respective jurisdictional

responsibilities, and that these should properly precede changes in technical and administrative arrangements, I find it difficult to conceive why he brings in this isolated piece of legislation dealing, as I have said, with such a small part of the problem which is involved.

To state that affirmatively, Mr. Speaker, I think that the matter which is of great concern to me is that the loan and trust corporations in the province of Ontario under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, should be subject to effective disclosure provisions of all companies that we have under the jurisdiction of this government. Loan and trust corporations fall within the category of public corporations. It should be available to any member of the public.

We are not just talking about disclosure to its shareholders, or disclosures to those persons who happen to invest in other instruments or obligations of such companies. Because of their quality as public corporations they should be required to make full and complete disclosure along the lines adapted where necessary—those, as we have finally come to agree that are to be required of public corporations which are floating issues through the stock exchanges or through the public under the auspices of the Ontario securities commission.

Then, when we have considered that specific rehabilitation, amendment, updating, modernization of The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, and we have coupled with it what is required in this field—that is the money market field—in additional supervisory and regulatory administrative machinery to carry out the supervision and regulatory administrative machinery to carry out the supervision and regulation as we expect it to be done, then within that context we can decide whether as a marginal matter we should provide for this guarantee of deposits.

It is only when we consider within the context of all those three areas that we can really deal with the kind of bill which the Minister has brought before us for second reading today. What concerns me, in the light of the Minister's statement, is the transferring of this guarantee of deposit obligation to the federal government without Ontario having provided, as it must of necessity provide, the leadership in the revamping of The Loan and Trust Corporations Act; to update it in the fields to which I refer—namely, of total disclosure, effective disclosure of the affairs of these companies, and in addition to that the assurance that we have the administrative and supervisory machinery within the province of Ontario, sir, within the Minister's department, to supervise as and where it is necessary.

It is only in the light of those things that we should be considering this question of permanently providing a guarantee of deposits. I feel that the Minister probably will say, "well, transferring it to the federal government will not mean it is there for all time", but in fact it will be. In fact, once we get it to the federal government and provide for that guarantee of deposit, it will become such a part and parcel of the method of doing business of those companies that it will for practical purposes be impossible to reconsider the principle at all.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that within the context of the endeavour to get the proper allocation of responsibilities and a general nation-wide investor protection climate in operation, that the Minister should be saying to the federal government, "well now, for the time being and in the specific situation in the province of Ontario, we are going to let our own law carry it forward until we have reached agreement, not just on the guarantee of deposit on a jurisdictional basis and on a nation-wide basis, but until we have reached agreement on the full and complete disclosure provisions which are to be applicable to these companies"; if the Minister wants to call them near banks or companies engaged in that business.

And in addition to that is the question of whether or not the supervisory and regulatory machineries are to be meshed in such a way that we each have our clear responsibility, or whether the federal government has in fact got the administrative machinery and the supervisory and regulatory machinery to do the kind of job which is required.

I am concerned, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, about this provision which, over the long course of the functioning of the department, would seem to tend to emasculate the supervisory and regulatory functions of the registrar under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act. It would seem much more preferable, Mr. Speaker, if a bill such as this, dealing with a traditional jurisdictional part of the legislative authority of this Legislature, is going to be dealt with at all it should not be dealt with in this way. This seems to transfer to the federal government a degree of authority in connection with these companies in a very indirect way, rather than facing up to the specific problems. I may say, from my point of view, I was delighted

to see the position which the Minister took when he was in Ottawa dealing with the matter. And yet this bill, Mr. Speaker, is a total contradiction of the very principles which the Minister enunciated and which are so very real.

The last point that concerns me about it is that of necessity—without trying to preserve provincial jurisdiction on any parochial basis—what in fact we endeavoured to do under The Securities Act by updating our securities law, is to provide the kind of leadership in an important market in the province of Ontario which has already had its ramifications in other provinces.

Because that legislation was modernized, other provinces have followed suit and therefore at the federal level, by and large, it will be possible to facilitate a nation-wide investor protection securities law and all the ramifications of that. I say to the Minister that in this field, with loan and trust corporations, and with such an antiquated approach as we have had to it, that it is incumbent on this government to produce a bill dealing with updating The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, updating the disclosure provisions, updating the supervisory and regulatory provisions and within that context deciding whether or not the guarantee of deposits is an essential and really a necessary part of the confidence of the public in such companies. Then on the basis of that kind of updated legislation, it might well be that other provinces would emulate that particular statute and when the Minister goes to these conferences at Ottawa to discuss general investor protection across the country, it would be much easier to facilitate the introduction of that kind of protective statute in general operation across the country. Instead of that, we are going to tend to perpetuate the guarantee of deposits without giving due and adequate consideration to the other aspects of loan and trust corporations.

Well, I may say that I think even a person who was the most partisan protagonist of the positions of trust companies would be quite legitimately entitled to say this is not a proper way. If the business community is to operate in the traditional way, which has had the support of the government, then there is no reason why a well-run effective well-managed sound financial institution, or loan and trust corporation, of which there are many in the province, should pay a penalty by way of premium, based on the amount of their deposit, in order to assist those companies which are less sound or have less of a historic tradition or have less of a tradition of sound management and who may be caught up in the fluctuations of a market situation such as British Mortgage and Trust were, or such as York Trust apparently became very close to being involved in. The basic problem was in fact that we had had a spate of incorporations of trust corporations over the last while and the department was not able to keep pace with its administration.

In the light of these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I find this bill to be such a contradiction of the good road that the Minister had started to travel, that, as I said, I consider it a great puzzle as to why the Minister should now feel that we must have this bill for the purpose of some minor tidying up of the question of deposit insurance.

I think the bill should be withdrawn; I think the Minister should give consideration to updating the present law in the province of Ontario related to loan and trust corporations in line with modern commercial corporate investor protection law and then deal with this question of deposit if it is to remain a permanent part of the commercial scene. I think there is very good reason to think that properly done, this kind of deposit insurance might on examination—if there were proper disclosure, if there were proper supervisory and regulatory machinery of the government in the second aspect of it—it might well be that the guarantee of deposit passed as it was in an atmosphere of crisis, would in the long run not be necessary at all.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, on February 10, Royal assent was given to a bill that some people colloquially called the "save the York Trust Company bill". It was an interesting bill that was rushed through in some 36 hours without the opportunity for discussion in committee, and without any proper explanation from anyone on the government Treasury benches as to what the emergency was. In fact the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, as I recall it, apparently took strong exception to a front-page story in one of the Toronto afternoon newspapers, attributing certain remarks to him.

However, we had that bill and it went through in record time, there was no time to discuss it, no time to refer it to committee; apparently we had to save that trust corporation. Well, I think the Minister should explain to us, before we get on too much further, whether or not the government of Ontario bothered to set up any of the machinery contemplated in that bill or did anything more

than to rush that bill through in record time, as I say, and let it sit until certain people up in Ottawa took certain other action.

I do not take the strong exception that the hon. member for Riverdale does to pushing the responsibility off to Ottawa. Not for the reason that I do not think that something should not be done in Ontario because I do, but for the reason that this government seems to be constitutionally unable to cope with the problems presented in the business and the financial world. And so when the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs and his colleagues see a way out, they waste no time in rushing in to fill the breach, slough off their responsibility to Ottawa and let Ottawa take care of it.

A lot of what the hon. member for Riverdale said makes good sense—his plea to the government to bring in an overall programme that will be meaningful in control of the financial institutions that operate in this province, not only loan and trust corporations, we have also talked about finance corporations.

Not a word from the Minister about that. Does he have any plans about finance corporations? If so, why are they kept such a dark secret? This bill does not deal with them. There is the lack of consistent thinking as reflected in the earlier bill. And you will remember Mr. Speaker, that I suggested to him, in that very short debate that we were allowed on the previous bill, that it should at least cover—if it was going to exclude finance companies—it should at least cover all trust and loan corporations carrying on business in the province of Ontario. You will remember, sir, what the Minister said to me; he said: "My advisers tell me it is constitutionally impossible."

Well, from February 10 to April 24, his advisers have had another look. And his advisers apparently now tell him that what I said was constitutionally possible early in February, and he said was not, apparently now is constitutionally possible in April. Strange, Mr. Speaker, that there is not even that consistency of thinking on the government benches, because this Act, if you will notice, applies to all loan and trust companies registered under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act and the other bill, you will remember too, Mr. Speaker, only applied to loan and trust corporations incorporated under the laws of the province of Ontario.

One can only draw one conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this sloppy, careless and really inconsiderate thinking that the government brings to these problems; they just wish the problems were not there, that they would go away, that no one would bother them about financial disaster.

Let us be preserved from having these horrible things happen in the province of Ontario and if we can slough off the responsibility or limit our responsibility we will be glad to do it.

As we said in the debate on the previous bill, Mr. Speaker, there was no reason in the world why they could not have made the bill apply to all loan and trust corporations carrying on business in the province of Ontario. Now the constitutional advisers of the Minister have apparently changed their minds and now they are going to do that very thing. I would like to know why they changed their minds in the very short period.

I suggest that they really did not change their minds materially. I suggest that they wanted, in the original instance, to limit their responsibility, in case somebody else got into trouble, and they would again throw up their hands in horror, and say, "Oh it was not our fault."

Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult government to understand because, in one breath, the get up and say, we have passed the greatest legislation in the world. This is one of the favourite phrases we get from over there, and yet when they have an opportunity, a responsibility and a duty to set their own house in order, what do we see?

Slough off the responsibility, send it up to Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, I said that I do not share the real concern of the member for Riverdale for the fact that this is being done, because I have no confidence at all in the ability of those people who inhabit the Treasury benches, to properly control these matters at the present time.

It would seem that the voters of Ontario are going to decide, very shortly, whether or not they should even have the authority to bring in any more statutes.

I would think there is only going to be one answer—but it is obvious, sir, that they are not prepared to accept it and, constitutionally, they are unable to provide for it.

In all of these things that have now become the responsibility of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, all we get are grand speeches about, "We are the greatest in the world." We pass great statutes, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. There are no staffs to support them, there are no proper studies.

Finance companies are still labouring under the old legislation. Another Prudential could happen tomorrow in another finance company, and there are no better controls. There are no staffs working. There is no legislation in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, for lack of something better to do, I am glad the government is sending this up to Ottawa, because at least somebody is going to pay a little attention. I have no faith that this Minister, or this government, is going to pay real attention to the real problem which is presented.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, there is one curious anomaly, as I see it, that has arisen under the legislation we were prevailed upon to put through with a great rush a little over two months ago, and which is now being amended so that the insurance system can be centralized in the federal government.

This anomaly, I think, underlines the point that has been made by previous speakers—that it is not enough to provide insurance protection for innocent investors. I personally believe it is desirable that this be done.

I was most unhappy at the way we did it, in the midst of what obviously must have been a very serious, though undisclosed crisis, when this House was unable to give due and adequate consideration, because of pressure from the government majority opposite, to a bill which established quite remarkable new principles.

I am not saying I was against the principles of the bill. What I objected to then, and still feel resentful about, was that we never had any time to give adequate consideration either to the principles in their broad generality, or to the specific working out of them in the bill.

We are not now, apparently, in this state of crisis, so there is a little more time permitted in considering the amendment. The basic principle, however, has now been established in this House and that we cannot discuss.

But we said at the time, I think in both Opposition groups, and it has been repeated most eloquently today by my friend from Riverdale, that it is also necessary, and indeed more necessary, to do something about the loan and trust company legislation generally so as to provide for proper supervision of these companies.

It is not good enough for the Legislature to provide a system whereby victims of bad management or other undesirable practices will be protected. We must also think of the interest of all the people of Ontario and of the Treasury of Ontario; or, if this bill should pass, and this insurance passes into federal hands, of the Treasury of Canada and the people of Canada.

We do not want to see a situation where, in fact, it is necessary for depositors, as they are defined in the legislation, to come to the government, whichever one it may be, for reimbursement for investments that have been lost because of improper management by the loan or trust company concerned.

This brings me to the anomaly that I referred to when I got up, Mr. Speaker. At this moment, about the best investment a person can make by way of loan capital in Toronto right now, is in guaranteed investment certificates of York Trust.

I have been told that it was the affairs of this company which created the emergency situation which forced the panic action of February 10—I think my friend from Downsview said that was the date—and put the government in the position where it had to drive its original legislation through this House without any proper consideration for the normal conventions of the House, which permit time for members to consider important bills.

This company is still offering 6.5 per cent on GICs, or it was a few days ago, I have not checked it today. Other companies which have, in the past, been considered to be—shall we say more conservatively managed—and that is a word that ought to appeal to my friends opposite, more conservatively managed, more cautiously managed, better managed in accordance with principles that have been considered as appropriate for trust and loan companies, are offering something like 5.5 to 5.75 per cent on similar types of paper, debentures or GICs.

Now I do not think the York Trust GICs would be regarded as good investments if it were not for the legislation that was passed two and a half months ago. But with the credit of the province of Ontario standing behind those GICs, up to an amount of $20,000 in any individual case, I would say that they are an excellent investment.

Anybody who has any money to spare, and wants to put it into loan capital, would be well advised to buy. But what is going to be the ultimate consequence of this situation, Mr. Speaker?

Are we going to get into a situation where there is an unsound competition in interest

rates among trust companies? Those that are less cautiously managed, setting high rates; the others, since their previous record of prudent management now counts for nothing, being in the position where either they have to meet that competition or they will lose the business.

Is this the sort of thing that is going to happen? I do not think we should permit deposit insurance legislation, desirable as it is, to become a shelter behind which managements which, shall we say, take something less than a cautious attitude towards their operations, can now shelter and gather up business from other managements with whom prudent investors in the past would have been more inclined to entrust their money.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this does point up very strongly the points that have been made previously in the debate. It is most necessary that there be adequate supervision of the operations of these companies.

It is most necessary that the government be satisfied, through its proper regulatory agencies, that the policies they are conducting are safe, that there is really no risk, barring some totally unforeseen emergency, that any of the money that they borrow will be lost. Otherwise it is failing in its responsibility to the people of the province. Individual investors, it is true, will be protected, but the people of the province could very well be in a position where they have to dig into their pockets to bail these companies out. I realize that what we have before us is an insurance fund and in time, no doubt, the insurance premiums will cover the risk—it will provide funds sufficient to cover any possible losses. That, however, is not the situation at the present time, Mr. Speaker. If there was a claim—and certainly none of us hope there will be one—it would have to come out of the tax money of the people of Ontario. Even later, when a sizeable insurance fund is built up, the effect could very well be that the prudently managed companies are being assessed—which is how the fund works—to cover up the errors of those that are less prudently managed. I do not think that is a desirable state of affairs either.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister in his concluding remarks—I see he has been making notes from time to time, so I have no doubt he intends to make concluding remarks. He shakes his head. Well, maybe he is not going to make concluding remarks, but it will be unfortunate if he does not. I certainly think we should hear more than we have yet heard from the government on this matter. I would hope that he would indicate to us what he has in mind with regard to the general regulation and supervision of loan and trust companies, both as it involves his own department and the agencies operating under the supervision of that department and also as it involves the relations of this government with the government of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the debate on second reading of this bill, it becomes obvious to me that those who spoke today could not have been present or have not read the debates of this House with respect to the deposit incorporation bill which was introduced and enacted in this House in the month of February of this year.

Now at that time, let me remind you of what I said—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I did not interrupt any one of the members—

Mr. Bryden: I know, but we did not make false statements—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I listened to a lot of irrelevancies and things that were not true. All I ask is the courtesy that I have extended to the members. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a reasonable proposition.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think there have been three members who have spoken in this debate and we were all present in the House at the time when the debate took place. If the Minister wants to make a false debating point to start his argument, that is his privilege.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Not at all, I think I listened to enough statements without background over the days in this House to make the statement I have made and I will stand by it and I will tell you why. At the time that that deposit insurance bill was introduced in this House, I said that it was the intention of this government to take advtantage of the federal legislation as, if and when it was enacted. That is exactly why this bill is here today. I declared our position at that time.

Now, let me distinguish between deposit insurance on the one hand and financial institutions or finance companies, if I could use those phrases, on the other. There was a situation that developed, and which is well known to all of the members of this House, at the end of January and in February of this

year. Do not ever think that the introduction of the bill in this House took place without the full knowledge of the federal government. When I use that phrase, I do not use it in any political connotation whatsoever. We have had the frankest of discussions from the very beginning until today. They will continue, not only with the Minister of Finance of Canada, but with officials of his department. The cooperation and exchange of information between the two governments would, I think, set an example of cooperation which all of the members of this House would do well to think about and conjure a little bit, because the basis of that cooperation is designed—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You should point this out to the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart).

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The member for York South should not get excited.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not excited.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This is designed for the benefit of the people of this province and for the benefit of the people of other provinces who may be directly or indirectly concerned.

Mr. Renwick: So was the—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I did not say anything when the member for Riverdale was talking. Just let me make my statement.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, go ahead. Why does the Minister not make it?

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would ask the Minister to proceed.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is very petulant today.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, I am just interested in how far you are going to stick your neck out, because you are going to have a chance to vote against this bill in a very little while. Then we will find out just how strongly both Opposition parties believe in what they have both said.

Now let me just talk on this whole question for a moment. We are talking about the area of banking; we are talking about near banks; we are talking about finance companies. If the government of Ontario did not believe that this whole area needed looking at, a new department would not have been established. The fact is, it was established. That is number 1.

Now let us look at the question of banks and trust companies. There can be no question that trust companies do approach and are included in that area called near banks. The situation which developed in the early part of this year had to do with that area involving deposits or similarly legally defined responsibilities of these companies, meaning GICs and certain debentures. The fact is that in the long run we have to distinguish whether this was right or wrong. This has no political connotations, because there were governments of more than one political affiliation which had responsibility at the federal level in this field. These matters developed during the regimes of both parties. Certain financial institutions took on the deposit receiving function and were permitted to do so by the federal authorities. It is against that background that it has to be decided as to whether that was right or wrong. It was my view—I do not want to interrupt the private conversations of the member for Woodbine who is mumbling to the member for York South—but I thought they were both interested in what I was saying—

Mr. MacDonald: We are.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, all right. Let us just have your close attention for 30 seconds. It is against that background of where this distinction and the true legal distinction of the matter and how it is going to be dealt with in the future came before us. If I had to define this matter and had the responsibility in total or were asked to express an opinion, I would say that a deposit receiving institution should be treated in the same fashion as true banks—if I could use that phrase—those banks which we regard as true banks and which we call banks; those are the very areas which I believe are federal in their nature. There are other areas of near bank operations having to do with their fiduciary relations or trust operations in the true sense of the word "trust". I believe, and it is my opinion as a lawyer and as an individual, that that area of the function is the true provincial authority.

Now, we now go back to the introduction of the bill. In discussions with the federal government and the Minister of Finance, in which I engaged myself and visited him and talked to him on the telephone, he had this bill introduced. I do not think it was on the federal government's agenda—that it would be advanced in the time schedule that eventually turned out. It was my view that it was the people of Ontario—and those are the people who engage my concern—those are

the people who must be protected in the first instance—it was against that proposition that this bill was introduced and I said at that time that there was a hiatus between that date and some date in the future when the federal legislation would be made available, but that it was my view and belief that this area was properly a federal area of jurisdiction.

In winding up this debate, having heard those members of the Opposition speak on the matter, I just want to say this, we may have differences of opinion on political matters—and that is all right with me—but in this area, which is so significant and important to all of the people of this country, whether they be depositors or business people who depend on Canada's credit or, indeed, on Ontario's credit, I think that this matter must be approached in that sense.

It is against that undertaking I gave, when the original bill was introduced, that, once the federal legislation was available, this direction would be made and that companies under our jurisdiction, would take advantage of those sections of the federal Act so that a national scheme of deposit insurance would be available.

A national scheme of deposit insurance is something where companies operate on an interprovincial basis with branches in many provinces. Whether they have a charter from any one of the ten provinces or have a charter from the federal government, there are many problems that are involved under the legislation advanced by some of the other provinces which only confirm the great complexities that exist and affect the practicalities of dealing effectively with this situation.

So the introduction of this bill today, and the principle which it involves, has to do with implementing what the government of Ontario said—and no reference was made to this by any of the Opposition members who have spoken today—when the deposit bill was introduced in February.

This bill before us today is the fulfilment of the obligation and the commitment, given by the government of Ontario, when it introduced the first bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk to some phrases such as "piecemeal"—I do not think there is anything piecemeal. We said there would be something coming as, if and when the federal government enacted its legislation. They have done that and now here we are, against our commitment, saying we are now prepared to direct the companies for which we are responsible into that federal scheme.

There were many things said during the bill—during the remarks of the speakers who spoke earlier, including the question of jurisdictional responsibilities, but my mind has not changed. I have more information about some matters but there can be no doubt that the concern, which is this government's concern, is for the people of Ontario, and certainly, with respect to companies, those companies which exist on Ontario charters.

You have heard a lot about company law, The Corporations Act, and what the province's, or the jurisdiction authority and responsibility is, when it issues a charter.

I simply say this, Mr. Speaker, when this legislation was introduced I recognized those responsibilities and I am honouring the commitments I made when I presented this bill today. I said at that time that deposit insurance was desirable and I say it is still desirable today.

I would like to make an observation. I think this debate has wandered fairly far but I think I do have a right. I will simply pick one though, I think I have 14 items which I considered as irrelevant—but I would just like to pick one of them when they talked about rushing a bill through.

One of the criticisms that is often heard from the Opposition is that when action is required, this government does not take it. Yet when we do take it, Mr. Speaker, and advance legislation, and see a need, then they say, "You are doing it too fast." Now what in the world is the Opposition—

Mr. Bryden: We merely want you to take the action the circumstances require.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh, the member is not running again, so let us not get into that stuff. I am sorry he is not, because he might be more reasonable and calm in some of these current debates.

But you cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time, I tell you that. Both Opposition parties do it and, it does not sit well with either one of them.

Mr. Singer: Oh, your halo is tight this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is right. We talk about Ontario being behind. How can Ontario be behind when it was the first jurisdiction in this country to even produce effective legislation?

I tell you that any responsible representative of any financial institution, or knowledge-

able man in the finance field, sir, or any responsible person of any of the other 10 governments in this country, will tell you that this was good, effective and desirable legislation, not only in the interests of Ontario but in the interests of Canada as a nation.

I will tell you something further—that last night, or this morning, the Hon. Mitchell Sharp, talking about the conduct of securities matters in this province, made a public statement that there was no finer securities legislation in the world, than that which the Ontario government has enacted.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I suppose I do have a couple of kicks—I was going to say kicks at the cat but I did not mean it that way—but I did not take advantage of these other men speaking today. I suppose I get another 10 minutes or something of that sort, do I?

Mr. MacDonald: Take all the time you want. It is only four o'clock.

Mr. Bryden: You have not said anything yet.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: With respect to the deposit insurance corporation—in spite of the discourtesies, Mr. Speaker, you permit them to make—it is fully operative and active, and, if this House, under the guidance of the Opposition parties, chooses to turn down this amending bill in principle today, the deposit insurance corporation is ready, fit and willing, equipped, competent and able to carry on the operation of the deposit insurance scheme, as of the time when this bill is thrown out.

If that is your wish, we are ready. So we will look at it both ways, in case the House turns the bill down today.

Mr. MacDonald: You are very uncertain of your own supporters.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Not uncertain at all. You never saw me go at something without being protected from both sides, did you?

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know, but on some occasions I wonder.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: About the meeting in Ottawa—you are pretty lonesome over there. Mr. Speaker, do you notice the member for Downsview is all by himself in the front row?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Running the whole party.

An hon. member: As usual.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: He was doing that when Mr. Wintermeyer was leader of that party and when Mr. Thompson was leader. I will not say any more about that.

Mr. Bryden: You have not got so many supporters over there.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I tell you, he has got to look out for those people to his left, because they are making headway against the official Opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: About this meeting in Ottawa a couple of weeks ago, that conference was called with respect to the finance companies, not specifically those near banks or loan and trust companies, where legislalation was being considered in all of the provinces and in the federal House of Commons.

It was directed to that area of finance companies dealing with consumer credit disclosure, the cost of credit, and those other matters. But more important than that, it was designed and called—I wish my own Chairman of the House would lend me his ear.

Mr. MacDonald: You are very touchy this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, I was just listening to all you people mumbling and talking.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I have listened for so many hours to something which meant so little that I am just delighted to take up a little time and give you something worthwhile.

Mr. MacDonald: But you want to force us to listen; there is no freedom of choice.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: But you do not want to listen. You see, this is the hypocrisy of the Opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That meeting in Ottawa was designed to establish a continuing committee of Ministers to deal with financial

institutions in the total, broad sense and including loan and trust companies, but notwithstanding that it is our dedicated intention to carry on and finish the business started before in February with respect to the deposits of loan and trust corporations.

The leader of the Opposition has talked about avoiding duplication of government effort and money by reinstituting a separate Ontario income tax return. This is about one of the most interesting propositions that has ever been put before the people of Ontario in the last 20 years. We will avoid duplication and eliminate the wastage of money by throwing out the tax agreement with respect to the collection of money, and we are going to bring back a brand new form for everybody to fill out. I hope the people of Ontario will remember that.

Now, let me tell you what we did at the conference in April. We agreed that we would avoid duplication; and this government and the present federal government, quite frankly, will continue to cooperate in these fields so there will not be any duplication of inspection. A standard will be established whereby the facilities and the personnel of both governments will be put together in the public interest. This is well advanced.

Mr. Singer: Are you going to do that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, just listen to me for a moment.

Mr. Bryden: You have lost your grip completely.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us kick the cat around fairly.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is right, I will try to be fair.

Mr. Bryden: Get the right cat.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: These negotiations, implementing that federal conference, were going on all last week in this building—and we are making a lot of headway, and it is good headway.

Look at the accomplishments on consumer credit. You gentlemen must understand what is going on, or do you, and I put this to you—

Mr. Singer: We always have a little difficulty in following you.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I put this to you: I think there were three addresses with respect to this matter advanced by the Opposition, and that in replying to them I find it very difficult to reply because a good deal of what was said had no bearing on the facts of the case.

I put this proposition, Mr. Speaker, to the House—let the two Opposition parties vote against this bill, Mr. Speaker; to my own party, I urge them to support it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the hon.—I have the right to speak.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, I had the right of winding up.

Mr. Speaker: I have no desire to close off the debate. Every member has a right to speak, although it is customary that the Minister introducing the bill conclude the remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: You are right, Mr. Speaker, and it was not my intention to speak, but the Minister was very provocative and challenging and I propose to accept his challenge. The Minister has said he had two commitments.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: His first commitment, when he passed the bill for deposit insurance early in February, was that as soon as the federal bill came into effect and we had a national scheme for depsit insurance, that he would amend the bill so that we could coordinate it. That is fine. We supported that principle. We support it now. We think that deposit insurance is a good thing, and for reasons that my colleague from Riverdale spelled out, there is obviously wisdom in it being coordinated on the national level.

However, Mr. Speaker, there was a second commitment and this is the whole point—the Minister who charges us with being guilty of irrelevancies has failed really to come to grips with it. The second commitment is that having passed deposit insurance, you are now faced with the kind of anomaly that my colleague from Woodbine spoke about: the companies which are the least cautious in their administration offer six and a half per cent, while the normal, traditional more cautious companies are offering only five and three quarters per cent, or five and a half per cent.

In short, Mr. Speaker, you now need more careful regulation and supervision by this government, and we have not yet had from the Minister any indication of what he is going to do. He takes refuge in the generalities of, "this is our total approach."

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This is the principle of the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking and do I really have to have the Minister interrupt me or have I got the floor?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, I have been interrupted by you so many times—

Mr. MacDonald: Have I got the right to continue?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is better. Go ahead.

Mr. MacDonald: Well let us "kick the cat" around for a moment.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, a perfect example of how some of the rules of this House—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, there is no breach of the rules of this House when the Minister gets up and thinks he is going to pre-empt the last speech and provoke the Opposition; the Opposition have a right to speak and I am now going to exercise that right.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Minister in his very belligerent mood has challenged us. The one commitment he has lived up to; but on the second commitment, we do not know whether he is going to live up to it. We have no evidence that he is going to live up to it. The Minister himself has said that if we do not pass this bill there is no problem involved. We have our deposit insurance fund; everybody is protected. In other words, Mr. Speaker, for once we are not in a position to be rushed. Let us see the total picture before we buy another pig in a poke, like we had to back in February.

And so I accept the Minister's challenge. I move, seconded by my colleague the member for Riverdale, that the motion be amended by striking out the word "now" and adding the words "30 days hence."

Let us give the Minister an opportunity to have his full programme he has talked so much about.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on the amendment—

Mr. MacDonald: No, no. That does not go to him.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Have you a copy for me?

Mr. MacDonald: I think he got the import of my amendment. He does not need to have a copy of it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, if I may just address my remarks to the amendment. I am not impressed by the Minister's challenge, nor by the remarks of the member for York South in taking it up.

I said in my original remarks that I have more faith in those people in Ottawa, that they will properly administer this form of legislation, than I have—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Laugh as you may. Mr. Speaker, the Minister is so easy to get frustrated.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am not frustrated at all.

Mr. Singer: He now interjects, laughs and guffaws, accompanied by our infrequent visitor, the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Eaglesson), who comes here this afternoon. Welcome.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the point is substantially this. This government has indicated through its record, its complete inability to deal with financial matters in the province of Ontario. Those people who have suffered grievous loss as a result of this government's mismanagement are now going to be protected, fortunately by more capable administrators in Ottawa. Therefore, to that point, sir, we will support this, because the Ottawa people will take over.

As I say, this government is constitutionally incapable of setting its financial house in order—so we are getting the best out of a very poor world, but we will vote for the bill as it presently stands.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one brief comment on the amendment. We, in this group, believe that the time is long past when we can take things on faith in this vital area. After British Mortgage, after Atlantic Acceptance, after Prudential Finance, to name only three outstanding cases, we are not prepared to take anything on faith.

We want to see the laws, or the proposed laws, right on the table in front of us; and

we want to see them on the statute books. We want the programme on the barrelhead where everyone can see it; and we will take nothing on faith, either from this government, or from the government at Ottawa.

As the Minister himself has said, no harm will be done to anyone if there is a delay in implementing the bill that is now before us.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I did not say that at all, I said "if this House chooses." I did not say there was no harm at all. I believe the bill should be passed.

Mr. Bryden: There will be no substantial harm to anyone—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is not what I said.

Mr. Bryden: I will say then that the Minister did not say it. It was what I understood him to say, and it is self-evidently true that there will still be deposit insurance whether or not this bill goes through today. Therefore, we say that there is every reason in the world why we should have the full programme before us, if there is a programme, that is, if this is not just the one avenue that the government is taking and if it is not going to jeopardize public funds to cover up failures in other fields. This may be what it has in mind, I do not know. As I say, we want to see what it has in mind. I say it is fair and reasonable to ask the government within the next 30 days to show us what it is going to do. Let us debate it in this House and defer this bill for 30 days. That is really all the amendment proposes. As we have said earlier in this debate, as we said when the previous bill was before us, we are in favour of this principle but we think this legislation by itself is far from satisfactory. We want more and we want to see what more is going to be done.

So I say to the government that it ought to accept the suggestion contained in our amendment of holding this until the rest of its programme is before us. If it takes less than 30 days, that will be fine with us, but we are willing to give the government 30 days.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: You are?

Mr. Bryden: As far as we are concerned, we are willing to give the government 30 days.

Mr. MacDonald: You have had 30 years and have not done it up to now.

Mr. Bryden: Well, the government has been there since 1943, 24 years, and its record has been one of total failure in this field up until now. Total failure.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister without Portfolio): Oh, stop playing politics.

Mr. Bryden: One collapse after another, financial crisis after financial crisis, and the Minister has the nerve to stand up and puff up his chest as if he had accomplished something.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! The member should stay with the amendment.

Mr. Bryden: I have made my point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, we support this bill as it is drawn. Not that we think it is the most wonderful of all legislation, but at least it is better than nothing. We do not want any further delay in this matter. It is far wiser in the long run to have the banks and the trust companies and similar organizations controlled from Ottawa so that we have legislation the same across the country. Therefore this is our main reason that this bill should be passed—in order to assist deposit insurance being administered by Ottawa. I know the Minister said Mr. Sharp admired the legislation. I rather suspect that the provincial government, when it passed the first bill this year, got a good look at the legislation that is being proposed in Ottawa. I think it is very similar.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: They just were not fast enough.

Mr. Trotter: This is where the provincial government has been at fault. Over the years, the provincial government has, more or less, had the main influence in this field—in the trust and loan business, anything to do with the trust companies—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, no, we have not been the dominant factor.

Mr. Trotter: Well, it has certainly been one of the main ones, and the reason—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The federal government.

Mr. Trotter: The reason we have had to go through the necessity of debating the bill in the first place and now passing this amendment is that this government followed its usual course of events. It allowed a crisis to develop before it took any action.

This is why we have to now go through the necessity of passing this legislation. But no matter how much this government is at fault, I say let us get on with the job and get to work. We do not want any 30-day delay. It may be asking too much for this government to show some speed, but I hope it will. I think because of the demand from the public and the demand from the financial community itself that perhaps even this government will get off its backside and get to work on this subject. So we in this party are going to support this—

Mr. Bryden: This is one of the quickest switches I have ever seen.

Mr. Trotter: —legislation with the hope and the prayer that something is done. It is about time that this whole field of finance had proper and sensible control. In our view that sensible and proper control rests with the federal government in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister wish to speak to this?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There is nothing there to reply to.

Mr. Speaker: I would advise the House that this is the ordinary hoist motion and as such I must put the question that the word "now" stand as part of the motion. In other words, I would ask the House that the bill be now read a second time.

The House divided on the motion for second reading of Bill 97, An Act to amend The Ontario Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, which was carried by the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Apps	Bryden
Ben	Davison
Bernier	Freeman
Brunelle	Gisborn
Bukator	Lewis (Scarborough West)
Carruthers	MacDonald
Carton	Renwick
Cowling	Young—8.
Davis	
Downer	
Dunlop	
Dymond	
Eagleson	
Edwards	
Ewen	
Farquhar	
Gomme	
Gordon	
Grossman	
Guindon	
Hamilton	
Harris	
Haskett	
Hodgson (Scarborough East)	
Hodgson (Victoria)	
Johnston (Parry Sound)	
Kerr	
Knox	
Lawrence (Russell)	
Lawrence (St. George)	
Lewis (Humber)	
Mackenzie	
Morningstar	
McKeough	
Noden	
Oliver	
Paterson	
Peck	
Pittock	
Price	
Pritchard (Mrs.)	
Racine	
Reilly	
Reuter	
Rollins	
Rowe	
Rowntree	
Simonett	
Singer	
Smith	
Stewart	
Thrasher	
Trotter	
Villeneuve	
Wardrope	
Welch	
Wells	
Whicher	
Whitney	
Wishart	
Worton—61.	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 61, the "nays" 8.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 27th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
(*Continued*)

Vote 804 agreed to.

On vote 805:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, on vote 805, item No. 4. I think under this particular vote the public health officers would be involved and I understand from The Public Health Act there has been a certain amount of anticipated expansion of public health services. This would be the vote involved. I wonder if I could ask the Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, if this concerns proposed expanded facilities for the medical officers of health. Would that be correct?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Yes.

Mr. Trotter: There are two or three things under this particular matter I would like to—

Mr. Chairman: I was wondering if it would expedite the work of the House if, rather than dealing with items in sequence from 1 to 18 in this vote, we were to deal with them as we have in former votes under the sections.

Mr. Trotter: I am agreeable to that. If there is anyone prior to No. 4, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. Office of the executive director? Local health services branch?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is the one, No. 4.

Mr. Trotter: First of all, I do hope that the Minister in this anticipated new legislation is going to encourage multiple screening. This government in its past record has not, I believe, been very enthusiastic about medical officers of health encouraging multiple screening. Some of it has been done in this province. I think Dr. Dale in Wellington and, I believe, a Dr. Bull in Scarborough, have done much to encourage this.

I think at one time in this House I mentioned that attempts were made by Dr. Dale to obtain grants from the province of Ontario for expanded services of the medical officers of health in order to carry on multiple screening. At one time he was turned down and then he went to the federal government and was able to obtain the grant.

When I was investigating this particular matter I was rather amused to learn that the man who made the grants possible for multiple screening and for Dr. Dale's particular area, was a man by the name of Dr. Charron, then working for the federal government. Now that gentleman is the Deputy Minister of Health for Ontario. It is quite possible that these new suggestions for expanded programmes have come from the Deputy Minister. I hope so, because certainly we on this side of the House support such an approach to the office of the medical officer of health.

You can use the old adage, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." I think this is what is behind this whole idea of multiple screening. I do not intend to go into this in detail, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt the Minister is well aware of this particular programme that took place under Dr. Dale. Just for the benefit of the members I would like to give you some idea of what can be learned by carrying out what is called the programme of multiple screening.

This is the scheme under public health—particularly under the medical officer for public health—of canvassing an entire area if at all possible, or even a certain section of it, in order to have people take various tests to ascertain what their health condition is.

For example, in the area that Dr. Dale serves, in the general Fergus area—that is Fergus, Ontario—they got together a number of volunteers to go from door to door urging people to go to the various clinics that were set up to take their tests. They canvassed 1,214 people and I am surprised that the average person took the interest they did in such a campaign. Of the people who were canvassed, nearly 62 per cent appeared at the clinics to take the various checkups that the medical health officer had to offer. Of the 100 per cent canvassed, about 9.5 per cent did not attend simply because they said they were going to their own doctor and were under active medical treatment.

So, counting the 61.7 per cent or the 62 per cent who did go and the slightly less than 10 per cent who did have medical attention previously, approximately 72 per cent of the people in that particular area were receiving medical treatment. Only a little less than six per cent objected to the whole scheme.

This shows, I think, the changing attitudes of the general public. I would imagine a number of years ago people would have called this just interference, having a medical health officer send canvassers to your door asking you to come and get a checkup.

Well, this system obviously has cost some money. The federal grants are being supplied and now I am sure the province is going

to take an interest. It will, in the long run, play a great part in preserving the health of our people. Also in the long run it saves money, because many of these people who were examined were found to have diabetes. In some cases TB was discovered, although today with our checkups on TB this is not quite so common. By multiple screening it is possible to find cancer in its early stages. It is possible to find many diseases that can be cured if discovered early enough.

I hope that after I sit down the Minister may give some indication of what he intends to do, particularly in encouraging the medical officers of health to carry on the multiple screening. It is true that in many ways we are hampered by a lack of trained personnel but it would seem that in the Fergus area they have been able to overcome this to some extent. What has been learned by the people who have had the courage to carry on pilot projects, we can apply to the province as a whole.

I commend the Minister for making some effort in this regard. What some of us may question—perhaps being in the Opposition for a while and watching this government—we have become a bit cynical of what it intends to do when it actually passes the legislation. But any legislation that encourages the public health facilities of this province can be good and useful legislation, as long as the personnel and the wherewithal is also provided.

As long as we have not created an empty shell, then I would hope that this will be a department of government that will expand and do very necessary good work. There are certainly a number of experienced medical men and others interested in this field who will be watching the government very closely in regard to the new legislation which has passed in this House at this sitting and which will affect the particular grant under this vote.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the use of these particular grants which will be under the authority of The Public Health Act also affects not only a thing like multiple screening, but what is even more imminent and what could be used in the very immediate future. That is the follow up service, the check up.

I think under your medical officer of health if a person has had TB there is a follow up system. Or if a person has had VD, there is a follow up system. This is most necessary in order that they keep the disease in check. Where your medical officer of health could be most useful is in the treatment of the mentally ill, because one of the great weaknesses in our present system here in Ontario and the care of the mentally ill is the after care system. I know that the hospitals have their outpatient services and, for the facilities they have, they do a good job. But if we had follow up services run through the public health unit—particularly if that public health unit was based on a particular area—if we had expanded our facilities so that we had a public health unit serving an area, we could do a tremendous amount to protect the health of our people. Where we need this follow up service from our public health units and where it has fallen down is best emphasized in the case of a man who recently killed his wife and committed suicide in the Hamilton area.

I just want to read this short item from the Toronto *Globe and Mail* dated, March 2, 1967, because it proves, Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make and the necessity of this particular vote and the importance of it. The dateline is Hamilton and it is very recent, March 2:

> —a recommendation that persons who are severely unbalanced mentally be checked at least once a year was made yesterday by a coroner's jury investigating the death of a Mrs. Steven Pucco and her husband on their West Flamboro township market garden farm on New Year's day.

Then, of course, the article goes into the fact that Mr. Pucco had used a knife and killed his wife and himself.

Now Mr. Pucco had been under mental treatment. He had been in an Ontario hospital in Hamilton in July of 1962, after he had tried to kill himself.

Later on, he was discharged and then eventually the tragedy took place. If we had had a public health unit to follow up on this it might not have happened. It is quite true that you cannot guarantee anybody full protection from themselves, or from anybody else, but, Mr. Chairman, this headline summarizes the verdict of the coroner's jury and that is, a yearly check up urged for the mentally disturbed.

Surely it is a sensible verdict and a verdict with which anyone who has had anything to do with depressions and emotional illnesses, will wholeheartedly agree.

It is a verdict that echoes the pleas that many of us have made in this chamber over the years—that this particular department of our public health units should be expanded,

especially in dealing with those that have been mentally ill.

If an after care programme was developed through our public health services, we would certainly be assisting those who need the help and, in the long run, it would cut down this turnover of 60 per cent.

As the hon. Minister knows, Mr. Chairman, 60 per cent of all the people discharged from our mental hospitals return to those hospitals and in large part because of the lack of after care.

The government today is going to find, more and more that, it will be financially responsible for the upkeep and the maintenance of the public health units. As in so many phases of government today, we find that there are really only two places to get the money—and we say this in almost every department that comes up—there are the federal government and the provincial government.

Even beginning on the work that the public health officers have done, so much of it is started with grants from the federal government and then followed along by grants from the provinces. In some cases the provinces come first, but I think even today, despite this expanded programme that the federal government with 11 grants, gives here in the province, there is still probably more money spent on health by the federal government than there is by the government of the province of Ontario.

But these things are going to have to be expanded and this is where the government is going to have to raise the money. When I used the term that more money is spent on health by the federal government, I mean in relation to the various grants that are given.

We are going to go through the funds that are voted on this particular vote, Mr. Chairman, and we are going to have to let the medical officers of health in on what patients are discharged from mental hospitals, so that we can have a follow up.

I believe that, in most cases today, and certainly in the immediate past, that if a mental patient was discharged from a mental institution, the medical officer of health had little or no information. What we are going to have to do, is to keep the medical officer of health informed and see to it they have the staff to follow up on this type of people.

It is not that the government has had no experience in this, because there have been some areas where the medical officer of health has attempted to expand the services in treating the mentally ill, and has got little thanks for it—and I can again use a practical illustration.

At the initiative of the mental hospitals in St. Thomas and London, the public health officers were brought into the picture—that is they were brought into the picture to take care of patients that were going to be discharged from the St. Thomas and London mental hospitals.

They arranged and cooperated in follow-up of mental patients in their own areas, and we may ask, "Well, why do they not do it in Hamilton?" Once, the medical officer of health in Welland county had a good follow-up programme arranged. It was doing well when a local mental health clinic went into operation, a clinic that quickly became so overloaded that it could not begin to handle the most serious cases who had been admitted to the Ontario mental hospital at Hamilton.

But what did The Department of Health do about it? It cancelled the follow-up that was working so well.

Then the medical officer of health in St. Catharines sought to set up the same kind of cooperation he had been involved in, in a previous post connected with the Ontario hospital in St. Thomas.

Again, the Hamilton Ontario hospital turned him down. He had a local clinic at the general hospital, overloaded with treating important but not as serious cases, as are dealt with by the provincial hospital at Hamilton.

Doubtless on department orders—now I am not sure of this, but I would not be a bit surprised—this particular medical officer of health was refused the help he wanted, and used the local general hospital clinic as his excuse.

Here is an instance in the Hamilton area, where an attempt was made to have a follow-up service, particularly in the county of Welland, in treating people who were discharged from a mental hospital.

This has not been encouraged as it should have been. In fact, it has obviously, in some cases, been discouraged and I want to emphasize to the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, the importance of using the public health office, of using our medical officers of health as the key men in developing after care services.

This does not just necessarily involve mental health, but I am emphasizing the mental health matter because I think it is the one big single problem that this department

has to face, and to which this department has not been facing up.

Again, I give it credit where it has done something, where it has started pilot projects; but too often they are dis-pilot projects and do not come to grips with the real heart of the matter, which is a large problem and which is going to entail a far greater effort than the government has made over the past number of years.

Our record of people that are returned to our mental hospitals is a disgrace, and shows that we need to do more than we have.

Under this particular vote, and under this particular item, is the area where a great deal can be done in prevention. Again, I say, the taxpayer is saved many, many thousands of dollars, providing we take the interest that is necessary.

And one last item; we can—under this particular vote—save money and, at the same time, give our people a better treatment. If, under our medical officers of health, we develop a better home-care programme than we have today, we are saving the taxpayer a great deal of money. Again, I quote a pilot project carried on in the Wellington-Dufferin area by Dr. B. T. Dale and I just quote from "Hospital Highlights," a publication that is circulated among all the members. I think these six lines or seven lines sum up what can be done by a good home-care system, carried out by a medical officer of health. This is what the "Hospital Highlight" says:

> Dr. B. T. Dale, medical officer of health for Wellington-Dufferin told the audition that the integrated Wellington-Dufferin home-care plan, administered by the Victorian order of nurses, saved 2,890 patient days in active treatment hospitals, and 1,450 days in chronic hospitals during the first year of operation. At roughly $27.00 per day in an active hospital, and $17.00 per day in a chronic hospital, the bill would have been $89,930, said Doctor Dale. Instead it was only $44,620 for providing the home care.

Well, there is a system of home-care that saves the taxpayer $45,000 and again, it can come under your medical officer of health. It is one more reason why this is an extremely important vote and I think we are seeing the beginning of a great expansion in this field and I do hope that the Minister has the interest and the energy in order to make this an extremely important arm of his department if it is properly organized, particularly on an area system.

I notice by your grants under The Public Health Act, you are encouraging the area system which I commend. In other words, those communities will become part of an area—or a regional administration—and will receive, I think, 75 per cent of their costs and grants.

This is a very good thing and a most needed thing. But in closing, I do again, Mr. Chairman, emphasize the need for medical officer of health supervision under these public health services in treating the mentally ill for after care. The case in Hamilton just recently need not have happened, and yet we see the coroner's jury of laymen realizing that something has to be done in this problem. We may be seeing the beginning of action by this government but it has been a long time coming.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, these matters which the hon. member brought up are very much the programmes that are in the mind of the department to aim toward and point out as provincial objectives. Heretofore, and I think this is traditional in the province, we have always left the decision regarding the public health programme to the local medical officer of health, whether he be serving a single municipality or whether he be the medical advisor, medical director of a unit.

The public health programme which he believed best served the needs of the people whom he serves was the programme which was accepted. Certain basics were expected and demanded of any public health department that benefited by public moneys. In the case of a unit it must establish a basic programme before it qualifies for provincial and federal grants. But apart from this, a medical officer of health was left free to determine, in order that he might best serve the needs of his own people, the additional programmes he would put into effect.

The hon. member is just a little bit out in one or two instances. It is quite true that there was no provincial money to support the programme in Wellington-Dufferin. First of all, it came after my estimates had been passed; it was then they made the application. But immediately we received the application we did with it what is always done in a case of that kind. If there is money still left in that portion of the national health grant available to the province of Ontario; we made application.

It is quite true that Dr. Charron was then made director of that phase of the work at the federal level and, of course, he did as

he would do no matter what the programme was. If it was worthy of support and the money was available to us, he allocated that money, and this how the Wellington-Dufferin programme was supported by federal health grants.

I may say we supported the Scarborough programme exactly the same way out of federal health grants which are made available to us. I think I have to point out to the hon. member, sir, that the federal government does not spend quite as much in health as the provincial government. The total federal health moneys available to us for grant purposes amount to $18 million of which $4.4 million is the public health grant.

That $18 million includes the capital construction grant for hospitals; it includes the mental health grant; it includes the cancer control grant, the maternal and child welfare grant, the physical-medical rehabilitation grant. It includes all the grants that are available to us.

Mr. Trotter: I think there is—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think there are seven, if I recall right. I am not sure if I hit all of them or not. But these are the large ones; $4.4 million is that portion allocated for public health grant. There is another large one there, the laboratories grant—public health research is about $2 million, is it not? Something of that order. These are the large ones.

It is possible, if we do not utilize all of one grant by application to the federal department of health, to have a transfer made from one to the other. However, we usually make full use of each grant for its particular purpose. We make use of all of the money and I would be less than honest if I said we did not appreciate it. But it is from that money that these programmes were supported.

The province is going to put more money of its own into this total public health programme. And one of the first things we are going to do is to meet with the medical officers of health jointly, in order to come to a concensus concerning provincial objectives. May 24 is the kick-off to this expanded programme. We have already invited every medical officer of health, and the chairman and secretary of every health board, be it a unit or a municipal health board, to attend the meeting when we will jointly discuss these matters and try to arrive at provincial objectives.

When I presented the amendment to The Public Health Act having to do with these matters, I made a fairly complete statement outlining the phases which we believed should be included in the provincial objectives; one of which is the multiphasic screening. We believe this is a good programme. We have learned this from experience—experience with matters which the province of Ontario itself instigated, that is the mass TB surveys and one or two others. But this is the main one, this is the one from which we have learned most. We have learned that it is largely possible to control serious diseases in this way.

However, there are differences and I think that we have to recognize that there are differences. Tuberculosis and venereal disease, are two diseases the hon. member mentioned which are epidemic, or they are infectious diseases and therefore constitute a public health hazard. We can, by law, demand that people subject themselves to an examination in these cases. We cannot demand that one by law subject himself to an examination to determine whether he has high blood pressure, heart disease or diabetes.

But of course, the hon. member did point out a very interesting sidelight of this programme, that a very large number of the people in a community are willing to accept these services.

Mr. Trotter: Sixty-two per cent.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, and in some places it is even better than that. As the programmes become popular, we are quite certain, in our own minds, that more and more people will accept these services. There will always be the hardcore but it is rather interesting to watch how this hardcore becomes smaller and smaller, as this comes along.

Multiphasic screening has been very much before our attention recently, since we got the first view of the reports of the select committee on aging, in which they believed, out of the depth of their studies and experience, that it would be a good thing.

We agreed with this and, in our minds, this is one of the provincial objectives towards which we shall urge all our health units to strive.

The hon. member mentioned—and while this is straining, it is a good place to bring it in—he mentioned the follow-up of patients discharged from the mental hospitals. Here again we get into a rather difficult area.

It is quite true that the tubercular patient and the VD patient is reported to the medical officer of health. This is mandatory under

The Public Health Act and the public health officer must know about them.

No matter what doctor or what institution becomes aware of the appearance of either of those diseases, also in the case of a whole host of other infectious diseases which would pose a hazard to the public health, the medical officer of health must, by law, be advised of them.

Mental illness is an entirely different illness and it is quite true that St. Thomas and the London area have built up a rapport between their hospital and the public health authorities in that area. This happens in other areas too, but this is not something that you can mandate.

If, between the directors of the hospitals and the directors of the public health services, you can establish that good rapport, and if the patients and their families are willing that this should be done, then this is fine, but I have to emphasize this is something you cannot mandate.

Oftentimes patients and their families say they want to go back to their family physician, who is advised, or ought to be advised, each time a patient is discharged from the hospital. This is routine hospital procedure.

We would like to see the medical officer of health brought more and more into this, and we do what we can to encourage it, but we cannot order it as we can in the case of infectious diseases.

I would have to emphasize, too, that The Department of Health did not close up the operation at Welland, nor did we discourage the medical officer of health. If he felt that we were discouraging him then his feelings are completely astray, because this is not so. The community mental health clinic was taken over by the group working out of the hospital, but this is an operation which the provincial Department of Health finances in total.

Prior to that, we were getting a little help out of the public health grants for the public health clinic, but now we do not get any assistance out of this. But we believe, and I am of the opinion, that the public health authorities are involved in this operation. There is no reason why they should not be involved. Looking at the public health service in the regional context, we believe that the medical officer of health is the coordinating force for all regional health services. There is no separation of any one aspect, or one facet of the service. We believe the medical officer of health is the man best equipped and best situated to do this job, and it is to this end we shall seek to encourage him and to direct his activities.

The hon. member spoke about the home care programme of which we are very much in agreement, and again when I presented the estimates I alluded to the expansion of these home care programmes. I might say that we did support this and we do support the Wellington-Dufferin service. The only change in its financing is that instead of drawing the 50 per cent from the federal health grant as we have done heretofore, we are taking the 50 per cent from our own budget and joining it to the other 50 per cent provided through the Ontario hospital services commission budget to finance these.

We recognize that this is a very excellent programme. We are anxious, and we are seeking, to encourage these programmes now to admit patients directly from home to the programme—that is rather a peculiar way of putting it—to admit one from his own home to his own home care. But rather than have a hospital based programme, we are seeking to encourage home based programmes as well, because we think that we can not only save money, but we also believe that we can catch illness earlier. And if some expert, visiting and nursing care is available to one before he becomes seriously ill, then it is much better for the patient and better for us economically.

Mr. Chairman: Does this section carry?

Mr. Trotter: No: there is quite a bit on this particular vote. Are we going into the private members' hour? I will let it go, then.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report it has come to a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the order in this private members' hour is resolution No. 3, shown under "other motions" on page six of the order paper.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 3, by Mr. Thrasher.

RESOLUTION: That, in furtherance of its conservation programme, the government should: (a) formulate a long-term programme for the planning and coordination of water management on a regional basis; (b) encourage the establishment of citizens' committees on a regional basis to publicize the importance of each citizen's role in preventing pollution and to bring forward suggestions; (c) enact legislation to ensure that all detergents sold in the province be biodegradable by not later than June, 1969; (d) call upon the federal government to initiate an industrial loan fund to assist with the cost of pollution-control facilities and to continue the tax incentive programme now in effect.

Mr. I. W. Thrasher (Windsor-Sandwich): I move the resolution. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on this resolution today because I feel and feel strongly, that pollution is probably one of the greatest problems facing man today. As the resolution reads, it is broken up into four parts, (a), (b), (c), (d). For those in the House who do not have the resolution in front of them, I shall read it.

(a) Formulate a long-term programme for the planning and coordination of water management on a regional basis; (b) encourage the establishment of citizens' committees on a regional basis to publicize the importance of each citizen's role in preventing pollution and to bring forward suggestions; (c) to enact legislation to ensure that all the detergents sold in the province be biodegradable by no later than June, 1969; (d) call upon the federal government to initiate an industrial loan fund to assist with the cost of pollution control facilities and to continue the tax incentive programme now in effect.

Mr. Speaker, we will now deal with part (a). Water is the basic essential to all life, and man's needs for clean water are constantly increasing. The ease with which we can turn on a tap and get drinkable water has made most of us cease to realize that we have a problem. As industry continues to expand, our demands for available water become more difficult to satisfy. Water comes from one or more of the following sources: a well or subterranean or ground water; an artificial lake; natural river or lake.

Every locality needs one of these sources to supply its needs to the community. Sometimes a municipality is curtailed in development because of insufficient water or sewage treatment to take care of its needs.

The fantastic dimensions of this problem extend beyond municipal boundaries and solutions to these problems must be provincial, with assistance from the federal government.

Therefore, accurate forecasts are needed followed by careful planning. These plans must be continually upgraded, so that the critical water shortages and pollution will be a thing of the past.

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, water is the fastest, easiest and cheapest method of transportation, and I believe that we should be using water to move our waste to the disposal plants, but we must also devise better, and cheaper, methods of cleansing water back to its original form after it is used.

The surprising thing about the use of water, is that there is exactly the same amount of water on earth as there was millions of years ago, but the problem is to get the water where it is needed.

We really do not consume water, we just borrow it briefly and return it to its environment. Take the city of Detroit, for instance. Once all the reservoirs and users of water fill up, there is exactly the same amount of water pouring back into the Detroit River as there is pumped into the city.

However, it is not pouring back in the same condition as before. My contention is, and this is very strong, that each and every human must pay his price for returning water to a clear state again after making it dirty.

That is why we will undoubtedly have to have many more stringent laws to enforce man to adhere to this regulation.

The province of Ontario has a world-recognized record in water pollution control. This recognition is evidenced by the number of agencies from other jurisdictions which have sought the advice of our Ontario water resources commission, and have used it as a model for water management and pollution control agencies of their own.

The resolution I am introducing, recognizes the important achievements that have been made in Ontario water pollution control. However, while much has been done, much more remains to be done.

The resolution asks the government to formulate a long-term programme for the planning and coordination of water management

on a regional basis. I believe this regional basis is very important, because no two regions have the same problem.

Take, for instance, northern Ontario, which certainly does not have the same problems as southern Ontario. Nor does southern Ontario have the same problems as Toronto.

For most effective participation in the development of regional policies, they should be the product of regional government. It is evident that for sufficient water to be provided to industry and homes, and in order for it to be kept clean, regional cooperation is a prerequisite. Some cities in the province have taken full advantage of the progressive programmes available from the province and have clean rivers and marvellous riverfront parks.

Others, upstream from them, may have decided that such programmes were of less priority, and the result is that the polluted water from upstream flows through even a city attempting to keep its waters clean. The regional concept has been applied in a more limited way but with great success by the conservation authorities.

This should now be applied to economic and political regions, where the main objective is continued human, domestic and commercial use of the water.

I would like to say a little about our Ontario water resources commission. The OWRC was formed in 1956 for the purpose of assisting municipalities with their water supply and sewage treatment problems. When the Hon. L. M. Frost introduced the bill, he emphasized that both the distribution of water and the elimination of pollution, were duties and responsibilities of the municipal government. The conception of the bill was that water and sewage disposal would be a cost.

The current statute provides for a considerable degree of provincial responsibility in both water supply and pollution control, while the municipality plays the role of the retailer. The importance of clean water for the people of our province, in terms of health and industrial development, cannot be over-emphasized, and our government intends to continue to direct its attention to this very important matter.

Undoubtedly, regional water pollution control planning must be on a broader base than by individual municipalities, and must take into account the water conservation and flood control measures being carried out by the conservation authorities.

The conservation authorities certainly are an integral part of clean water, because runoff, with its pesticides, can be just as damaging to the water as probably some factory pouring its residue into the same stream.

I would say this is why it is very important that local municipalities work together, in water conservation, water supply and pollution control. There are now something like 36 conservation authorities. I might add that I am trying to set up one in Essex county. We are going to have a meeting on May 16 and my hope is that this authority becomes a reality.

These projects would have been impossible had the single municipality tried to make them a reality. Working in conjunction with The Department of Energy and Resources Management the provincial government and the federal government, the conservation authority provides a unique example of coordinating effort through regional organization.

This conservation plan takes in such matters as land use, recreation, engineering, forestry, wildlife and what-have-you. It is only by tying them together on a regional and provincial basis that they can be made effective.

Long-range integral planning through the Ontario water resources commission and the conservation authorities, working on a regional basis, is a must. The Ontario water resources commission has been very successful in well over a hundred projects where they have negotiated, and taken over, complete programmes of municipalities.

The results of this programme have a very beneficial effect on overall water programme management. There are a few municipalities yet to take advantage of OWRC, but soon the whole province will be on a network that will be second to none in the world.

Undoubtedly one of man's biggest problems is with industry. Industry has spent well over $100 million in treatment facilities in the last few years. This must be added to the cost of selling their goods. However, this is a necessity because we cannot continue to pour residue from industry into our rivers and lakes.

The OWRC is divided into five divisions which are as follows: research, construction, plant operations, sanitary engineering and water resources. The Ontario water resources commission has certainly done a lot, since its inception, to alleviate some of the problems which we have today.

The OWRC's main objective is to ensure maintenance of public water supply in a safe

condition for domestic consumption and for other uses—and this includes proper treatment of sanitary and industrial wastes before they are discharged into rivers and streams.

The other objective is to make it possible for municipalities to finance modern water and sewage treatment works. The commission programme has been designed to aid in the construction and financing of these works for any municipality that may be in need.

When the Ontario water resources commission came into being in 1957, under Bill 164 of the Legislature, it was estimated that $2.4 billion from all sources would be required over a 20-year period, to meet water and sewage works requirements throughout the province.

The OWRC has wide powers and includes the supervision of all surface waters and ground waters in Ontario used as a source of water supply.

The commission also has the right to examine any surface waters or ground waters in Ontario from time to time to determine what, if any, pollution exists under section 30 of the Act.

Under The Sewage Works Act, section 37, sewage works shall, at all times, be maintained, kept in repair and operated in such manner, with such facilities as may be directed from time to time by the commission.

Under section 27 of the Act, it says:

> Every municipality and person who discharges, or deposits any material of any kind into or in any well, lake, river, pond, spring, stream, reservoir or watercourse on the in-shore bank thereof, or into any place that may impair the quality of such well, lake, river, pond, spring, stream, reservoir or the water or watercourse, is guilty of an offence and, on conviction, is liable to a penalty of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for a term of not more than one year, or both.

I only reiterate these parts of the Act to show that the OWRC definitely has the power to make pollution control a reality, but this is going to take time and a lot of money.

I am sure the OWRC is going to have to become much more forceful before this becomes a complete reality. For instance, the division of sanitary engineering investigates all cases of pollution as they become known. The trouble is traced to the course and every effort is made to persuade the offender—municipality, industry or individual—to remedy the situation.

I say that municipalities should take advantage of the many facets of water and sewage facilities that are available under OWRC and its highly trained staff. These men are highly trained and, I personally believe, much better equipped to handle the problems of municipalities than the municipalities themselves.

With the high cost today of installing these underground installations, sir, municipalities really have no option but to take advantage of this service. The water resources commission is to be commended on the fine work it is doing in Ontario and it is to be hoped that they continue to put teeth into the Act, so that in the very near future, Ontario will be the one place in the world where pollution ceases to exist and we will have the cleanest water in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with part two of the resolution. The second proposal in this resolution is related to the first. Government should encourage the establishment of citizens' committees on a regional basis, to publicize the importance of each citizen's role in preventing pollution, and to bring forward new suggestions.

Government simply cannot legislate clean water and sit back and hope that everyone is going to do their job in helping to keep it clean. The cleanliness of our water, as well as the cleanliness of our streets and parks, depends on the individual's desire to refrain from dirtying it.

Industrial concerns are a valid and ready target for scrutiny in taking pollution control measures. The regional citizens' committees, I propose could form the basis for increasing regional cooperation, as regional representative government becomes a reality.

They could provide an important element of participation and help people to realize their involvement with water pollution and its prevention. They could bring forward suggestions for cooperation, within the region, for uses which might be made of clean water; and for standards of cleanliness acceptable to the citizens of the region. Here might be a very good place to bring up the point of our boats polluting our waters.

I suppose many of you know, or have seen, boaters out in the lakes dumping waste over the side, as well as big freighters dumping their oil into the water. Fortunately, our government is taking steps to control this method of pollution, but government cannot stand back and watch every boat out in the lake. Our people must realize that they are part of the "keep the waters of Ontario

clean" and not dump everything into the lake at will.

Mr. Speaker, my next two points concern industry. Municipal pollution control measures are proceeding with a broad programme of construction and operation assistance provided by the province, sir. In the area of industrial pollution control, much more remains to be done. Some people have called for full application of legislation against the industries which are now polluting waters. A great deal has been accomplished. All new industrial concerns in this province must have approved treatment facilities if they are connected to the municipal sewage system. A large number of outstanding large concerns have led the way in construction of full treatment facilities and these industries should be congratulated.

There is one example, Mr. Speaker, in the Wabash project in Labrador, in which waters obtained from nearby lakes, before it is returned, is passed through a filtering system to restore it to its purity. It seems rather odd that so much care is being taken to prevent pollution of water in the tiny chain of lakes in a land which is one-third water, one-third muskeg and one-third rock, and thousands of miles from civilization. Nonetheless, it is all part of an overall effort to create a fine place to live and work and taking only that which is needed, leaving the rest of the land unspoiled. Perhaps from Dofasco, in Labrador, we could take a lesson in water pollution control.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is necessary for our citizens to play a big role in this anti-pollution control. One of the suggestions I am going to make is that if all the men in the province of Ontario had to carry out the garbage for one month, I am sure we would devise methods where garbage disposal units would be used, flushing the residue into the sewers, on down to the plants, and turning the residue into fertilizer. Right here in Toronto, Eaton's is selling the processed sewage from one of Toronto's sewage disposal plants. Milwaukee sells a fertilizer called the "So-Green Fertilizer".

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can go on letting our organic fertilizer be buried or be dumped into the rivers and streams. I think it is high time we did some research on this problem and once again turned this organic fertilizer back into the soil. I am afraid that if we do not look ahead, our children's children will be suffering from lack of organic fertilizer in the soil.

In St. Petersburg, Florida, there is a composting plant at work on a large scale, producing high efficient organic fertilizers made from garbage. This plant was built by Westinghouse Electric, which has a subsidiary in Canada. Perhaps we should see them about building one for us here in Ontario.

Mechanical composting processes can be adapted to any size of community, from village to metropolis, and certainly cannot be compared to our garbage dumps. In addition, the process is aerobic. It creates no nuisance and may be placed adjacent to residential areas, eliminating long truck hauls. They eliminate air pollution from incinerating garbage and refuse and will eliminate a number of sewage disposal plants.

This could well be the answer to our pollution control, when we have heavy rain storms that flush the water right through the plants and into the streams. I think it is high time we took a look at this method of disposing of our garbage and turned it into organic materials that can be returned to the land and help enrich market gardens and farmlands. Humus is a real wealth, which creates maximum fertility, resulting in greater quantities of food production.

I would here suggest that our citizens band together in regions and come up with suggestions to help obliterate this vexing problem, because only if we do, and do it fast, will we be able to improve the lives of others behind us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will deal with part three of the resolution. I really do not go into this as part of the resolution, because I believe it is almost solved. However, Canada's detergent makers are committed by voluntary agreement to make what is called biodegradable detergents. This means we will no longer be plagued by rivers, wells and taps that sometimes gurgle with semi-brown bubbles.

The cause of this scum has been ABS—alkyl, benzine, sulphanite—a chemical that washes whiter than white, but at the same time it makes it difficult to break down suds after they leave the tub. Suds might seem to disappear once they have gone down the drain, only to bubble up again when normal sewage treatment process prove ineffective in breaking them down.

United States companies have spent an estimated $150 million in developing and producing a new chemical, called LAS, linear, alkylate, sulphanate. This has been in use in the United States since 1965. LAS is biodegradable. By the time your wash water has been through the sewage treatment plant,

it will be reduced by about 95 per cent if it has LAS, compared to 40 to 60 per cent with the old formula.

I should mention at this point that biodegradable means to be broken down by biological organisms. Most Canadian detergents until recently were not altered by the sewage treatment process. They would pass right through the sewage plants and create an unsightly foam that could be seen in the streams.

In the United States voluntary conversion to this production of such a detergent was completed by June, 1965. Conversion in Canada has been somewhat slower, although an estimated 90 per cent of production was to be converted by the end of 1966. Legislation would simply ensure that the chemical industry completes its stated programme within a reasonable time limit.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go to section four of the resolution.

Canada and the United States have a mutual obligation set out in article four of the boundaries water treaty of 1909, to see that the waters flowing across the boundaries are not polluted on either side to the injury of health or property of the other. The beginning of the considered attack on pollution of the Great Lakes system began in October, 1964, with a request for the two governments that the international joint commission undertake to study the pollution in Lake Erie, Ontario, and the international section of the St. Lawrence River. In conducting this study, the commission established international boards of experts drawn from both countries.

The national study, noting a serious and deteriorating situation, particularly in Lake Erie, sent an interim report to the government on December 28, 1965, recommending that they, in association with the state and provincial governments, take action as soon as possible to ensure: (a) maximum possible removal of phosphates from waste water, before discharging it into the waters under study of their tributaries; (b) prohibition of construction of combined sanitary and storm sewers and initiation of a programme of separating existing combined sewers; and (c) regular sampling of effluence.

In the United States, a campaign against pollution has been started by the federal government under The Water Quality Act of 1965 and it has the power to establish standards on navigable waters if the states fail to act before 1967.

In Canada, water resources are largely a provincial responsibility although the federal government has certain specific obligations, including those arising under the boundary water treaty. In addition the federal government has recognized the responsibility to assist in research to provide financial assistance to municipalities and industries, to formulate national policies in consultation with the provinces. The most recent example of federal-provincial cooperation in this field was the national conference in Montreal from October 31 to November 4, 1966, on environmental pollution, under the sponsorship of the Canadian council of resources Ministers.

The new federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources is responsible for coordinating work of the federal agencies in relation to water pollution in liaison with provincial agencies and the council of the resources Ministers. The federal government will bear, in addition to its own contribution, about half the cost incurred by Ontario in directly supporting the continuing water pollution studies of the Great Lakes by the international joint commission.

Furthermore federal and provincial research programmes will be coordinated in cooperation with the United States agencies also engaged in this study by the commission.

The results of the present programme will provide guidance for broader investigations of the Great Lakes in which the federal government and the province will continue to participate. Over $1.5 million have been invested in studies of the lower lakes this year—90 per cent of the cost being borne by the federal government. It is intended that this investment shall grow from year to year reaching an estimated level of over $5 million by 1970. I might point out here that the United States federal government is doing much and putting a lot of focus on clean waters. There are many, many pamphlets urging the citizens to help in the clean water programme.

With the United States and Canada having so many thousands of miles on the Great Lakes watershed it is imperative that we work in conjunction, or that our federal government and the United States federal government work in conjunction with one another so that we will be working towards a common denominator. I think this is a long-term programme. The governments are now working on recommendations for sewage treatment, collective practices, master planning of integrated systems. This study should include, the amount of water municipalities and industry need for a given area. How much water is available; what are the sources

of pollution; the quantity and variation; what will be the demands of the resultant waste—10, 20 and 50 years from now? How do present uses affect the water resources; what quality water must be achieved to accommodate the desired beneficial uses; what is required to make the used water re-usable; how much will the necessary pollution control cost?

We must recognize that we must maintain water quality at a level that will permit water re-use if we are to meet water requirements essential to continued expansion of the national economy and well being.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to reiterate some of the more important points that I have covered.

1. Better techniques in sewage treatment be developed in order that the pollution reaching the waterways be reduced and effluent quality maintained.

2. Greater emphasis placed upon the importance of all phases of research in order to maintain clean water.

3. The fact that northern Ontario has 69 per cent of the province's fresh water should be given consideration, to have a representative on the OWRC.

4. Latest methods should be devised to turn raw sewage into humus fertilizer.

5. The province encourage regional citizens' committees and give guidance on how they might assist in the clean water programme.

6. Make sure that all companies selling detergents change over to a biodegradable product by a given date.

7. Work in close conjunction with the federal government and pollution control facilities.

8. Long range integral planning through OWRC and the conservation authorities on a regional basis.

9. Set up new regional offices throughout the province.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, one could hardly find argument against the information the hon. member has placed on the record, but when I read the resolution and try to figure out the principles involved I would think that it is somewhat redundant today to be discussing it in this House. I think the resolution, if we dealt with it some 20 years ago before we had the establishment of conservation authorities and the subsequent establishment of the Ontario water resources commission, would have generated a very hot debate in this House. Looking at the first part of the resolution we find it says that "in furtherance of its conservation programme the government should, (a) formulate a long-term programme for the planning and coordination of water management on a regional basis."

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is another occasion when a government member uses the private members' hour established in this honourable House to gain some publicity back in his own riding, and this is one of the most superficial efforts that I remember during our private members' hours. Early in March of 1965 we received the interim report of the select committee on conservation that was appointed on June 22, 1965.

I do not have to remind the House that the interim report carried a lot of information and told us that there were 98 briefs and submissions received and they had 58 days of sitting. I myself was appointed to the committee to replace my colleague, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), when it was re-established on July 8, 1966, and of course we submitted our final report to the House not long ago. That committee was established to investigate the whole ambit of the functions of the conservation authorities throughout the province and bring in recommendations to make them more effective and more efficient, and certainly the committee did a good job and I was happy to sign the report.

When we talk about the first part of the resolution we have to remind ourselves that there are 36 conservation authorities that have a membership now of something over 700 members, and of course these are the groups that should be doing that kind of work across the province. Now, the second part of the resolution encouraged the establishment of citizens' committees on the regional basis to publicize the importance of each citizen's role in preventing pollution and bringing forward suggestions. I think that part of it would be somewhat of an affront to the conservation authorities, because certainly that is their job.

Now, we realized during the investigation that there were areas of the province that were not covered by conservation authorities and the committee took this into consideration. It involved a section of the province that the hon. member represents and they recommended that those sections not covered by an authority adjacent to an authority be taken in and be given the kind of consideration that is needed, so I do not think that part of the resolution bears any recognition whatsoever.

Now we come to the (c) part—"enact legislation to ensure that all detergents sold in the province be biodegradable by no later than June, 1969." I sat in the House last week and listened to the report of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) and he gave a very detailed report —some seven pages long, and in part of it I want to quote, and it is page 2279:

> I am pleased to report to you that as of December last all detergents being sold in Canada are of the new biodegradable type. Tests on this new type of detergent indicates that 95 per cent of the foaming agent is decomposed while passing through a secondary sewage treatment plant. Even where no treatment plant exists the rate of natural decay of the new material is much faster than that of the former type.

So I take it, with the good word from the hon. Minister that this problem is now looked after. And I know it did cause considerable concern for some time.

Let us look at the other section of the resolution. Call upon the federal government to initiate an industrial loan fund to assist with the cost of pollution control facilities and continue the tax incentive programme now in effect. As I said before, the conservation authorities under their powers have used the scheme—in the present Act this means a scheme undertaken by an authority for the purposes of the conservation, restoration and development of natural resources and control of water in order to prevent floods and pollution, or for any such purpose.

Now, I think that they can do the job if we can get the recommendation of the select committee implemented. I do not think we again have to take a slap at the federal government by asking them to set up an industrial loan fund. I would think that many of the large industries can clear up their pollution without help from any government with taxpayers' money. Some may need help but that should be determined with the discretion of the department. I do not know what present tax incentive programme is now in effect. I will make some inquiries, but I would like to quote from the Minister's report, again on page 2278:

> Control of pollution resulting from industrial wastes continues to form a vital part of the government's programme. Industries discharging wastes to public waters are examined and kept under surveillance and the installation of treatment facilities for industrial waste discharges is being actively promoted throughout the province in accordance with the requirements of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act. Through direct contact with new industries, the commission approves all waste treatment installations before the industry goes into operation. As a result of this intensified approach to the problem, the industrial waste pollution situation is steadily improving and the overall response of industry to the government's pollution abatement programme has been encouraging.
>
> The increasing volume and complexity of domestic and industrial wastes reaching many of the watercourses of Ontario require, however, that more sophisticated techniques in sewage treatment be developed in order that the pollution loads reaching these watercourses may be reduced and affluent quality objectives may be maintained.

Again I say that the Minister has reported to the House and he has assured us that the OWRC is doing the job that this Legislature entrusted to them. I would suggest that if the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich wants to give effect to his concern over this problem that he should go to the government and to the Minister and ask them to implement the recommendations of the select committee which studied the problems of the conservation authorities. And then we will get some improvement in the many problems that he mentioned.

Certainly, I think it was an affront to the committee and to the secretary of the committee and to the chairman of the committee that the Minister in his remarks during introduction of his estimates, never once mentioned the select committee's report.

He gave the House no indication whether he was pleased with it or whether he might consider implementing some of the very important points that were involved in the committee's report. And I would just like to read one phase of the recommendations to bring it to the hon. member's attention, in line with the kind of programme that he was presenting to the House, and I refer him to recommendation 27 from the report on page 124: "That every conservation authority be required to prepare, with the assistance of The Department of Energy and Resources Management and public participation, in a long range conservation plan." I considered that one of the most important sections of the committee's report.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Government policy for several years.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why did you set up the committee? Just to get the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Pittock) off the hook and nothing else, then?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, no—

Mr. MacDonald: You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Gisborn: We spent a lot of time in discussing this recommendation to arrive at that brief paragraph, as to the need for the conservation authority, with the assistance of the government, to develop the long range plan so that we would once and for all do away with some of the fumbling and indecisiveness that they were facing in their efforts to do the job across the province.

Then recommendation 28: "That the conservation plans should consist of maps and written text, enunciate policies, project future needs, specify projects to be undertaken and their priorities." A very important section that the Minister should have given mention to in his report.

Recommendation 29, I quote: "That the conservation plan or any amendment thereof should not have force or effect until approved by the Minister of Energy and Resources Management".

Recommendation 30: "That no project should be undertaken by an authority until a conservation plan has been adopted and approved by the Minister".

So I think that the hon. member who introduced this resolution has all of the things at hand to develop the kind of programme that he has presented, by going to the Minister of this department and the government and asking them to get on with the job of implementing the recommendations of that select committee.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about that.

Mr. Gisborn: Just a minute, until I get finished, and only then, if you have got a place on this agenda, can you use it.

Mr. MacDonald: You had a word the other day and you did not use it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You did not use it either. I noticed when the vote went through, you never said a word on conservation.

Mr. Gisborn: I will take my last two or three minutes to agree with the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich on one point. He indicated to me that he was not satisfied with the job that the Ontario water resources commission was doing, and I just want to refer to one or two instances in Hamilton.

Hamilton bay has been considered the cesspool of Canada and we have given up hope of it ever being cleaned up. About a year and a half ago, we had the Steel Company of Canada apply to the city of Hamilton for permission to draw their main water line from the lake and use the water, millions of cubic feet per day, in their steel process.

They convinced everyone, even the experts that the cleaning process they would use, would ensure that the water would then go back into the Hamilton bay as clean, or cleaner, than it was when they took it out of Lake Ontario.

But some experts in that field said, that would still not satisfy their concern. The concern was that by taking these millions of cubic feet out of the lake, and using it as a process fluid in Stelco, and then pouring it back into Hamilton bay, they felt it would drive the effluent and pollution out of Hamilton bay, into the lake—and I am afraid that is what is happening right now. There is great concern about the currents taking this stuff down the shores of Lake Ontario.

We have the Steel Company spending a lot of money to make this water cleaner when they return it to the bay. We then had a report in the Hamilton *Spectator* on Tuesday, November 1, 1966, that the Dofasco plant, that is the abbreviation for the Dominion Foundaries and Steel plant in Hamilton, were alleged to have been dumping tank truck loads of acid into the bay. The person who observed this, took pictures, attempted to get a sample of the fluid, this was burnt, and the plant police came and confiscated his camera and put him out of the plant. That case is not straightened up yet and we will have more to say about that at a later date.

I will read from an excerpt of that report and I quote:

> Dofasco also came under fire in an Ontario water resources commission report based on industry. The report dated April, 1966 and shown to the Hamilton harbour commissioners yesterday, revealed that the amount of suspended solids dumped into the bay by Dofasco has risen from 82.5 tons a day in 1963, to 146 tons a day last year. Either solubles, oils, tars and others were up from 0.44 tons a day to 3.6 tons

> a day. Port director C. W. Morgan said the major problem occurred in the Ottawa Street slip, when oil and tar were blown into the harbour.

I would hope that some time or other we will have a report from the Ontario water resources commission as to what the situation is now, because if this continues, even though we have given up any recovery of the Hamilton bay, we have to start thinking about Lake Ontario.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, speaking to this resolution, I have to agree somewhat with the statements of the last speaker in relation to the intent and wording of this resolution.

It seems to me that the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich almost skirted around the very intents and points of many sections of his resolution, and I feel that he really does not grasp the significance of the work of the select committee on conservation, and the whole conservation theme, as well as that of the water resources, and the joint commission with the federal authorities, both in Canada and the United States.

On one hand, he complimented the OWRC but mainly, I feel, he was critical of this particular agency. And we, in the Opopsition parties, have certainly been critical of the water resources commission over the 11 years of its operation.

We have been critical of the lack of overall planning, of overall coordination and of the lack of guidelines, both in relation to sewage problems, water pipelines and other conservation measures.

First of all, I feel that national objectives and guidelines should be established. It is not just an Ontario problem, it is a Canadian problem, it is a North American problem.

And I refer back to the meeting of the resource Ministers of Canada last fall, where many of these guidelines were established. These guidelines must be acted upon by political decisions, at Ottawa, here at Queen's Park and at the other provincial capitals.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, the conference recommended the need for a federal organization to develop a pollution basic code, an organization to coordinate and disseminate this information and to do research and coordinate other agencies doing this type of work.

This conference further recommended national standards and objectives; further stated that the best unit of pollution control is a region; and that the attack on pollution and water problems should be formulated on a multi-functional basis. It is essential that laws be based uniformly for pollution control all across our country and, for that matter, all across North America.

We note at this resource Ministers' conference in Montreal, that our province was represented by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) rather than by our Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

We, in this party, are somewhat perplexed as to whether this government also does not have a great deal of confidence in the ability of this Minister. Or whether, by sending down the Minister of Municipal Affairs to this conference, this government is really realizing that it has a tiger by the tail in pollution and that the method of attack on this pollution problem is through a reshaping of the municipal boundaries into effective regional governments to attack this problem of pollution, to attack the problem of water supply and the host of other services that can now be treated effectively, and more economically, by the united effort of areas within our province.

I would hope that this would be the reason for possibly slighting our Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

In our observations and study on the select committee on conservation, of which I was a member for two years, I feel our committee came to the unanimous conclusion that there should be a new effective department in government, a consolidation of several branches of government.

A Ministry of conservation could administer all Acts under the statutes of our province that deal with water, pollution, with ARDA, with erosion and our recreation problems. This, in fact, would create an over-riding body to see that work done under The Drainage Act for one purpose, would not, at the same time, be bad for conservation as we see it.

Conservation authorities as they were set up originally, were on a regional basis, that is, a drainage area. They have done very good work in many areas relating to specific conservation projects but I am sorry to report, Mr. Speaker, they have not received the fullest cooperation in the past of Ontario Hydro, of The Department of Lands and Forests, of the Ontario water resources commission and, I might include, certain bodies of the federal government.

I think a good example of this is in the Trent water system where the local residents and cottagers in this area, see the lakes fronting their properties drawn down to maintain the level in the Trent system, where other lakes, that may not even be inhabited, are maintaining a full level of water.

I feel that proper guidance in programming in this one area alone, could do much to alter this situation. It certainly is the case in the spring run-off where it is not properly controlled. Many other individual situations such as this could be drawn to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and these would further fortify the need for an overriding body to coordinate the activities in all these fields, for the best conservation practices in our province. I would hope, along with the member for Wentworth East, that many of the 127 recommendations that we made on this committee could be acted upon during the next Parliament in this province.

Conservation authorities will eventually cover all of southern Ontario and could be, and should be, the effective group to fulfill the hon. member's second portion of this resolution—that is, to encourage citizens' committees on a regional basis to publicize the importance of each citizen's role in preventing pollution and to bring forward suggestions. This is what conservation authorities themselves have been trying to do, but they could do it much more effectively if they had the priority and the finances to carry out this work. They are in fact citizens' committees doing this type of work.

The third portion of the hon. member's resolution deals with detergents sold in our province; that they be of biodegradable quality. Almost a year ago members of my party and myself met with officials who are manufacturing this and we knew that this was coming into effect the first part of this year, so I do feel as the other two members that this part of the resolution needs very little attention. But this is no longer the culprit. The real culprits in pollution are the phosphates that are pouring into our rivers and lakes by millions of gallons. Many of our sewage plants, Mr. Speaker, are in fact fertilizer plants—producing phosphates to make the algae grow in our lakes and rivers. This is the real problem today.

The fourth point in the member's resolution calls upon the federal government to create an industrial loan fund to assist with the cost of pollution control facilities and further continue the tax and centre programmes. Certainly I think we all realize that money is the key to fight pollution and the water service difficulties that beset us, but first of all we must establish the policies, the procedures and the short and long range objectives and also the responsibilities of the senior levels of government, the local governments, the industries, and we the people ourselves. It is we the people that have paid in the past and it is we the people that are going to continue to pay more and more in the future in this war on pollution.

To date, in all sewage and water works the municipalities have carried the load with the home owner footing the bills. Water supplies and pollution control centres have been developed as municipal finances were available, but it is the ability of the home owner to pay that has ruled the development of these facilities. And many municipalities, Mr. Speaker, were frustrated in developing these facilities by their borrowing capacities and the rulings of the Ontario municipal board.

Now, about three years ago a new method of financing these facilities was devised by this government which would allow the municipalities to construct the facilities and pay for them over long periods of time.

In effect, Mr. Speaker, with the finances charge calculated, I feel that eventually these facilities are going to cost double the original contract cost and the people are paying for these with increased rates for water and to cover the cost of sewage as well. But to this date, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, this government has not given grants or direct financial assistance to any of its municipalities for either sewage plants, sewer construction or water filtration plants.

Mr. Grant Duff of the urban development institute has related the high cost of subdivision lots to the lack of the high cost of these services. He stated that governments assure the regional government or the OWRC that major trunk sewers must be provided to service land and that the province must reorganize its municipalities on a regional basis and relieve them of some of these costs and that of education also, so that they are financially capable of accepting residential growth in an orderly and expanding manner.

Back in 1964, Mr. Speaker, I spoke on the estimates of the water resources commission and at that time called upon this province to pay for major trunk water lines and major sewage lines. Only a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, in this House, the member from North Bay (Mr. Smith) and his very concise reflections on the OWRC—and I might make mention that he did speak on this problem for almost 30 minutes during the initial debate

on these estimates. And he pointed out these many problems and made the following recommendations and I quote from one of these:

> That a definite programme of regional government should be instituted across the province to facilitate the provision of sewage and water facilities in the most economical and practical way and to create a formula of direct financial contribution to the municipalities in need to provide for water services and sewage treatment.

Including what is very important, Mr. Speaker, "sewer separation in our older municipalities and further the establishment of water grid systems".

I think that these are very worthwhile suggestions by the hon. member from North Bay.

Now, this resolution from the member for Windsor-Sandwich calls for the federal government to do something. But it does not call upon the province to do anything. Yet our municipalities are the creation of the province itself.

Now, as far as industry is concerned, I agree that tax incentives for water and air pollution control facilities should be continued and even expanded. Low cost, long term loans should be available. But I feel further that this type of industrial equipment should be tax free, from both the 12 per cent federal tax and the five per cent provincial tax. I feel if this province is sincere in its fight against pollution, that they should take the first step and I challenge them to do so and remove this five per cent sales tax from this type of equipment and show good faith to industry and the people of the province of Ontario.

In the member from North Bay's recent remarks, he suggested this long term, low interest money for industry in order that pollution requirements would not endanger the existence of their operations in our province. The Montreal conference of resource Ministers stated that pollutors should bear the cost of treatments and the pollution damage on resource users. This is their theory. And further that there should be financial incentives to industry to improve its anti-pollution measures and to encourage research.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Nipissing—from North Bay—set forth our Liberal Party's position on this matter: to provide industries with the capital cost funds at low interest rates, and over long periods of time, plus removal of the sales tax on this equipment.

I think they did this very well, and as I stated before, I challenge the government to make a move and show their sincerity in this matter.

To the member for Windsor-Sandwich, although there are certain shortcomings in his resolution, I feel our party supports the intent contained therein.

Clerk of the House: The 27th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. A. H. Cowling in the chair.

It being six o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 74



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, April 24, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 24, 1967

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued 2545

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 2583

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1967

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
(Continued)

On vote 805:

Mr. Chairman: We are now dealing with the estimates of the local health services branch.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, on vote 805, still on item 4. I would like to ask the Minister through you, what is the normal range of salary for medical officers of health? I had understood that one was as low as $11,000, but I am not certain. Are they that low?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): As low as what?

Mr. Trotter: I understood the lowest one was about $11,000 a year. Is that correct, or have they been boosted? What is the range?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The range presently is $15,000 to $20,000 per year.

Mr. Trotter: $15,000—so that is a relatively recent raise, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I believe the MOHs' salaries were upgraded about the same time as our own, within the past year.

Mr. Trotter: In the past year? I am glad to see that has come in. I still think that to get a good MOH, $15,000 is low, unless perhaps it is a young man coming in and is going to make it his life work. The amount of money that these men can earn in private practice, or even working for companies as a doctor, is usually in excess of $15,000.

I understood it had been raised, but I thought that even at $11,000 two or three years ago, you would have difficulty getting the men you want for this job. A medical officer of health is a key position in any area, and if you are going to expand this arm of your government, as I hope you will, his role is going to be even more important.

Mr. Chairman: Is that section carried?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, there is an observation I would like to make and a question I would like to put.

To begin with, Mr. Chairman, I am rather concerned about the state of the public health units generally, and the rather strong feeling on the part of the public health nurses. They are having difficulty bargaining with their individual boards of health, and the movement amongst the public health nurses to seek recognition under The Labour Relations Act, either through direct certification or through voluntary recognition, is meeting resistance on the part of a goodly number of boards of health. It is very demoralizing for some of the public health nurses units.

I can think of Halton county as a very good example; Peel county as a good example; Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry as a good example, where they have had considerable difficulty in attempting to achieve certification. There has been, to say the least, bargaining in unhappy faith on the part of the boards of health, and very little support from The Department of Health regarding the objectives of the public health nurse.

I am not suggesting for a moment that this is the central role of The Department of Health. I quite appreciate that The Department of Labour is intimately involved in this procedure and that the Minister can quite properly say to me that that is in large measure, the work of his colleague, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales).

But I would like to put this to him strongly, that the morale of the public health units is what is at stake and there is no doubt, for instance, that in the units I have mentioned—I have met with nurses' representatives of all those units in the last three or four months in their own bailiwicks, so to speak—there is a very serious question of depreciating morale. There have been a goodly number of positions gone unfilled, and the registered nurses' association of Ontario has in their friendly term, "grey-listed" the public health units involved. There is a considerable degree of ill-feeling.

It is important I think that the community and the government rally behind the position of the public health nurses. What they are asking is what any self-respecting professional group has a right to ask in the society, and they are being denied it in a vigorous fashion by local boards of health who obviously have no comprehension of and respect for legitimate bargaining procedures.

I cannot put this too strongly to the Minister. I think what the public health nurses require is some sense from within the department, that the department sympathizes with their viewpoint and is prepared to go to bat for them. I am sad to say that they have, at the very best, an ambivalent view of the department's intention. They are not at all sure where The Department of Health lines up.

Again I appreciate the argument that this is primarily a municipal decision. It is an area of local autonomy, but in precisely the same way as the member for Parkdale pointed to the salaries for the medical officers of health, I could point to the salaries of the public health nurses. There has to be some rationalizing of this field. There has to be some levelling out of the very severe differences which exist, particularly on salaries and on working conditions.

I do not know what it will take to bring some of the boards of health to their senses, Halton county being a perfect example. But whatever it takes, it should be applied in large measure by government, to show them that government considers preventive health sufficiently important to rally behind the nurses' cause.

One other observation, Mr. Chairman, might be made. So poorly accepted is public health in the Ontario community, that when the nurses are driven to the extremity of withdrawing their services, when they go on strike—as they have done in two of the public health units—it makes so little impact on the community as a whole that the boards of health can successfully thumb their noses at the nurses and tell them to go peddle their nursing capacities in other directions. As a result, you have a group which is not only frustrated, but publicly humiliated and has to come back into the role which they formerly fulfilled and begin to negotiate from an even weaker position than that which obtained when they felt they had to withdraw their services.

It is a commentary on the nature of preventive health in Ontario that that should be the case. One would wish that if the public health nurses ever threatened to walk off the job, the entire community would rally to their side, recognizing the important features of their work. As it is, they can walk off their job and there is barely a ripple because preventive health, alas, has never been given the distinction and accord which it merits.

So those basically are my observations, Mr. Chairman. As I said, I appreciate that this is a divided authority. But I also wish the hon. Minister could throw the full power of his department into the struggle on behalf of the public health nurses, and indicate to local boards of health that they should not play so cavalierly with the future of the public health nursing profession.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the hon. member understands and appreciates the position of the department. The board of health is the employer, of course, and we are simply the coordinating body. We do not, as a rule, interfere. Indeed, we do not, so long as the unit is carrying out its job, interfere in any way with the operation of the unit.

We have however, made very clear to boards of health that whatever resources may be at the disposal of the department to assist them in this way, it is there. We have recognized over the past two years now, I believe, the retention by the unit of the labour relations consultant in order that they may have whatever expert help there is available to them in this area.

Beyond that I do not believe that The Department of Health can go. I recognize what the hon. member says, that units are able to go on, even if the services of the public health nurses should be withdrawn for a time. I suppose in a way, that is a commentary on the efficiency of the unit's operation, that its services are so well up-to-date that they can be put in a state of suspended animation, if you will, for a time without the public suffering.

This is not a good way to settle a labour difference of any kind. We are constantly seeking ways, not that I am pretending that we are here to take sides one way or another. We believe that the staffs must be given salaries that are commensurate with their responsibilities and in keeping with the trend of the times, and we have shown this by recognizing the bargaining and the results of bargaining negotiations which have come about.

There is no doubt that public health nurses' salaries have been bettered, like all others.

But apart from that, which is not a very definite answer in any way, I do not think there is any other way The Department of Health can become involved in these matters now.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Chairman, while we are on this vote, I would like to take a moment to express my appreciation to the hon. Minister of Health and the members of his department for their dedicated efforts in maintaining and improving the standard of health of all residents in the province of Ontario.

There is a saying that "he who has health has hope, and he who has hope has everything."

The legislative programme for this Centennial year proposed by the hon. Minister of Health is a heavy one indeed. It embraces many areas, from research through local health services, mental health, a coordinated programme of services for children with mental and emotional disorders, extension of group homes operated under The Child Welfare Act and extension of our programme to control air pollution, which we hear so much about. It is clear from this programme that our Minister is determined to ensure that the province of Ontario continues to maintain its lead in every aspect of health.

I would like to say a word or two in particular on public health, and especially to pay tribute here to the work carried out in this field by the Welland and district health unit, under their able and dedicated director, Dr. L. W. Sturgeon.

Over the years, this health unit has established a very high reputation so that it ranks today as one of the most effective units in this province. I would like to express my appreciation on behalf of all the constituents of my riding for the work which this unit is doing. In addition to its work with the mental health unit, Dr. Sturgeon has been actively assisting the alcoholic and drug research foundation in its plan for a fully developed programme to be initiated this year.

With the assistance provided as a result of provincial grants, we now have in the county of Welland two general hospital-based mental health clinics. These clinics, of course, cooperate very closely with the Welland and district health unit. One of these clinics is at the Greater Niagara hospital. This hospital has been fortunate in being able to recruit the services of Dr. Nixon, who, I am told, is one of the top community mental health specialists in this country.

I would also like to commend the Minister of Health for the increased grants which have been made available this year for the improvement of health unit services at Niagara Falls, my good friend I think will appreciate this—Welland and Port Colborne. This year the grant is to be raised to 50 per cent for each of these municipalities against last year's grants of 25 per cent for Niagara Falls and Welland and 33.75 per cent for Port Colborne.

Mr. Chairman: I think the member for Parkdale wanted to ask the member a question, but I think he has forgotten the question now.

Mr. Trotter: No, I know the question. Mr. Chairman, I just wondered if the hon. member for Welland was aware of the fact that Welland county health unit once had an excellent follow-up service for mental patients. In recent time it has been allowed to fall apart—their after-care services—is the member aware of that?

Mr. Morningstar: That is not the information I get, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think there is no better time than now to put this record straight. I refreshed my memory on the story over the dinner hour. First of all, this was not Welland county public health unit after-care service. We seconded from our hospital in Hamilton two field workers and they commuted each day to do the work under the aegis of the Welland county health unit in the hope that they could stimulate them to set up a community service. One of the ladies was attacked by nature, she began to raise a family. You cannot stop that, I am not against motherhood. The other lady decided she did not like that kind of work and she left. Now, the unit wanted us to send two more workers—

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): She did not like being a mother?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, the second lady did not like the work in the field, the mother is doing her job now, the job for which she was intended. But the other lady did not want to stay in this line of endeavour at all, and we felt this was a good time for the unit to take full community responsibility. Now this is the real story. The project was not allowed to fall apart.

In the meantime, the community clinic which our hon. friend has just told us about had gotten into the act and was carrying out very effective work. It is my understanding

that the medical officer of health has been in very close contact with this truly community operation now. I think this House, Mr. Chairman, had better get this story straight. This project was not allowed to disintegrate because of any action of The Department of Health or the Ontario hospital in Hamilton.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on this point perhaps this House can take a slightly different perspective. In his two most recent annual reports, the one for last year and the one for the preceding year, Dr. Sturgeon, the medical officer of health for the Welland county health unit, has directly accused The Department of Health of scuttling his mental health after-care programme. It is in writing. In fact his statement two years ago which I read into the record, was a very vigorous statement indeed. He implied very strongly and he said in personal conversation and had said widely that the two workers seconded from the Ontario hospital in Hamilton to the Welland county health unit were there to facilitate an after-care service on a permanent basis. He did not understand, as medical officer of health, the reason for the subsequent breakdown.

The Minister has given an interesting observation on the reasons why the two social workers left; they seemed perfectly plausible. The question obviously in Dr. Sturgeon's mind was why was the experiment not continued? Mr. Chairman, what is truly significant is that as soon as the experiment ended, the number of people committed on a readmission basis from Welland county to the Ontario hospital at Hamilton, I guess, multiplied 10- or 15-fold; it is some incredible statistic. I remember looking at it at the time. While the experiment was taking place in the years 1963-64 or 1962-63, I forget which, the after-care provided by that very intelligent use of resources kept the readmission rate at the Hamilton Ontario hospital from Welland county down to one of the lowest readmission rates in the province.

What we are really saying, without arguing over all the particulars, is that the medical officer of health, whatever the Minister may feel, felt genuinely hard done by. He is a medical officer of health who is widely respected in the profession, obviously has the support of one of his local members, probably both his local members, I am sure, and there was a considerable confusion over the responsibility of government in this field. There is just no question that the refusal of the government to encourage public health after-care for mental health patients is one of the prime reasons for the soaring readmission rates in the Ontario hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, no matter what the Minister puts to this House, I say to him through you, sir, that there are a great many Ontario hospitals that continue to nourish the ancient view that public health has no place in mental health after-care. There is an attitude of condescension on the part of much of the mental health group in this province towards the capacity of public health to deal with such people. It is a very sad condescension, indeed, because it breaks down all kinds of possibilities for preventive mental health in the field. If as a matter of course public health units were notified at least, if the courtesy were given to have them notified, some of the after-care could be followed up in an accelerated fashion. You would then lower your readmission rates to the Ontario hospitals. The point that the member for Parkdale made earlier I think is right on topic. It is an exceedingly valid point, in fact it is fair to say that so abused has public health been in this province, so demeaned has the status of public health been, that perhaps it is understandable that the mental health division would look with a jaundiced eye on the capacity of public health units to cope.

That, I think, is the fault of government and is the responsibility of government. There is no sense participating in this process of self-delusion. It is a pretty critical situation. Until public health units are vested with the responsibility which they are capable of carrying out, then mental health after-care in Ontario will be in a state of perpetual inadequacy. That is what we are really putting to the Minister. I wish I had the annual reports of the Welland county health unit with me, particularly the one previous to last year, when Dr. Sturgeon spelled out in no uncertain terms his dissatisfaction with the government and his sorrow at the breakdown of what was an obviously intelligent project.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, it is rather a peculiar thing that the annual report of the medical officer of health is taken in preference to the statement in this House of the head of The Department of Health. I am just as adamant in my view, sir, that The Department of Health has done everything in its power to encourage a closer rapport or liaison between the Ontario hospital system and the medical officers of health. I am given the advice now that the workers were staff of the Ontario hospital, Hamilton. Dr. Sturgeon, along with others, agreed that

they should be placed on the staff of the Welland county general hospital clinic. It was after the transfer was made that they both left for their different reasons. The mental health clinic still has money in its budget to employ replacements. I think this should bring this into absolutely clear perspective. Our public health division has written to each medical officer of health in the province laying the views of the department before them for their consideration in this respect. Our director of hospital management has similarly written to the superintendent of every Ontario hospital advising them of our views in this regard. These are professionals, both classes are specialists in their own field. We never have, and we are not going to, dictate to our professional people what they do or how they shall do it. We put before them the views of the department, the views of the professional directors of the department, in the hope that they will see worthwhileness in the views, and will set up programmes.

I emphasize again, sir, that the mentally ill patient is in an entirely different category from the patient who is suffering from an infectious disease. He is not a menace to the public health and how do we know that he wants to be turned over as another case to the public health unit? He was admitted to an Ontario hospital on the certificate or committal order of his own doctor, or two doctors, as the case may be. He will go back to his own doctor. Now whether the follow-up is as vigorous as it ought to be, is hard to tell. I am of the opinion that it is not as vigorous as it might be but this again is the professional view of the doctor looking after him.

I am not going to talk about readmission rates at the present time because much of this comes under the mental health vote. Because of the association between mental health in this case and public health, and there is a close association, there is no doubt, this discussion has been quite in order. I cannot quote the figures at the present time—these are the readmission rates—about which my hon. friend from Scarborough West becomes far more exercised than I do. After all I have practiced medicine for a few days, sir, and I think I am in a little better position to understand whether this is just as important a matter as he seems to feel in his mind.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have my professional view and I will put it up against my professional superintendents, too.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I accept the Minister's professional view as a medical practitioner. I am saying to him that we on this side of the House have the right to put before him the views of his staff in the field administering his departmental edicts.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not arguing that.

Mr. S. Lewis: Now, we will get into the readmission rates under mental health. One can quote chapter and verse of what the superintendent of the Toronto Ontario hospital, the Kingston Ontario hospital, and many others think about the question of readmission rates. We can come to that later. What we are saying here, Mr. Chairman, is that one of the factors influencing the readmission rate is unquestionably the deplorable state of mental health after-care in this province. If the Minister thinks that mental health after-care can possibly be served by releasing somebody, by having somebody removed from an Ontario hospital and returned to his private general practitioner, who, as the Minister well knows, barely has 15 minutes for his patients, let alone to provide the counselling services required for after-care, that is no solution whatsoever.

You are ignoring the public health units. It must be said in this House the Lincoln county public health unit has no knowledge of what is going on in the Ontario hospital in Hamilton. They were not as of last year—I can speak more authoritatively of last year, I do not know what the department has done in the interim—even informed of people who left the Ontario hospital, Hamilton, until they got into subsequent difficulty back in Lincoln county and had to be referred by the public health personnel once again.

It is the same with Welland county, and it is the same with Hamilton itself. The Ontario hospitals, except in isolated instances, have not seen fit to contact the public health units. I have a very strong feeling, Mr. Chairman, that the mental health division personnel – some of the leading psychiatric intellects in the mental health division, both past and present—probably have very little use for public health in its capacity of administering to after-care.

That is probably what the problem is, and we get down to the root of it again, public health has been largely ignored, largely abused, largely rejected by the government of this province for something like 30 years. We have finally passed an Act which is entirely permissive in nature and will make no substantial contribution whatsoever.

That being the case, Mr. Chairman, one cannot but deplore this kind of defence on the part of the Minister. If the letters have gone out over the last few months—and that is a novel fact in this department—if the letters have gone out then one welcomes them. One would only wish that the Minister could somehow bring the public health unit personnel in any given OH catchment area together with the superintendent of the Ontario hospital and sit down and work the thing through, removing all the discriminatory professional attitudes that impede the possibility of mental health after-care in Ontario.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is going to take the attitude regarding public health that I gather he seems to take in drawing the comparison that mental illness is not an infectious disease, well of course no one is arguing it is an infectious disease. But if the public health and the medical officers of health under our modern circumstances are only going to be concerned with infectious disease or have their emphasis on that, then they are going to miss completely the main work that they are supposed to do. It is obvious in our time that infectious diseases are now going to the background, that because of the various serums and the vaccines the matter of infection, although still important and we still have to be on guard, is not nearly the curse that it was 20 or 25 years ago.

One of the main emphases is going to be on such things as mental illness and on the prevention of illness, whether it be an infectious illness or otherwise. Under The Public Health Act which is going to be more or less a guiding light of this whole particular vote, to have permissive legislation can be an extremely bad thing if you are going to do nothing. It can be just more window dressing.

At the same time, if you are flexible in your legislation, but in your administration have the will and drive to do something, even permissive legislation can go a long way towards solving the problem. But if the Minister is going to cling to a very Victorian attitude by saying that mental health is not the same as infectious diseases and, therefore, tries to draw a severe line and restrict the work of medical officers of health, his attitude is going to do a great deal to hold back progress in the health of the people of the province of Ontario.

When the hon. member for Welland got up and gave that prepared statement to more or less circulate among the people of his riding, it was obvious that he was either hiding or did not know what has been going on in the county of Welland.

Mr. Morningstar: I did, too.

Mr. Trotter: Well, why did you not come to the defence of Dr. Sturgeon then? We are the ones who are fighting Dr. Sturgeon's battle here, not you. You just sit there and every once in a while—about every six months—you get up to give a speech to circulate in your riding.

Mr. Morningstar: It is common sense, when I do say something.

Mr. Trotter: It is time you faced the facts over there. It is time you got over this. It is annoying to see where a pilot project was begun as in the county of Welland and it was working—I do not know where the hon. member for Scarborough West got his information, but the facts as he gave them were completely wrong—as I have understood it from two or three other sources, literally The Department of Health scuttled a very good project in the county of Welland. It is a matter that should not be forgotten. This problem should be aired in this House.

But if the Minister, either because of a Victorian viewpoint, or just by saying it is local autonomy he is just going to sit back and let these things happen, we are going to have a sorry state of affairs which are going to be even worse in the province of Ontario.

It is just not a question of him even sitting back, but from what I can gather the actual over-action of this department has caused the county of Welland a severe setback in the treatment of the mentally ill.

I can only repeat to the member what I said before the supper hour. In this case in Hamilton where the man discharged from the Hamilton hospital killed himself and his wife last January, a coroner's jury in March said there should be more after-care services from our public health unit.

This is an obvious problem in our day and age. It is true that when the medical officers of health first took over their appointments in the old days they worried about the measles and TB, but today their major health problem should be mental health and they are going to have to be a part of it. They have many phases to their work, but this is the major problem that they are going to have to face, and the whole attitude of this government, and particularly of the Minister in this problem, is one that should be depre-

cated at every turn because he is definitely shackling progress in mental health in this province.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Chairman, one can hardly dispute what the hon. member for Parkdale has said—that mental illness is one of the greatest problems which must concern us today. There are certain questions of priority and method and emphasis. I was really going to make some comment on some of the words of the hon. member for Scarborough West who as I think is well known and generally accepted as one of the best users of words in this House.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Facts, too.

Mr. Dunlop: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Gisborn: Facts, too.

Mr. Dunlop: Well I will not go along with that. It reminds me very much of a man in the United States some years ago who was very much concerned with the whole mental health movement and he decided to put some money into the promotion of mental health week in one of the United States. Indeed, he did buy some bumper strips and had them made available for people to put on their cars. He also selected the wording himself, and following the typical wording which he had seen in the tuberculosis and cancer movements, he had the bumper strips printed with the words "Fight mental health".

I am interested that the member for Scarborough West keeps talking about preventive health. What does he mean by preventive health?

He also refers to preventive mental health. Is he trying to prevent health or prevent mental health? I think there is some other idea that he has in mind and he has got his jargonistic machine out of gear. Let me also say one thing about his general view about using MOHs and health units for the follow-up of everything. I think he believes that because a certain function is a function which is provided by government, municipal or provincial, therefore it is better than something which is provided by individuals in the private sector.

On hardly knows how the training of the average medical officer of health or the average public health nurse would make a great contribution to an overall programme for mental health after-care. By and large they have not got the training, no matter whether they say they have or have not. He has talked to MOHs mainly, I gather. By and large the MOH's training is all concerned with matters of environmental sanitation and biological oxygen demands and all this kind of thing. I think it would be a great mistake and a matter almost of irresponsibility if the government were simply to establish a programme by rule and by rote which said that a particular programme of after-care for the Ontario Hospital dischargees was to be placed in the hands of the MOHs.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted the member for Forest Hill stepped in because he has certainly sharpened the area of difference and that is all to the good. It is a pleasure. I think the Minister of Health would agree to have a variety of voices in these estimates.

Let me say to him, sir, that we are all playing with words, if that is the emphasis he wants to take. The phrase "preventive health" is a reasonably accepted phrase in the western world. It connotes for most people the suggestion that you try to cope with illness before it occurs, or try to anticipate the occurrence and deter it. That is the general aspect of preventive health. Whether one says preventive health or preventive mental health, the implication is the same.

Mr. Chairman, I deliberately used the phrase to offset the obsession of this department with illness. I deliberately try to avoid playing the games of the The Department of Health where everything in the field of health is only dealt with when it has achieved an acute stage—when health becomes essentially a medical model in a hospital setting and the community is divorced from health services generally. That is the problem with this department, that is the fundamental problem. It is so preoccupied with illness it never has any opportunity to deal with the preventive features of medicine. I do not think it is really a play on words. If I may say to the member for Forest Hill, it is quite deliberate on my part to try to get away from the emphasis that the department tends to convey.

May I also say to him, sir, that no one suggests that the private sector cannot cope with certain of these areas adequately. I am sure it can. I am only suggesting that in this instance we have a public sector established by government, contributed to by government, whose aims and objectives are set out by government, and which is in a superlative position to do a job, if it was encouraged to do this specific job. Instead of that, it is roundly discouraged by this government.

Let no one have the view which the member for Forest Hill seems to have of the medical officers of health: that they are involved still only in questions of environmental sanitation and contagious disease control. The whole vista of public health and indeed their training in the last several years, has been of all the other areas of public health. Multi-phasic screening, mental health after-care, preventive dental health, birth control clinics, all these areas which open up new vistas in the public health field. Those are the areas which I speak of.

I would also say to the member, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister through you, that I want to assure him that it is not only medical officers of health. It is also for instance, public health nurses, who have been trained in psychiatric nursing in the public health units, and feel very frustrated indeed that they cannot do a logical thing like mental health after-care because the referrals are not made to the public health units.

I think, Mr. Chairman, no matter how one argues it, it is very difficult to get away from the fact that the government's approach to public health is not very friendly. The government's approach to mental health after-care is, to say the least, deplorable. Most people in the province are agreed on that fact. What we are asking from the Minister is that he knit the two together.

If the member for Forest Hill really wants to know, I think it would be fair to say that my party feels that public health should be the basis of health in this society, that the preventive programmes embodied in public health should be the cornerstone of health in this society around which all other aspects of health revolve, to which they are all related. It is that focus that we are trying to bring into the field of health. We may have a genuine difference of opinion here, but that is precisely what we are hoping to achieve.

Mr. Dunlop: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I really suggested the private sector can entirely look after all these problems. All these problems cannot be looked after with the skill and knowledge we have as yet at our command.

On the other hand, the member for Scarborough West, I think has an obsessive idea of what can be done in the public sector. He makes very quietly an assumption that such things as operating multi-phasic screening programmes will do a great deal in prevention. I should like to know for example on what good scientific research basis he has found that multi-phasic screening programmes have really contributed to any improvement in the health of the community in which they have been conducted.

These are things which are easy to read about and are proposed by advocates of one theory or another and which a person who is not professional in the field, and is not, perhaps, scientific in their view, can be taken in by. These are the kind of things that you read of as being great in the *Reader's Digest*. I wonder if he does not take far too much on the pure faith which comes to him from the doctrine of the position which he enjoys.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, it is no doctrinal position. It is the facts which, if I may say to the member for Forest Hill, perhaps he was not here—

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps I should remind the members that we would like to avoid constant dialogue between two members. See if we can pass this vote.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Why?

Mr. S. Lewis: The question of the hon. member for Sudbury is well taken, why? The point is that, interestingly enough, the government has accepted the principle of multi-phasic screening clinics as appropriate throughout the province of Ontario in all the public health units. The Minister subscribes to it and has subscribed to it openly, for the very good reason that there is much sufficient and telling evidence in the province of Ontario.

I am not familiar with it all but let me give the member three examples, if he wants cold hard facts.

The medical officer of health in Wellington-Dufferin county, the public health unit, conducted two major surveys in the field of multi-phasic screening and identified a large number of diseases ranging from heart conditions to diabetes and managed to do a great deal of important work in the preventive field by this identification.

In the city of London, the medical officer of health has a walk-in clinic for senior citizens and applies to those walk-in clinics the tools of the medical trade. He does a lot of screening work and has identified a great many cases which, if not caught at their early stages, might have resulted in crippling after-effects.

In my own borough of Scarborough, a glaucoma survey was conducted by the medical officer of health and other factors were brought into—

Mr. Dunlop: You would not call the glaucoma survey a multi-phasic, would you?

Mr. S. Lewis: No, you are quite right. But in the process of doing the glaucoma survey, he has now moved into the field of multi-phasic screening, with similar results. The truth is that in Ontario, multi-phasic screening as a process of identifying disease has been demonstrated beyond argument as an adequate form of public health prevention. I think it has now been adopted by the department. The Minister can correct me if I am wrong, but I seem to remember that his lead-off statement included multi-phasic screening clinics as one of the objectives which the government hoped to achieve in concert with the medical officers of health.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Forest Hill, because he was on the committee on aging. I was also on that committee and one of our recommendations was that there should be more multi-phasic—or as some people call it, multiple-screening. So I hope that the hon. member for Forest Hill has not changed his mind.

Mr. Dunlop: I did not feel like bringing in a minority report.

Mr. Trotter: The member did not? Well, it is too bad because one or two of us did not hesitate to put in a dissent when we thought it necessary. This, of course, is most important, and I am glad to see that at least the Minister is now taking a serious look at it. I hope he will do something and will disregard the remarks of his colleague, the member for Forest Hill.

Mr. Chairman: Is this section of the vote carried?

Mr. S. Lewis: No, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask under this section—I think we are on the local health services branch—where we stand in the field of school dental services generally in the province of Ontario. Does the Minister have any breakdown at all of which public health units participate in school dental surveys? And, if the member for Forest Hill will forgive me, in preventive dental health?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There are school dental services in a number of units. There are dental programmes in the Bruce county health unit, the Grey county health unit, Huron county health unit, Leeds and Grenville, in Prescott and Russell, Simcoe county, Wellington and Dufferin, Haliburton. There are certain townships in Haliburton, provisional counties, East York, Leaside, York township, York county health unit, Ottawa city health department.

Mr. S. Lewis: Does the Minister have any hope that this might spread? As I understand it, those dental services in the schools are very advantageous indeed. I believe some of them even apply the solution, whatever it is called, to children's teeth, and over a period of time have noticed a significant prevention of decay. I wondered what specific plans the department might have for an expansion of this service, if any.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is one other of the provincial objectives, dental health services. It would be our hope once again to encourage every health unit, provided it is a need within the limits of their authority and responsibility, to set up those clinics, because these will be recognized programmes under our new public health programme.

Mr. Chairman: Section carried. At the top of page 64, the laboratory—

Mr. Trotter: Just a moment, are we going by sections? We are going by items, are we not?

Mr. Chairman: By sections.

Mr. Trotter: Do you mean the whole section? You mean the whole of vote 805?

Mr. Chairman: No, it is broken into sections. We are still on the same vote under vote 805 on the top of page 64, laboratories branch.

Mr. Trotter: I had one item, item 17 on ambulance service. That is still on page 63.

Mr. Chairman: I think that will come under special health services branch, farther down on page 64.

Laboratories branch carried.

Special health services branch now, the last item, if the member for Parkdale will deal with that.

Mr. Trotter: Well, the new legislation has been passed, Mr. Chairman, affecting the ambulance service here in the province of Ontario. I would like to know if the Minister has prepared the regulations. I understand, for example, in Prince Edward-Lennox they have started an ambulance service and the whole system is delayed because of the change in the regulations of the department. This is, I believe, a new grant. This is an expanded grant from the department. Has

the Minister the regulations now so that the various counties or municipalities know what they can do?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: These regulations are just promulgated, and they will be going out to the municipalities and operators who come within the scope of the regulations.

The first regulation relative to financial assistance was promulgated last year—last September I believe—and it is in operation now. The regulation relative to standards of training, equipment, and so on and so forth, have just been promulgated.

Mr. Trotter: I am talking about something as recent as April 11 of this year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It has been promulgated now.

Mr. Trotter: I am particularly interested in Prince Edward-Lennox—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is no reason for any hold-up in the service whatsoever. On April 1 or shortly after April 1, every municipal clerk was sent a telegram advising him of the imminence of these regulations, and was told that interim licensing would be observed until they had had ample time to upgrade their equipment, their standards of equipment, training, and so on, to meet with the requirements of the regulations. So there is no need for any hold-up. I think there was some confusion, some misunderstanding, on the part of municipalities and operators alike, but I think that should now be dissolved.

Mr. Chairman: Under special health services branch?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, on that particular topic, I would ask the Minister if there is any estimated amount for these grants to municipalities? Does he have a medium that he aims at, that municipalities strive for, in seeking to get the subsidy? A rural municipality might have one rate to tax its people or a larger metropolitan area might have a certain figure. Does the Minister have any medium figure for these municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is no set figure, the Act and regulations permit the department to pay 50 per cent of the municipal subsidy.

Mr. Paterson: What are the variants in these rates of the municipalities, or does the Minister have any figures at this point? Does $5 per capita in the rural area sound reasonable, or is that high?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no, it is not on a per capita basis to my knowledge. I think the agreement usually arrived at between the municipality and the operator is for a lump sum annually, and we will pay them 50 per cent of that lump sum.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have several questions on this section.

Under this section there is an item—provincial aid re homes for special care. Is this the point at which the Minister might make a specific comment on the homes for special care, how they are going, which hospitals have been relieved as a result of their implementation, and what the prospects are for further expansion?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The amount of money, Mr. Chairman, is in here because the operation of the homes come in here. But the statistics actually will come under mental health. If the hon. member would not mind, I will keep this mentally open until then. The homes for special care branch comes within the public health division. Indeed, I think this is a very excellent argument against the claim that there is no after-care. This really is after-care. But I will get the statistics from the mental health people.

Mr. S. Lewis: So be it, Mr. Chairman, there is no reason why we should not wait.

The home-care assistance programme, this may also be parallel, perhaps it would be more appropriate to discuss it under the Ontario hospital services commission?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is all right here.

Mr. S. Lewis: Fine. Well, if I recall the home-care programme for Metropolitan Toronto, is that not an Ontario hospital services commissions financed programme?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is divided. I can give the member the information.

Mr. S. Lewis: But it is in here?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Then could the Minister give the information on how the home-care programme breaks itself down, which areas, what is happening?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There are actively going now programmes in Toronto which cost $608,000 last year. There was an esti-

mated 2,300 cases. Ottawa with 500 estimated cases, the cost for 1966, $136,418. Guelph, with 265 cases, the cost in 1966, $119,504. Hamilton, with 100 cases, $59,918. Windsor, 100 cases, $53,603. London, 100 cases, $45,843.

Each of those programmes came into operation late in 1966, Hamilton and Windsor in August, London in October.

For 1967-1968, we are planning more. The programmes for Toronto, Ottawa, Guelph, Hamilton, Windsor and London will continue, Waterloo county will be new and it is anticipated they will look after 100 cases at a cost of $60,000.

Conversations, I believe, are under way with other areas, I believe I mentioned them in my opening remarks. There are quite a number of areas interested in this programme. They will be in *Hansard*, I read them in my opening remarks. There are several communities very actively interested in the establishment of these home-care programmes, and apparently they are serving a very useful worthwhile purpose.

Mr. S. Lewis: What is the financial breakdown? You have half a million dollars put aside. What is the provincial contribution to this, how is it financed?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The total cost is between the OHSC and ourselves. The estimated cost for 1967-1968 is $1,450,000. That will mean roughly one-third from the OHSC, one-third from the province and one-third from national health grants or public health grants.

Mr. S. Lewis: Does the Minister have any estimate of the number of days of hospital care saved by virtue of the home-care programme in these various communities?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not have them here, but I can get them. It is rather an impressive figure. I read them recently, but I do not have them with me. I will undertake to see they are put in the hon. member's hands, or table them in the House.

Mr. S. Lewis: I, too, was under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that this in a sense was a real breakthrough in easing the burden on the hospitals and returning care of people through the community, and I have been most interested to see just how significant it is.

I wanted to ask a question in this branch about maternal and child health. I wanted to ask the Minister to make his statement now before the House, or elaborate on his statement about birth control clinics. In The Public Health Act which he discussed, perhaps he could elaborate on such clinics with a little more detail to suggest exactly what he thinks the role of the birth control clinics might be, and whether this might well encompass not merely the dissemination of information, but perhaps pills or devices, and so on.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Here again, Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I think that when the announcement was made and when this amendment was brought in, this matter was expanded out of all proportion. This is one more of the programmes within the view of the provincial objective. If it is deemed by the medical officer of health that this is necessary to meet a need of the people within his care, then he will be encouraged and supported in the establishment of a family planning clinic. There is no provision under The Public Health Act for us to provide devices or medication, whichever method is used, and until I can get money for that, it would be dishonest of me to mislead the people into believing these would be available.

We believe that the counselling can be done there, the proper prescription perhaps can be given, or if the medical officer of health feels that he would rather refer the patient to a family physician, then this, of course, will be his responsibility. At the present time, there is nothing included in the budget to provide either devices or medication.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is an interesting observation, Mr. Chairman. Is the Minister saying that all that stops him from seeing that as a role of the family planning clinic is in fact a budgetary allowance? Would he see the dispensing of medication and birth control devices as part of the role of the family planning clinic, were the money available?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I do not believe I would, Mr. Chairman. I think on the basis of need, yes, it ought to be if need is the only thing that stands between the patient and the device or the medication. Of course, it would be a matter of financing, but if there were no need I do not believe it would be the role of the public health clinic to provide that. There are many other areas where medication or prosthesis might well be provided, and unless we were prepared to do the whole job, other than on a basis of need, I do not think that is the role of the public health clinic at the present time.

Mr. Sopha: Has the Minister consulted his advisors to ascertain whether he would be liable to criminal prosecution if he disseminated these devices?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, the Minister took it upon himself. I am not going to involve my staff. If somebody has to go to jail, I guess I have to go.

Mr. Trotter: Well, if the Minister needs a lawyer, he has a good one right here.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will get a good lawyer; I will speak to my hon. friend.

Mr. Sopha: It strikes me that the way my friend the member for Scarborough West, for whom I have the most profound admiration, talks about this family planning and birth control and all these other in-phrases in the far-out progressive way of thinking in order to be with it, it seems that no family must contain more than four members. I am one of those who has had a great deal of distress within my own breast that the births in this province last year were down 17 per cent. I look ahead, perhaps not in my lifetime, but in the lifetime of my children and my grandchildren when this northern half of the continent might be populated by 50 to 75 million people. It certainly will not be populated by that many if my friend from Scarborough West has his way.

Mr. S. Lewis: Now, just a second, Mr. Chairman. While this debate is taking place, at this very moment my wife may be adding to the population of this province. So let it be understood, Mr. Chairman, that I am not suggesting any intrusion on the capacity to add to the province of Ontario and its population or anywhere else.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): He just does not want the Tories to—

Mr. S. Lewis: Well I am not that selective may I say to the member for Bracondale—just the government.

What I am saying is that where family planning clinics are established—I am putting it on the Minister's own terms—he is the one who has openly advocated, and I for one salute him, that part of the public health units should be in the dissemination of family planning information. I am simply adding to that to suggest to him that it is, as everyone knows, in many instances low income families who seek advice from family planning clinics and from local public health centres. It is low income families and families in severe difficulty who often approach the child-care centres of the public health units. It is traditional in many of these families that they do not have a general practitioner, a family physician, on a regularized basis. It may well be that as the Minister thinks this through to its logical conclusion, he will see that the dissemination of information is not sufficient, that where there is a need and a genuine need, then people should not in fact be shunted from place to place. It should well be within the purview of the family planning clinic attached to the public health unit to dispense medication and devices as well as information when it is medically justified and where the circumstances merit it.

I do not think one need set up something which by its very nature can be prejudicial. If you are going to establish these and encourage the public health units across Ontario to have such a branch as part of their operation, then one should look at it in the overall view and, I think, take a fairly open, flexible and enlightened approach. One assumes that the medical officers of health and the public health nurses know what they are about, that they are responsible human beings, and that they will administer their office with a sense of propriety. That is all one is asking of the Minister. I appreciate the difficulty; the member for Sudbury has certainly pointed out one very real difficulty —the law being so preposterous in this regard. It is very difficult for anyone to do anything intelligent in the field. I would say to him and to the Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, that what one is advocating here is a service to the community, where it is not now available, with little relationship to questions of population.

Mr. Chairman: Shall this section of the vote carry?

Mr. Sopha: I am not satisfied at all that it is necessarily intelligent. That is why I quarrel and perhaps it is on a philosophic approach that I quarrel with the proposition. I do not see anything wrong *per se* with the fact that children are born to low income families. Certainly during one generation there may be some deprivation in that economic unit, the household, but in many cases in the next generation the children having sought their own ways in the world, it is remedied, and the cycle turns, and their experience in the economic climate is much better than that of their parents. I am unwilling just for reason of economic need to circumscribe the limits of the family.

There is another thing that ought to be said here—this Department of Health func-

tions for the whole of the body politic and there are several millions of people in this province who are against birth control for religious reasons. I do not know that the public, being of the character it is, is willing to see the provincial Department of Health get into the business of birth control. I, for one, I do not know how my friend from Parkdale feels about it, and I bow to his superior judgment in that, because he knows more about those things than I do. I would be just as happy to let the Malthusian law take its impenetrable and irresistible way here. It did not take many generations to ascertain what an idiot Malthus was—is that too strong a word?—what a fool he was in the injunctions that he delivered against the population increase. I have to say when I survey this country from Bonavista to the Queen Charlotte Islands that it is a pretty sad spectacle that we are still only 20 million inhabiting the whole northern half of a continent. I say to the Minister of Health, get out of this business, let the member for Perth (Mr. Edwards) carry it on in the nefarious and sinister way that he does and let that be the limit. I am going to watch this department very carefully to see what they are doing.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member can put his mind at rest. He can go home and sleep quite quietly tonight, and quite calmly, and not worry about what The Department of Health is going to do to the population in this regard. There is nothing mandatory about this programme but I do think that the temper of society is such that at least it is our responsibility to see to it that adequate, proper and bona fide advice is available to people who want it.

Now, unfortunately, there is a greater loss on the other side of the coin. There are too many of our mothers dying as a result of criminal abortion or things of this kind. This to me is a far greater menace to the body politic than any advice that we might give through our public health units in respect of family planning. This service will be established by those medical officers of health who believe the needs of their people justify the establishment of the clinic. It will be supported and it is recognized in this modern time as an essential social health service and I do not think that this will alter the birth rate.

The birth rate is down, as my hon. friend said quite factually, 18 per cent this year, without the recognized family planning clinics. I do not think that it is going to drop any more because they are in vogue. I think that, in balance, we might find that we have more and healthier children and certainly will lose fewer mothers; that to me is far more important than a temporary drop in the birth rate. I cannot get too upset or exercised about the drop in the birth rate because this is a cyclical thing. I am quite certain that the wheel will go full turn again; there will be periods when it is up, there will be periods when it is down, and I think nature has a way of looking after these things. I believe my job is to see to it that people who need and want the advice have it available and can rely upon it being authentic.

Mr. Chairman: Shall this section of the vote carry?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, just one final observation. I would say to the Minister and the member for Sudbury through you, sir, that whatever vagaries there were to Malthus, and there were many, the problems of population in international terms at the moment approach disaster. That should at least be recognized. That is obviously not true in this country or in this province.

What we are really saying by the provision of this kind of information through public health units is that public health should recognize at least part of its social responsibility. Public health in Ontario will not recognize criminal abortion as a public health hazard, as a public health menace. It is small compensation, indeed, that we should attempt to save hundreds of lives and tremendous tragedies by providing for the dissemination of birth control information through family planning clinics as part of these units. It is in no sense a restriction of the low income group to have whatever number of children it wishes. One assumes that there are many such families, indeed, many families across the province generally in different circumstances who require the information, who wish it. At the moment, they have no access to it for whatever reason in medical terms in the context of appropriate clinical advice and that is what I hope the public health units will be trying to facilitate. I suggest to the Minister that he take it one step further and that he apply a total health service and, where it is justified, the devices and the medication be provided as well as the information.

Mr. Chairman: Special health services branch carried? The next item, environmental health branch?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, this item deals in part with the whole problem of air pollution control. I am not sure here just how far the Minister plans this $540,000 to go toward the new air pollution plan for the province and how much of it applies to the old Act. But I do think that we have to face up to the fact that on this continent particularly, as well as other places, we are now approaching a situation where no longer can we be complacent about what is happening in the atmosphere around us.

It was my privilege to attend the conference in Montreal last fall to which the hon. member for Essex South alluded this afternoon. At that time the whole problem of the pollution of air, water and soil was dealt with pretty thoroughly and completely. But the thing that emerged more than anything else in that conference was that we are not yet facing up in any realistic sense to the total problem. We have not yet set standards in Canada as to how far we are going to let this thing go.

There is no question that at the present time we are living in a civilization which is going to pollute the atmosphere; we are not ever going to get back to the purity of air that our forefathers experienced in pioneer days. One thing we have to make up our minds to is this, that we have to determine how far this shall go, how dirty we are going to let the air become. We are told by experts that, by the end of this century, we have to take at least 50 per cent more impurities out of the air just to keep up to where we are now. If we are going to make any advance in the situation, we have to take out much more than the 50 per cent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a serious situation, and I understand the Minister is giving very serious consideration to it today. This is the reason for his bill, and this is the reason he thinks that the province ought to take over the whole matter. I have a quote here from Hubert Humphrey, the vice-president of the United States, December 12, 1966, a quote from a speech he made in Washington. He pointed out the great dangers that are building up. He says this:

> I said that there is a serious toll of human life involved. And there is. The nation that suffers the most is ours—

the United States that is—

> —from emphysema, for example, a disease associated directly with air pollution. It is the fastest-growing cause of death in this country today. Among American men, the death rate from emphysema is almost 10 times what it was in 1950. Each month, 1,000 more workers are forced prematurely onto the social security rolls because of the crippling effects of this disease. Significantly, deaths from emphysema are twice as high in our cities as in our rural areas.

And he also says:

> Like emphysema, other major respiratory diseases—bronchitis, asthma, lung cancer, not to mention the common cold—are clearly linked with air pollution, even though the link is incompletely documented as yet. However, there seems to be a growing body of evidence that all of these disturbances of the lung and the throat are related at least indirectly to the atmosphere that surrounds us, the air we breathe.

Now, just last Saturday, one of the Toronto newspapers, Cameron Smith in the *Globe and Mail*, mentions this same link and this same problem. He points out that the report published last month by the United States national centre for air pollution control does not refer specifically to Toronto, but considers dangerous levels of pollution that are far exceeded in the downwtown areas here.

I quite realize that the cities in Ontario are not, on an average, as large as the cities on the eastern seaboard of the United States, but we are building up real danger in the metropolitan areas. And he points this out:

> Last year levels in downtown Toronto were five times above the level at which significant health effects occur. And they were 50 per cent higher than the level at which the report says excess deaths will result.
>
> Metro works department sampling stations, located at the city hall and at the juvenile court on Jarvis Street, recorded annual averages of .073 and .086 respectively last year.

And the danger point is supposed to be at .050. This is a concentration of sulphur dioxide per million parts of air. Now, the article goes on to say:

> Most of the sulphur dioxide generated in Toronto comes from the Richard Hearn steam generating station, operated by Ontario Hydro on Cherry Street. Last year it produced 74,300 tons of sulphur dioxide from its stacks, more than half the total for all of Metro, according to works department figures.
>
> Dr. Holmes said he and his associates were checking the number of complaints received on Thursday last from heart

patients and persons with respiratory problems, and there appeared to have been more received than ordinarily would be expected.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this situation cannot be ignored—and certainly the Minister is not ignoring it, I am not suggesting that. But I asking him, in respect to his plans for the future, what are his plans in respect to the pollution in Metropolitan Toronto and other areas? We drive in downtown Metro in the morning, on a calm morning, and we see the great body of smoke here. When driving along the Gardiner expressway we see the cloud of smoke hanging over that part of this city. We drive across the Burlington bridge and see the great pall of smoke hanging over Hamilton and the harbour there. And we go into Sudbury, where my hon. friend in the front row lives, and we see the great cloud of smoke being spewed out of the smokestacks up there and spreading out over the whole countryside.

Is the Minister going to allow Metropolitan Toronto to move forward, or does he plan that this Act now before this Legislature shall be in effect in time to do the job effectively here in Metropolitan Toronto? Last fall, Metro evolved its by-law which had to do with effective administration and had to do with fuels which are low in contaminants. There was a great deal of optimism in Metropolitan Toronto when they had at last worked out the process by which they could effectively enforce the clean air idea in this area. But the people who are well trained, and who understand these things, and are ready to move ahead, have been frustrated since that time because there has been a lack of action here. The Minister has not seen fit to allow the passage of this by-law under the former Act and has said that it must await the enactment of new legislation.

It just seems, Mr. Chairman, that unless there is going to be immediate action—unless this Act is going to be proclaimed right away —unless the Minister is going to allow that corps of workers so painfully built up over the period of years to operate—there is going to be a continuation of this frustration in the Metro area. I would like to know what the Minister's plans are in this field.

I have some other questions I want to ask, but I wonder if the Minister would enlighten us as to just how quickly he expects the new Act to come into operation? If we stop talking and let him go ahead with it, I suppose he will tell us. But what are his plans in respect to the people who are ready to operate in Metro? Are they going to be spread over the province to train others? How soon can we expect real results and what proportion of this $545,000 is going to administer the old Act and what proportion will come under the new Act when it is proclaimed?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this amount of $545,000 is all for the continuance of the old Act. Now, let us put this squarely at the outset. There is no need for any sense of frustration on the part of Toronto. They know that and I know that, there is nothing stopping them carrying on their smoke control as they have been doing, except they should have changed in 1959 and written a new by-law under the new Air Pollution Control Act. Instead they elected to continue under that old term of The Municipal Act which was repealed at the time.

However, there is nothing to stop them carrying on with that as they are doing now. The only difference is that we will give them a grant to assist them with the financing of it. On January 1, 1968, The Department of Health will take over the control of the total programme as was laid down when I presented the bill to the House—what I said is all in *Hansard*. The planning is laid out; the phasing is laid out; the programme is laid out; but in the meantime—

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Minister a question of clarification right here? I understand one of the problems in the Metro area is the lack of control over fuels—low sulphur fuels that the authorities here would like to see burned and yet they have not the power to enforce this at the present time. It is also difficult, because of lack of standards, to really establish just who is polluting the air and it is very difficult for them to get convictions.

These were among the problems that the people faced, and still face, in Metropolitan Toronto. I wonder if the Minister feels that these could be overcome and that they are mistaken in their feeling?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot state at this time whether they can be overcome. I am advised that they can, but that there are some difficulties inherent in it. We are prepared to step in on a case of that kind now, if the complaint is laid before us. The Metro authorities can continue to control the smoke —that is the part that they see. I am just advised now that there is provision in the Act before the House—it is beyond a proposal

now—to cover this very problem you mention. But in the meantime—

Mr. Young: Yes, but they cannot do it until that Act is passed. That is my point.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We can do it, though. We will presume that we have the power if the matter is so urgent, but Metro can control the smoke problem as it is. Since 1963 they have not had to attempt to control industrial emissions because that has been a provincial responsibility. I would therefore point out again in summing up, the $540,000 is to allow us to pay grants to those municipalities that are trying out programmes now until January 1. The rest of the money which we ourselves will need will come from public health grants. We have access to them, which can put the amount in excess of $1 million.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I am just not certain—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview has another question on the same point?

Mr. Trotter: Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. Young: That is all right.

Mr. Trotter: I am not certain at all what the government intends to do about the problem of clean air—pollution, if you call it that—but it is a question of where we need to get some clean air. We have had this problem of smoke and we now find out, after some of us have done some reading on it, that the real problem that we are having today is not so much with smoke, which is bad enough. It is the question, as the member for Yorkview mentioned, of the products of burning fuel, such as carbon monoxide.

I was in Los Angeles last December and was amazed to see the problems they have. If you stand up on a high point and look down, you realize what a terrible situation they have.

Then I come back to Toronto and ask questions about the problem that we are faced with and find out that the city of Toronto has the highest ratings for carbon monoxide in the air of any city in North America. We may ask where the fault lies. Obviously in the city of Toronto itself they do have a hard core of professional men who have been working on this problem. I think that they are disturbed that now that new legislation has been passed by the province, the hard core of trained men which they built up will be dissipated in much the same way as the hard core of Avro engineers was dissipated when they did away with the Avro plane. It has taken the city of Toronto years to build up this hard core.

I believe that the major responsibility for air pollution lies with the province of Ontario. I think that, because it is in The Department of Health, the department should pass legislation whereby it ensures that laws are passed, and laws especially are enforced, to protect the citizens of this province. I would like a definite commitment from the Minister on two things:

1. Is Ontario going to be divided into areas, perhaps even using Metropolitan Toronto as an area, to see that this can be enforced locally?

2. What is the programme of the province insofar as air pollution generally is concerned? I do not see that the government is actually coming to grips with the problem of carbon monoxide in the air, particularly in large centres like Toronto and Hamilton and Sudbury and Sarnia and Sault Ste. Marie. These have become very serious problems.

The worst case is probably Toronto, because about 90 per cent of the carbon monoxide comes from automobiles. Yet the problem we have had with the hydrocarbons comes right from a government agency—from the Ontario Hydro. I have seen no indication that the province intends to take any action against one of the major arms of this government.

I am not satisfied at all, nor have I seen it in black and white, what the policy of the government is. As we all know, some ten or twelve years ago the government had a committee on air pollution. This whole issue, this whole major problem, has just been allowed to drift in the smog. The answers that I have heard the Minister attempt to give simply are not coming to grips with the extremely serious problem—a problem that is going to become an even greater crisis unless we do something in the very immediate future. Now I ask the Minister this: what really is the role of Toronto in regard to air pollution generally? Then, what role will the city of Toronto have in enforcing smoke control and what role, if any, will the city of Toronto have in trying to enforce the matter of controlling carbon monoxide and the hydrocarbons?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure myself whether Toronto, the city of Toronto, is still in this, or whether Metro took over responsibility.

Mr. Trotter: It is Metro.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Metro. Well, Metro will continue to control smoke for the remainder of this calendar year under our proposal.

Mr. Trotter: What happens at the end of the calendar year?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The province takes over total responsibility and our policy was laid out with the submission of the bill to the House on April 5 of this year, so that our policy is on the public record now. The bill has to go before the committee of the Legislature and come back to the committee of the House and then for third reading. It will be law and the province will take over.

The hon. member says we are not coming to grips with this. This is quite true, because we do not have the legal authority yet, but we will be having it very shortly, I presume, if the House backs us up in this. I take it they will, because everyone seems to be very much in favour of this kind of programme. Therefore we will come to grips with it.

I recognize that the carbon monoxide and the sulphur dioxide fumes are very troublesome features of this, but I am quite certain that they can be controlled—indeed, I am assured they can be controlled. There need be no question in the mind of any member of the House if the agency of the government, the Ontario Hydro, continues to break the law without taking the steps that are possible for it to take—then, of course, it will be treated as anyone else in the province will. I think it is only right to say that you have been told in this House that Hydro is trying its very best to cope with the problem. It is just not something that can be made to disappear overnight, but I think that it would be quite wrong of me if I were to lead the House to believe that I think a programme of this kind can be effectively brought about by punitive measures. If there is any place for preventive measures it is in a matter of this kind and by education, by persuasion and then only by mandate, if necessary we will try to bring the programme to fruition.

The hard core of Metro personnel will not be disturbed, my staff tell me; they will not be spread over the province as has been feared. The existing Metro staff will be supplemented to take on more duties. The province will be divided into regions, and Metro has already planned to be a region. We are quite convinced that only on a regional basis can this be done.

As I stated at the time I presented the bill for second reading, it is only by the province assuming control—and I believe that the hon. member for Parkdale has stated this on several occasions as his belief—can this programme be effectively carried out. This is being found more and more to be the case in other jurisdictions where they have faced the very difficult problem too. Only a short time ago I read a report from California that even that state is seriously contemplating taking over control because municipal control, while effective where it is in operation, cannot be equitably applied unless there is mandatory legislation. Surrounding municipalities can either institute programmes or not, as they choose.

For that reason, and for many other reasons which I have already put on record, we believe here in Ontario that only central control on a regional basis can be made to work.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to get even that much out of the Minister. I know he says he has laid down what the policy of the government is, but we in the Metropolitan Toronto area have been concerned—at least many officials have been—as to what was going to happen to their staffs. My understanding from the remarks the Minister has made, Mr. Chairman, is that the Metropolitan Toronto staff, so far as air pollution is concerned, is not going to be diluted but is going to be given further duties and have a staff increase. This is what I take from the Minister's remarks.

One thing that is difficult to understand is why it has taken this provincial government so long to come to grips with the various impurities like carbon monoxide. It is true that we think smoke is the worst because we see it, but when you start to read on the subject you realize the various sulphurs and carbons are far worse than the actual smoke that we see. Yet it is only in this day and age that we are now passing legislation where we can even begin to enforce laws in order to control what has become a very serious problem.

This is an illustration, Mr. Chairman, on this vote, of the snail's pace at which this particular department and the government as a whole moves in trying to solve a problem. This is something that people have been screaming about for years, and yet they just have to drive to Hamilton and smell the harbour to know that they have a major problem and have had it there for years.

Those of us who live here in Toronto are perturbed and shocked to learn how badly we stand in comparison with other cities. We

go around perhaps criticizing the situation in Los Angeles and then get the rather shocking and amazing information that we, on many occasions during the year are twice as bad as Los Angeles. So I am not too hopeful that the Minister will take much action in this, because he really has not shown any interest in this problem over the last number of years that I have been here.

I have felt that the main source of impetus in coming to grips with this problem will come from the province because, in all frankness, the Ottawa government has failed miserably to make the effort that it should have. This problem of air pollution is not only a provincial problem, it is a national problem and an international problem, and we have not had the leadership from Ottawa. For the sake of all of us, we simply have to take the leadership and pressure Ottawa into taking far more interest than it has displayed. For some inconceivable reason, men in government, men in power, regardless of their party politics have ignored the pollution of our air and of our water. They have never come out with any major plan of attack.

Now it may be that these Acts and these features that we have from the government in regard to air pollution at this late date may be more or less window dressing for election time—I do not know, this is what will have to be judged in the future. I am cynical and suspicious of their programme, but I do have the hope that they really mean to do something.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister if consideration has been given by his department to the banning of certain types of fuels? I read somewhere in the press that in certain sections of the United States, certain types of carbon fuels were not going to be permitted to be burned after a certain date. Is there any consideration concerning that type of suggestion, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not sure that there is an arbitrary date set, but there are considerations that fuel of a certain sulphur dioxide content, I believe it is, cannot be burned at certain times. Now, just how the details of this will operate, I do not know, but I do know that this is one of the considerations.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the Minister what the standard of measurement is for air pollution? Is it a microgram per cubic metre?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have to plead that that question puts me out of my depth. I never was a physicist and I have no bent for engineering. I am afraid that I am quite out of my depth. I will have to ask my people.

Mr. Trotter: The average is 30 parts per million—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I know it is 30 parts per million but how it is measured, I cannot tell you.

Mr. Trotter: For carbon monoxide it is 30 parts per million, and in Toronto we are about 72, and sometimes go to around 170.

Mr. Newman: Apparently there are different standards, because the one that I happen to have uses a standard of micrograms per cubic metre, and the comments were that 125 micrograms per cubic metre was the standard at which health could be sustained. Beyond that it was getting to be a real health hazard.

May I ask the Minister how the new Act will operate in cities bordering upon the United States? I refer particularly to the two cities, Sarnia and Windsor, where most of our pollution originates in an industrial complex known as River Rouge and Zug Island. Even this morning as I motored from the city to here, I could see the reddish pollution drifting across the Detroit river and settling on various parts of Essex county and the city of Windsor.

Mr. Chairman: I do not want to interrupt the member, but seeing that there is not any provision for funds here for the new Act, and that it will be before us in committee, and once again before the House for discussion, I wonder if we could stay with the estimate that is before us.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the Minister, then, if the department has any report concerning air pollution in the city of Windsor? I understand that there was one which had been submitted to the department and it was one which was very, very serious. It illustrated how bad the pollution had been in the past and that there was need for action almost immediately.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member is quite correct, sir, this is part of the programme. This area, together with the Sarnia-Port Huron area, is the subject of an air pollution reference to the international joint commission. Now this reference is concerned only with the trans-boundary flow of air

pollution. The province, besides being concerned with this aspect is also concerned with the amount of pollution generated in the area and its effect locally. However, the activities of the air pollution service are directed to accomplish both of these objectives. A representative of the air pollution control division of my department is a member of the advisory committee of the international joint commission and, therefore, is completely knowledgeable of what they are doing. But all across the international boundary, and on the provincial boundaries, of course, these become responsibilities of the international joint commission.

I would like to point out something in connection with what has been said about the responsibility of the federal government. I brought this to the attention of the federal Minister of Health and Welfare at our recent conference and urged him to persuade his colleagues in Ottawa to join with us in this problem, which involves very definite responsibilities of the federal government.

I am hopeful that something is to be done at that level to assist us with, if nothing else, setting up national criteria which will be applicable across the whole of our nation.

Mr. Newman: May I follow through, Mr. Chairman? I would like to ask the Minister if he intends to make public the report of the city of Windsor concerning air pollution in that city?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not sure that I have it. I cannot recall. I cannot say if I intend to make it public or not. If it is referable to the city of Windsor, doubtless they have made—

Mr. Newman: It has not been made public at all, but it was submitted to the Minister's department and it has not been released at all because it dealt extensively with the pollution resulting from the American side of the river.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Chairman, I think I might be able to help with the hon. member's question.

Mr. Sopha: I doubt that. I am sceptical.

Mr. Knox: Well, the member may doubt that, but may I have a try? Comparative data for major North American cities, particularly in Canada, are sketchy. Available average levels for United States communities are derived from camps which have continuous air monitoring programme stations operated by the United States public health service to provide continuous concurrent data on air pollutants in United States cities. Over a two-year period, the camp levels were as follows: Chicago, 13.5 parts per 100 million; Philadelphia, 7.6; Washington, 5.1; Cincinnati, 2.9; New Orleans, 1.0 and San Francisco, 0.8. Of the few Canadian cities where measurements were taken and published, Windsor reached 9.3 parts per 100 million in the 1951-52 period, which is the last measurement taken.

Mr. Gisborn: What is the member reading from?

Mr. Knox: Hamilton shows two levels for 1964—4.7 for the industrial area and 3.5 parts per 100 million for the overall city reading. At Sudbury, where one of the main industries is the recovery of sulphur in the form of sulphuric acid, the average measured over a 10-year programme was 1.8 parts per 100 million. The 1966 measure for the city of Sarnia, since someone asked, was 2.3.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): What is this from?

Mr. Knox: I am quoting from a report given at a seminar in the city of Sarnia and drawn up by Dr. E. R. Morton from one of the industries, DuPont. He is on the St. Clair research committee on pollution, which has been in operation for some 14 years.

Mr. Sopha: My friend, the member for Lambton West, will never know what a comfort it is to be assured that the next time I am walking along Elm Street eating the sulphur, and smarting at the eyes, to know that it is only 1.8 parts per 100 million. I am gratefully indebted to him. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it is not too great an exaggeration to refer to the story of the octogenarian saying to the young man, "Where were you born, son?" He said, "In Sudbury." He said, "When did you first see the light of day?" He said, "When I moved to Moosonee." That may emphasize the quality of the atmosphere there some days.

I say to the member for Parkdale, when he expresses his suspicion about the intentions of this government in regard to this new legislation that is being passed, that to me it is nothing short of death bed repentance. That is all it is. They have had 24 years in which they have viewed the atmosphere in this province getting dirtier and dirtier. It is only one the eve of a provincial election that a pretence is made of some

forthright step for provincial control in this very vital area which reflects in its totality that basic enjoyment of the air is a necessity of human rights on this planet.

One of the great writers, I forget which one, said the hallmark of the disintegration of a civilization is the way it dirties its environment. Now, contemplate the profundity and the depressing nature of that remark. I wish I could remember which one of the historians it was who said that several years ago.

However, we cannot have it both ways; we have to be fair about this. We cannot exalt the affluent society on the one hand and demand an ever-increasing tempo of commercial and industrial activity in order to provide us with those objects of conspicuous consumption and then, on the other hand, want the environment to be pure, clear and unsullied. Those two things have to be balanced off one against the other. If you want the pure environment of water and air then the best place to go is somewhere in the heart of central Africa or some atoll out in the Pacific ocean. But you can hardly have it that way in an environment where you have the pace of economic activity that we have and want to have in this province.

Having said that, speaking as the member for Sudbury, I want to say a few things about the problem there. The Minister is aware, there is no doubt about it, of the specific allegations that have been made by responsible members of local 6500 of the united steel workers about the pollution, environmental pollution, which they claim to be extremely hazardous to health, in the iron ore plant in Waters township. I know he is aware of this because my friend, the member for Yorkview, made him aware in this House. I have had the opportunity to have conversations with his own people within his department about this problem. That is the level at which I thought that it ought to be opened with The Department of Health; I did not think, as the responsible member, though I was aware of it, that it ought to be opened on the floor of the Legislature. The member for Yorkview opened it here because he received some material, information, from a man by the name of Valentine in Sudbury. There is no question about it, that he got his information from Ken Valentine. I have seen that assertion over the hand of the member for Yorkview. Mr. Valentine, it is unfortunate, but very appropriate to say this here, let the member for Yorkview in on this, apprised him of it, and I do not know that he did not stimulate him to raise it on the floor of the Legislature. Mr. Valentine, a high official, a senior official in the united steel workers, at the national level, plays politics in preference to concern for people's health.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What is this member doing?

Mr. Sopha: If I have to say it among the hubbub of inanity that I get from the left, I am going to take my time and say it. Mr. Valentine is, of course, one of the carpetbaggers, he is an itinerant NDP politician that came into town.

Mr. Bryden: The member is just being childish.

Mr. Sopha: No, that is perfectly true.

Mr. MacDonald: Why does not the member deal with the issue instead of playing politics himself?

Mr. Sopha: That is one of the benefits that we get in Sudbury—we get the people from the national office of the NDP come in to change our political life.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member is wrong as usual.

Mr. Sopha: Now you see the inferences that come from that. Instead of the safety and health committee taking it up with the responsible people in the environmental health branch of The Department of Health and seeing what could be done to rectify the situation, the national people prefer that the member for Yorkview be their spokesman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: This cuts them to the raw. You see how this grabs them, Mr. Chairman, for me to say these things. The member for Yorkview, of course, becomes the parrot of these people on the top floor of the union hall.

When I became aware of this, I say to my friend the Attorney General who attends me, I got in touch with the safety and health committee of the union which is the responsible body. They expressed their dismay, not to say their chagrin, that it had been raised on the floor of the Legislature. Mr. Maguire—you will like that name, Mickey Maguire—the chairman of the safety and health committee who resides in the hamlet of Garson, expressed his displeasure that it had been raised by the member for Yorkview.

Here is the way I want to pose it to the Minister. I see no good reason at all why The Department of Mines, if it is to be a meaningful department in respect to the mining industry, should not have within its department a unit modelled on this one in The Department of Health that would exercise these policing powers in respect to air pollution for the mining industry only.

In that regard, one observes that they have the sulphur fumes arbitrator who, of course, is mainly concerned with the damage that is done to those engaged in agriculture by reason of the emission of these sulphurous fumes from the stacks to the west of us which providence has decreed—I say to my friend from St. David (Mr. Price)—always blow in an easterly direction. One never sees them blowing west. I do not think the human is alive who has ever seen Inco's fumes go away to the west where there is less habitation. Providence has decreed—I guess it is the westerly winds—they come over the north part of the basin where the best farming lands are located.

Now, this sulphur fumes arbitrator a couple of years ago journeyed down to Toronto and amid the sanctity of Toronto—I wish the Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) was here to hear this, 250 miles away the sulphur fumes —the arbitrator announced that there are less sulphurous fumes coming from Inco. Well, you would need an electron microscope to prove that proposition. Nobody in the city had ever noticed that. With the erection of another iron ore plant if anything the amount of fumes that is being emitted is greater rather than less. Unless somebody gets carried away with this recovery of sulphuric acid, it is my appreciation of the situation that the amount of sulphur fumes that are diverted into that operation play but a very small fraction of the total amount generated by the smelters and the other burning processes of both the Copper Cliff smelter and the iron ore plant.

They would have to recover a great deal of sulphur, as I understand it, in order to make any indentation at all on the total amount, but we have not heard at this point —to be fair to the member for Yorkview— from the Minister of Health. At least I have not heard what steps he has taken in order to look into these complaints. They were serious allegations made by the safety and health committee about the escape of carbon monoxide, particularly in the iron ore plants. Indeed, Mr. Maguire informs us that on one occasion several men on a shift had to be taken to hospital and had to be treated.

Well, common sense seems to tell me that this ought to be a responsibility of The Department of Mines. The Department of Mines is responsible for every other aspect of safety—underground working; the cages; the tenders; and everything else. If there is, as I suspect, a hazard to health here, then why does not The Department of Mines have the foremost responsibility? Why do they have to wait for The Department of Health to come into this area and this branch to activate itself?

The people of Sudbury and particularly those responsible people in the union and the safety and health committee are entitled to hear from the Minister of Health. I do not know if he even attends me in this. He seems to be engrossed in some literature that is before him which may or may not appertain to his department. It might be a letter from somebody in Nigeria for all I know, some missionary writing to him.

I think that I have seen the correspondence that has passed between Mr. Soden, the president of local 6500, who is not himself NDP—the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) will be encouraged by that—and he did not write to the member for Yorkview so far as I know.

Mr. MacDonald: He gave us the information a year ago. You have been sleeping on the issue for a year or two.

Mr. Bryden: You have not been in this House for two weeks.

Mr. Sopha: Well, let us put it on the record. When the member for Yorkview raised it in this the most solemn place in all Ontario, a school teacher of Lively wrote to the member for Yorkview and said: "Where did you get your information, I would like to know more about it?" The member for Yorkview wrote back and said: "I got the information from Mr. K. A. Valentine of the united steel workers".

Mr. MacDonald: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Sopha: Well why are you saying he got it from Soden?

Mr. MacDonald: I said I got it from Soden.

Mr. Sopha: You got it. Well who was talking about you?

Mr. MacDonald: I just wanted to let you know you have been sleeping at the switch about this problem for over a year.

Mr. Sopha: Who invited you into this argument?

Mr. MacDonald: I just want to bring you up to date.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Sopha: I want you to retire to the TV screen with that pipe.

Mr. MacDonald: I may do that, but I have to watch you for your mis-statement of facts. You are missing the boat.

Mr. Sopha: You know I might say to you that the pipe is a symbol of insecurity, you know.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, in the Freudian philosophy.

Mr. MacDonald: I would hate to think what your symbols of insecurity are at the moment.

Mr. Sopha: I have a two-year-old who has a soother and I am going to bring it and try it on you instead of that pipe. Alright? That is fine, having dealt with him, he will be quiet for the rest of the evening.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right? Do not bank on it.

Mr. Sopha: Well, do not move into the lawnmower now, you will get another swath.

Mr. Gisborn: You are not very serious about the sulphur problem.

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes, I am. I put it on the record as it occurred, and I expressed my concern which is just as, and perhaps more genuine, than the concern of others who use it only for political purposes.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right? Well congratulations!

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, we are getting some distance away from this vote, but I do find a great deal of interest in the fact that there is insecurity in another member of the House here. He obviously is feeling his neck—his political neck—and so he presents the House with this outburst. I might say for his information that the specific bit of information that was asked for by his informant, who evidently wrote perhaps at his behest, I do not know, to get certain information, that little bit of information certainly was given to me by Ken Valentine.

I know Ken Valentine, I have been in touch with him from time to time. I also happen to know Mr. Soden, the president of the local, and Mr. Maguire and other members of the committee. But I would call to the attention of the hon. member that the first time that this came to my attention was in May of 1966 when I received a copy of *The Searcher,* local 6500, united steel workers of America. That is May, 1966.

Here for the world to read was the story, a story for the hon. member for Sudbury to read, and the hon. member for Sudbury if he had wished at that time could have brought it to this House. Following that, and before this time, the members of local 6500 had been to this government. They had tried their best to get action from this government. Failing to get that action, Tony Soden wrote in April to the Minister of Mines and outlined the whole problem and asked for action. Again no action. Not even a reply to the letter was forthcoming.

Last fall, in October, the committee journeyed down to this centre and asked the government to take certain action. Again, no action was taken.

Since Christmas, as the hon. member knows, Mr. Soden, Mr. Valentine, and other members of the committee were in this city to meet with members of the Cabinet to put this problem before them. No results. The member at that time did not seem to think it was his prerogative to intervene in this whole case.

I raised this matter in the House and I raise it again.

Mr. Sopha: Indeed. Let us be clear about that. Until I am asked I certainly would not intervene.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: The hon. member knew about the sulphur dioxide in the plant. He knew about the carbon monoxide in the plant. He knew about the intolerable situation. He knew that the union had monitored these gases, and knew they were above the tolerable level. He knew there were about 23 cases or so where men had very serious effects from the gases, and he thought it not his business until asked to raise it. Well I think the hon. member—

Mr. MacDonald: They need a change of member up there.

Mr. Bryden: They are going to get it, too.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have been the object of an accusation here. My second to the left here sits muttering, and I am afraid what he mutters will go into *Hansard* and be unanswered.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I am aware, if my friends to the left are not, that there is a collective bargaining agreement in existence between local 6500 and the International Nickel Company of Canada—

Mr. Bryden: What has this got to do with it?

Mr. Sopha: Safety and health are matters of negotiation between them, and I state as a matter of principle that in respect of that agreement I will not intervene until I am asked.

Mr. MacDonald: There is no point of order —you are very easily disturbed.

Mr. Sopha: Shall I tell you the point of order?

Mr. MacDonald: No, no, you ought to get the facts in time so you will feel more secure.

Mr. Sopha: I was accused. Now that has hurt my friend and if he wants I will withdraw that.

Mr. Chairman: I have asked the member to state his point of order.

Mr. Sopha: I promise never to mention the pipe again.

Mr. MacDonald: No, no, you should have it to build your security.

Mr. Sopha: I was accused. I have faced the brunt of some scurrilous comments about my failure to intervene and I have stated that I would not intervene in a matter of collective bargaining until I was invited to do so. I shall adhere to that principle as long as I am the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in this point of order, because this is a new field for collective bargaining. Certainly I do not know of any collective bargaining process where a union bargains with the employer to get the gas out of the works.

Mr. Bryden: Bargains about the health of people.

Mr. Young: This is a matter for the Minister of Health. It it not a matter of collective bargaining. That is simply a red herring.

Mr. Sopha: What are you talking about? The safety and health committee is a matter in the contract.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, if we could get away from the hon. member for Sudbury and his problems for the moment. I come back to ask the hon. Minister of Health when action is going to take place in the Sudbury area in respect to these gases? When are we going to get action to clean up this situation that has been there for years, ever since those smelters were built? It is high time that this Minister began to take the action that has been asked for by the people of Sudbury, if not by the member, by the union and its executive, and its representatives. We would like to know what action the Minister now contemplates.

I know the Minister of Mines told us some time ago that Inco was instituting certain processes. They were also going to ventilate more effectively, so that those gases could come out into the air for the hon. member for Sudbury to breathe. Instead of looking after the sulphur where it ought to be looked after—within the structure of the plant itself —they are going to vent it more effectively out to the outer air, for the people of Sudbury, into the whole Sudbury basin.

Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us what the answer is to all the presentations that have been made by the people of Sudbury to this Cabinet over the last three or four years and more?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I first answer the question posed by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville? He spoke about a report. This report was made jointly by the federal government and the province. It was submitted to The Department of External Affairs to support the reference of the international joint commission. The international joint commission have the authority to release this report. I have not. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal about the mines at Sudbury and it was quite interesting to listen to the by-play and the interplay—

Mr. MacDonald: Now let us have some government action.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —with the fears of insecurity, because one sucks a pipe, another sucks a bottle, and others a soother. Throw that baby's soother away, you will spoil her jaw, will you do that for me, please? In the interests of her teeth.

Mr. Bryden: Here is an expert talking.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Now the story about the International Nickel. May I make very clear to you, sir, that The Department of Health acts as a consultant in industrial health environmental sanitation to The Department of Mines. It does not need to set up a department of health of its own. This is our function and has been our function for several years.

When we are called upon to involve ourselves as consultants to The Department of Mines, we do so:

In view of many health complaints from the union at International Nickel Co. at Copper Cliff concerning working conditions at the Copper Cliff operations of Inco, on December 3, Mr. L. E. Soden, president, local 6500, sent identical letters to the Minister of Mines and, the Minister of Health complaining about gas conditions in the Sudbury smelter. On January 4, 1966, as a result of this letter, a meeting was held in The Department of Mines boardroom. The union requests were the establishment of legal limits for short term exposure for sulphur dioxide because of excessive exposure in the smelter at Copper Cliff and Coniston.

A detailed survey of gas conditions in the smelter should be undertaken by the industrial hygiene staff and a study of causes of sickness and death in smelter workers should be made.

Union workers have done sulphur dioxide tests on their own. The results were quite high. There were statements also that the life expectancy of workers was reduced because of their exposure to sulphur dioxide.

February 21 to 25, 1966: an engineer from the industrial hygiene branch conducted detailed studies of ventilation and an assessment of sulphur dioxide pneumonia levels in the areas complained about.

Investigations were made at the Copper Cliff smelter, Coniston smelter, iron ore recovery plant and Levack Mine. In general, our engineer found gas concentrations to be lower than those reported by the union. Nevertheless, improvements were considered necessary in several areas and the company is engaged in a major programme of process control and ventilation changes which it is felt should improve the situation.

March 6, 1966: a physician from the industrial hygiene staff visited the iron ore recovery plant.

March 13, 1966: a physician from the industrial hygiene staff, Department of Education seminar with members of the local union in Sudbury.

March 24, 1966: the industrial hygiene branch prepared a memorandum on short term limits for exposure to sulphur dioxide. This was forwarded to The Department of Mines to be used as a guide only. It was not released to the union and it is not considered to have any legal status.

April 19, 1966: the noise control specialist from industrial hygiene branch conducted a noise survey underground in the Frood Mine as the result of a union request.

April 20, 1966: an engineer from the industrial hygiene branch again visited the International Nickel Co. He and a staff member of The Department of Mines discussed the union complaints in the union steel workers hall in Sudbury. Again there was mention by the union of the need for a study of life expectancy in smelter workers exposed to sulphur dioxide.

April 29, 1966: Mr. Soden wrote to the Minister of Mines and the Minister of Health, complaining of a lack of action following a meeting on January 4, 1966. There was also a suggestion that investigations carried out by The Department of Health and The Department of Mines were not representative of the actual working conditions.

It should be pointed out that no agreement was ever made that The Department of Health would engage in a comprehensive study of mortality and morbidity in workers of Inco. As a matter of record, the local union promised to provide more data to support the request for such a study. As yet, this data has not been received.

June 29, 1966: Mr. J. P. Hickey, of the united steel workers of America, wrote to Mr. B. J. Legge, QC, chairman of the workmen's compensation board, concerning sulphur dioxide exposure. Copies of this letter were sent to many people, including the Prime Minister, the Minister of Mines and the Minister of Health. The letter contained a request for the examination of workers exposed to sulphur dioxide for periods in excess of two years, air sampling for sulphur dioxide and a study of ill effects from exposure to sulphur dioxide.

There is no conclusive evidence, however, of any increase in respiratory or heart disability in workers exposed to sulphur

dioxide from smelting operations, except for the occasional episode involving acute exposure. Furthermore, there is no concrete medical evidence that lung exposure to long levels of sulphur dioxide results in chronic respiratory disease.

July 5, 1966: A physician and an engineer from the industrial health service visited the International Nickel operations and reviewed working conditions.

The chief engineer of mines, Department of Mines, on that same date wrote to the local union to point out that the department had the primary responsibility for investigation of these complaints, that the industrial hygiene branch acted as consultants to them.

On October 5, 1966: Mr. G. Demers, MPP for the riding of Nickel Belt, telephoned the industrial hygiene branch requesting a meeting of interested persons with the local unions to discuss health complaints.

On October 26, 1966: this meeting was held in the presence of the hon. Minister of Mines, the Deputy Minister of Mines, Mr. R. L. Smith, Dr. E. Mastromatteo, Dr. V. L. Tidey of The Department of Health, and Mr. K. A. Valentine of the united steel workers of America.

At this meeting, there were union complaints about carbon monoxide exposure in the iron ore recovery plant. Air sampling for carbon monoxide was again carried out by individual workers who were members of the union. According to their figures, the concentrations of carbon monoxide were excessive, and control and monitoring by the company were inadequate. Details of alleged cases of poisoning from carbon monoxide occurring in workers were also presented.

November 17, 1966: A review of conditions in the iron ore recovery plant was made by a representative of The Department of Mines. A physician from the industrial hygiene branch was also present during this review. Some of the complaints made by the union had not been brought to the attention of the company, and were either corrected, or in the process of correction at the time of this visit. The episodes involving carbon monoxide exposure were also investigated. One case was before the workmen's compensation board field tribunal at the time. The others involved minor effects with no serious or permanent disability, as a result of mechanical failure.

November 22, 1966: The hon. Minister of Mines wrote to the local union, recommending procedures for the handling of future complaints. The union was asked to discuss these complaints first with company officials, then when a written reply was received by the union from the company such complaints should be forwarded to The Department of Mines.

In conclusion, my staff sums the matter up as follows:

> A great many complaints have been received from the local union over the past year. These have been investigated by the staff of The Department of Mines and The Department of Health. An attempt has been made to establish a uniform procedure for the handling of these. The role of the occupational health service in The Department of Health is that of health consultants to The Department of Mines.
>
> It should be pointed out that during the past year, two cases of respiratory cancer —one involving a sinus, the other involving a lung—have been reported in workers from the Sudbury area. These have been presented as claims for occupational disease to the workmen's compensation board and, in our understanding, they have been rejected.
>
> This information is added in the event that some reference is made to the occurrence of pulmonary cancer in workers from the Sudbury area. Present data do not indicate any increased risk in these workers comparable to that at the Port Colborne refinery.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the detailed, chronological account of what has taken place insofar as my department is concerned in this matter.

The further development now is that a review of mortality experience is under way, and the physiological testing of employee groups is presently being set up as a research project in the hope that we can delve more deeply into these complaints and see if we get anything from the experiences available to us from such research.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I understand from what the hon. Minister has said, that there is divided jurisdiction here and The Department of Health simply acts as consultant for The Department of Mines, so the Minister of Mines is the person to whom we look for redress of the situation at Inco. Is this correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would not say that it is divided jurisdiction; it is complementary jurisdiction. We work together.

Mr. Young: But the ultimate—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The ultimate authority lies with the Minister of Mines.

Mr. Young: The incredible thing to me, Mr. Chairman, in this recital tonight is the way that the people of Sudbury through, largely, the local union, have had to prod and dig and drive and work to get action in this field. Surely, after all these years, when it was known what was going on in the Sudbury basin and when everybody seemed to be aware of it—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not think that this is a fair summation, sir. The first date is December 3. Now, December is the Christmas month; on January 4, we with The Department of Mines began to take action. There is not a great deal of time there. We cannot just drop everything immediately and go at it. I do not think it is fair to say they had to dig and prod and wait, because there was just a month between the date of of the first letter sent us by Mr. Soden and the date of the first action between the two departments.

Mr. Young: The action obviously was not effective because the union had to come down time after time to Toronto to meet with the local authorities here. That is my point. I think when the time comes that The Department of Mines' estimates are before this House, that may be the time that we can get a final answer about this whole matter.

Mr. Sopha: It seems from a recount of the circumstances from the lips of the Minister of Health, that it was a case where the local union had to prove their case beyond a reasonable doubt. They had the onus to convince him absolutely and his officials before they would take any action, and that is the impression I have received through the whole piece.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: May I object here, Mr. Chairman? I think after they read this in *Hansard,* they will see that they have the wrong impression. We found, on checking the test results, that ours did not agree with them. I think this is understandable because, as was pointed out to them, this was a highly technical undertaking and it may well be that their personnel who did the testing were not adequately trained, or their equipment was not adequate to the job. But there is no case of making them prove their point. They gave us their complaint; they gave us the result of their tests; and our staff went up on February 21—and I think it is only right to point out to the hon. member for Yorkview, that they did not have to come down—we went up there—

Mr. MacDonald: Did the company know that you were going?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I do not think so. We do not tell the company when we are spot checking, we simply go around there. I know my hon. friend has a suspicious mind—he is not insecure, he is just suspicious. In fact, I think there are times when he is a little bit paranoiac.

Mr. Bryden: Well, the voice of experience—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, the voice of experience! He was that way the first time I ever heard him speak in this House, and he and I came in on the same day. He has only deteriorated in this regard.

Mr. Sopha: Can we stop this dog fight and let me continue my remarks?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I continue to have the floor?

Mr. MacDonald: When he had a dog fight, it was okay.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: He had a dog fight for a little while.

Mr. Sopha: Do not do as I do—

Mr. Bryden: Do not insult the Minister; no man would ever sink that low!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not insulted, and I say to the hon. member, I am highly flattered that I should be accused of copying you—

Mr. Sopha: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If the hon. member for York South would only open up the window of his mind and let a little breeze of fresh air blow through.

Mr. MacDonald: Amen!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, amen! Well, it is hopeless, Mr. Chairman, I quit.

But the point does remain that when the union laid their complaints before us, we sent staff up, as we do, to act in the capacity of consultant to the Minister of Mines.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Minister of Health that in one area he is perfectly correct—that is that I get that impression after watching the situation very closely. As respects one level of the union hierarchy the company can never do anything right. The company is the enemy. It is to be met and battled and fought every inch of the way. I rebel against that attitude and I share Mr. Maguire's views that this place was not the place to unveil this problem.

Mr. MacDonald: Nonsense.

Mr. Sopha: Now, I would like to have the assurance on behalf of these people—I am speaking of the safety and health committee —that The Department of Health will stand ready when presented with evidence, to use the Minister's own phrase, to drop everything else. That is precisely what I want him to do when there is an allegation of a serious health hazard. That is not asking too much.

If, as they showed me, the result of the readings are an emission of carbon monoxide that is far and away above that which is acceptable for human tissue, then certainly these people, and the people of Sudbury, and everybody who works in those conditions, will expect him to drop everything else in order to ascertain whether these allegations are well founded or not.

The other thing I want to say—and here I am told to part from my friends to the left—is that having discussed this problem with the company—now just to mention that will offend them—just having discussed it with officials of the company, I am satisfied in my own mind that the company is concerned about these allegations. I am prepared to say here and to bear the brunt of all the furor and criticism it will bring, that I do not think the International Nickel Company is the great ogre, the great Moloch, that is waiting there to devour everybody, which is the picture that my friends have of it.

Mr. Bryden: Far from it, the member treats it with great deference.

Mr. Sopha: I represent all the people of Sudbury, including the people at the management level of Inco. In contrast to the candidate for that party, when he was nominated, he said, "I will be the union's candidate." He was going to represent only the union.

Mr. MacDonald: The member's silence over the year on this issue shows which side he is on.

Mr. Sopha: I have not had that silence. I have not been guilty of the silence that I am accused of. But there I put it on the record and I see government's role plainly in this. That is, the government is the detective, it is the supervisor, and the Minister of Health and The Department of Mines are its servants of the public. When they are told about these dangers to health in the environment it is nothing less than the duty of the Minister of Mines to act with all proper despatch.

I just want to add this one thing.

I wish I could feel assured that The Department of Mines itself and the people they have in Sudbury who are responsible for this, would act with a commensurate despatch. I want to say responsibly that, having viewed the activities of the chief engineer of mines in Sudbury, the servant of the Minister of Mines and his chief official, that he is not always as sympathetic to the local union as he ought to be. I get the impression from him—that is Mr. Hoffman—that the local union is to him somewhat of an enemy that has to be dealt with.

We are able to point to one specific intervention, unwarranted intervention, in trade union company collective bargaining in which he engaged himself. It was clear to a good many people in Sudbury during those very dramatic and highly charged days, that no little contribution to the atmosphere came from The Department of Mines. However, that may be, I want to leave the matter there and leave the record plain that as long as I am the member, I am at the service of the union whenever they come to me and, let us put it on the record, they only came to me in the month of February. I have the exact date in my files, but it was in the month of February. The union came to me about this problem at my own request. I asked them to come and see me.

After the hon. member for Yorkview raised it in the House, I contacted the chairman of the safety and health committee myself and asked him to bring his people over on a Saturday to discuss this problem and they made me aware of their evidence. Immediately on my return to Toronto I called an official of this branch—and I have a record of his name in my files also, it does not come to me—and I had a discussion with him about this problem of the toxic effects of carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide and the allegations of the people in the union.

So there it rests. The Minister of Health is aware of it. At least I can report back to the people, if the opportunity presents itself,

that a full disclosure, a full parading of the problem, has been made to the Minister of Health and he has the onus from now on. It does not really matter who protested. From now on, we cannot go back and erase what the moving hand has written. From now on the Minister can hardly use the excuse it has not been properly brought to his attention.

Mr. MacDonald: It has been properly brought up by the member for Yorkview.

Mr. Sopha: All right, fine. I am willing to accord that. I am saying my view is that it was the wrong way. He employed the wrong way. I am not going to go through the motivation except to say to these people that as long as the national people are there, they will play politics ahead of the workers' interest. They will. They will play politics ahead —and the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree) can sit there and nod, because he knows whereof I speak.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, they came to the hon. member for Sudbury a year after they came to others.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 805 carried?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on that vote, I know the remarks I am going to make or the questions I am going to ask are related inextricably to Sudbury, but I am not specifically concerned with Sudbury. I would like some information from the Minister about the administration and operation of The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act, if it comes within his estimates?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This does not come within my department at all.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister if he would comment —even though it is not strictly within the purview of his department, as he has just said—would he at least comment about this area of air pollution, as distinct from other areas of air pollution, either under existing law or under the proposed law which would come under his department?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat confused. I am not just quite sure of the question.

Mr. Renwick: Let me put it a little more simply. I had thought—it is probably my error—that The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act was an Act which related to one area of the deleterious effects of air pollution related to sulphur fumes. I notice that in The Air Pollution Control Act there is a specific exclusion, or a specific section, which preserves this Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act outside the operation of the air pollution control, which I understood is to be under the department of the Minister. What I am trying to get at is this: is there or is there not going to be a Ministry completely responsible for all aspects of air pollution control? If it is not under the Minister's department and is not intended to be under his department, is there a department under which it falls and from whom we could, in the course of our estimates, get information about this Act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is not for the time being intended to bring this within the scope of The Air Pollution Control Act. That is why it is specifically spelled out as an exclusion. We did this, as I stated at the time the bill got second reading, because very few cases come to arbitration. They are usually settled by mutual consent. Of course, as the hon. member as I am quite certain knows, perhaps better than I, its duties are limited only to the assessment of damages from sulphur fumes. They have nothing to do with the control of the pollution. Control of pollution will be our responsibility. The assessment of damage from sulphur dioxide fumes only—it is limited strictly to damage from sulphur dioxide fumes, or sulphur fumes—they will assess any damage only. We will be responsible for the control of the pollution if the pollution is from sulphur in any of its forms.

Mr. Renwick: As I understand it, sir, under The Air Pollution Control Act which will go before the committee, the area of economic loss other than that caused by sulphur fumes is going to be under the Ministry of Health. If it is the intention that air pollution control should be centred in one place then why is this Act not under the Minister of Health? If it is not under the Minister of Health, who is responsible for its operation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The Minister of Mines is responsible for the administration of damage by sulphur fumes arbitration of action. It is specifically excluded in section 11, sub 11 of our Act.

Mr. Renwick: Is it the intention that it will continue to be under the Minister of Mines or is it going to be transferred into the Ministry of Health?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is our long range view, but at the present time, because it has

been operating well and because it appears to be operating well—I think I put it when I debated the bill that we had enough; we had bitten off enough at the present time. We will try to digest this.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I will not prolong this. Does the Minister of Health have anything at all to do with the operation or the administration of this Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Only the attempts to control the source of the pollution that will give rise to an action under the "damage by fumes."

Mr. Renwick: Let me then ask the Minister this question. When he refers to the industrial emissions, and realizing that this Act comes under the Minister of Mines—for reasons which I do not now understand, but which we can pursue with the Minister of Mines—of the companies which contribute to the assessment which is levied under this Act, The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act, what steps has the Minister of Health taken to control the emission of fumes by such companies if this is the meeting ground between his Ministry and that of the Ministry of Mines?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This will be part of our phasing programme. You will recall, I think it was at the last session, we indicated that we were to change our regulations or produce new regulations to give us the power to control existing industrial sources. Those regulations came into operation last September, I believe. I stated when I submitted this bill that our intention was to do this on an industry basis, and we would begin with the industries which were causing the greatest amount of damage or producing the greatest amount of pollution.

Now, whether the industries producing sulphur fumes, or in whatever form it comes, would be among the top priorities I am not in a position to say at the present time, but my hope would be that the action of the air pollution control service would be so effective that there will be no need for this Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act very much longer.

Mr. Renwick: Out of this rather inconclusive exchange am I to take it that up to the present time the Minister of Health and his department have not taken any steps at all to control the emission of sulphur fumes by the companies which contribute to the assessment made against them under this Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I think this would be right. Smelter operations under our present legislation are specifically excluded, but under this new Act they are brought within the terms of reference of our Act. I cannot say this with any degree of certainty, but for two or three years now we have been examining all plans for new industries, and none could be established until they had been approved by the industrial hygiene branch. They were screened for the effectiveness of their air pollution control, and until this was done they would not get approval to build.

We intend to move in on the existing areas, but smelter operations could not have come within the scope of those regulations to which I just made reference because they were specifically excluded under our presently existing Act. The new Act now will allow us to deal with them as with any other source of pollution.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the ambit of this Act is sufficient to cover sulphur fumes from the treatment of sulphides, for the production of sulphur or sulphuric acid for commercial purposes, which is not necessarily within the area of smelting as I understand it, but is a normally accepted industrial process.

What I am trying to get at is, the Minister has said over the last two or three years any plans for any such plants in the province of Ontario have required the approval of his department so as to make certain that the emissions will be subject to whatever up to date controls there can be put upon them. Now, does this apply to extensions to existing plants, and can the Minister give us any information as to what companies have been subject to this prior approval of his department for their plans, and whether any of them have been turned down? How has his department operated in this field?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not believe I can give you the numbers, but I can tell you that it seems to me every few days I am signing a number of letters of authority to build or alter. All new buildings, all extensions, all major alterations—alterations that would in any way affect the emission of air contaminants or pollutants—all of these come within the scope or within the interpretation of new facilities. Does that answer the question?

Mr. Renwick: Well, let me be specific then. Since 1963—which I think was the date the Minister referred to as the date on which industrial emissions were completely under

the jurisdiction of his department—have there been any plans submitted by the Electric Reduction Company at Port Maitland? Has there been any inspection made of the emissions from the Electric Reduction Company at Port Maitland? Has there been any study made of that area? Have there been any complaints received and processed through his department about that company? Have there been additions constructed to that plant within the last two, or three, or four years, which have required the prior approval of this department? Or has nothing at this stage been done about the Electric Reduction Company at Port Maitland?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will get the specific answers to these questions. I know that we carry out the monitoring programme in the Port Maitland area. The answer of the complaints is "yes". The answer to the question: has anything been done about them?—"yes". We established an arbitrator who assessed damages, and these have been awarded to farmers whose livestock and vegetation were damaged. We have just appointed another arbitrator, who is carrying out studies of reported damage to last year's crops. I believe we have given them approval for an extension to their industry, but I will get that definite information now.

In 1966 the approval of control installations for new industrial sources or for existing sources, altered or modified, were 321 applications covering 447 major sources. These were processed by my department, and 352 firms were visited in connection with the approvals.

Complaints concerning 158 industrial sources were investigated so that the branch has been very busy.

Field surveys during 1965—an *ad hoc* arbitration procedure was set up for the awarding of damages for agricultural economic losses caused by air pollution in Haldimand county, and payments by the industry were made in late 1966 after some considerable negotiation because of the release form.

Port Maitland Electric Reduction installed controls last year, that is in July 1966. These plans were submitted for approval and a continuing monitoring programme is still going on.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, under what authority was the arbitrator apointed? Was this by agreement in the dispute between the company and the farmers in the area, or was it in some way or another the same arbitrator—that is under this Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This was done by an agreement worked out between the company and the farmers involved and, I believe, the federation of agriculture had a field man very much involved in this matter. All three parties agreed upon one man and we appointed him. He was an agricultural expert and his work, apparently, was very satisfactory to those involved.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I do not expect answers to these questions tonight, obviously, but I would like to put them on the record and ask the Minister if, in due course, he could provide me with the answers if the questions are answerable.

The first question is—what steps were taken by the Ministry to record the amounts of air pollution in the years 1960 to 1967 in the Port Maitland area?

2. If records were kept of air pollution in this period in this area, what were the figures obtained for all kinds of air pollution, but in particular, what were the maximum recorded figures in parts per million for fluoride pollution?

3. What were the maximum figures for the fluoride pollution in parts per million of samples taken from soil, vegetable and livestock in the period from 1960 to the present?

4. What is the total number of livestock that have been: (a) destroyed because of sickness; (b) been declared unfit for human consumption in the period and place stated; (c) What percentage increases do these figures represent over average figures for these categories in this area?

5. How many certified cases of fluoridosis have been recorded in this area in this period?

6. In the years in which arbitrators have been appointed to mediate between industry and agriculture in this area, what sums per annum have been arrived at as representing pollution damage and how much has been paid in compensation?

7. What steps by means of warning, prohibition and fine have been taken to prevent and/or alleviate pollution and what other steps have been taken to alleviate pollution in the Port Maitland area?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I believe that answers can be obtained to most of those questions, Mr. Chairman, if not all of them.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 805 carry?

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, there is another question that I would like to ask the Minister. There are some letters which I receive from

time to time from across the province in connection with this matter. One of them I would like to call to the attention of the Minister.

It is in connection with the Bibby Foundries on Beverley Street in Galt. There has been a problem there for some years; I hope that it has been cleaned up and perhaps the Minister can inform us as to this situation which has aggravated a great many people. At one time 800 signatures were gathered for a petition, yet somehow they were not successful in getting this situation alleviated. I wonder if the Minister has any information on that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not have that information here but I will undertake to get it. I cannot recall having heard of it, but I may very well have read the correspondence.

Mr. Young: It may be that these people went to the wrong source; I do not know.

Mr. Chairman, the other question I would like to ask is in connection with research. Is the department undertaking any research or encouraging research in this field of prevention of air pollution? For example, we are told that incinerators in apartment buildings are one of the great sources of air pollution in an area like Metropolitan Toronto. The combustion is extremely inefficient. Whether it is possible to have an incinerator built which is efficient is a moot question. In some places—I think New York city is one—the use of incinerators is forbidden and all garbage is collected and disposed of at municipal incineration plants.

The other one is domestic oil burners in homes. The oil burners that we have today are very inefficient. There has been no real pressure on the oil companies to do research in this field so that burners can be efficient enough to cut down air pollution. The feeling is that since the oil companies were satisfied with the present level of combustion, they have not undertaken to do any real work to discover how oil might be burned more effectively and efficiently and thereby eliminate many of the by-products which go into the air and pollute the atmosphere.

I wonder if the Minister has any information as to research which is being carried on in these fields because they play a very large part in the pollution of the air in our cities. In Metropolitan Toronto, I am told, there are a million sources of pollution and a large part of that million is made up of oil burners in homes and incinerators in apartment buildings.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot give the hon. member the specific projects that are going on, but I do know that in 1966 we spent some $87,000 and this year we have already allocated for research, $110,000. This is being done for us largely by the University of Toronto, the University of Western Ontario, the Ontario research foundation, Queen's and any of the others involved in it. These are ones I know of, but I can get a list of the projects if it would be of interest to the hon. member. I cannot tell him what they are at the present time.

Mr. Young: I would appreciate such a list. The Minister cannot tell us, then, if any of them are specifically addressed to the problem of oil burners or to the disposal of garbage?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I really could not. I believe there was a project—again I am depending entirely on my memory—directed at incinerators, but I might not be very accurate in this regard.

Mr. Young: A final question, Mr. Chairman. The matter of standards has been exercising our people across the country. At the pollution conference last fall, this came very much to the fore and there was a great deal of questioning as to whether or not governments really had addressed themselves to the whole problem of standards in this field of air pollution. I would like to ask the Minister about his thinking in this respect. Will the new Act set such standards and make them effective and as to whether at the present time the Ringelmann scale which is used by Metropolitan Toronto is adequate. Will that be replaced by something a little more specific and something more definite so that the air pollution authorities can effectively measure pollution and bring people to court because there are standards against which the performance of those particular emissions can be judged?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that the hon. member brought up, as I recall, during the debate on our bill. I stated then that we, at our present stage of thinking, were dependent upon the Canadian standards association. They would, we believed, be our guide but not something to which we must slavishly adhere because our people had definite ideas in this regard as well. But there will be standards, sir, there is no doubt about that. This is an area in which we believe the federal government can help us very decidedly. The inescapable fact is there will be definite standards by which

we can compare and measure the degree of pollution and use as an acceptable basis, that can be proven and will be acceptable, we hope, to the courts if that be necessary as grounds for complaint.

Mr. Young: I think I agree with the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that standards must be national and even international particularly in places like Windsor, Sarnia, Niagara Falls and Toronto. A while ago the Minister said that Metropolitan Toronto can now enforce its air pollution by-laws; it can take effective action. The question that still remains in my mind is how they can take effective action if there are no specific standards by which they can measure performance of any industry or burner, or anything of that nature?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think that there are acceptable standards. I think their Ringelmann chart is an acceptable standard. At the present time there are questions as to how accurate it may be, but there are several monitoring stations in and about Metro Toronto, so that there is no question about difficulty in measuring the degree of pollution available.

Mr. Young: It is very hard to get convictions now.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, this is something, I am told when they do get a conviction I understand it is very difficult to have an adequate penalty or a salutary penalty imposed. Provision has been made for that, too, and I think I will talk to my friend, the hon. Attorney General, and see if he, in turn, can talk to his magistrates in the hope that they will take a more serious view of this matter, because it is a very serious health matter.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 805 carried?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just before the vote carries, I would ask the Minister, if he is going to centralize air pollution control in the Ministry of Health, to seriously consider taking under his department The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act? I realize that they are, for administrative purposes, going to leave The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act as it is for the time being. It seems to me that you are going to defeat your whole purpose if you do not at least take the administration of that Act under your department for air pollution control purposes. Surely there must be some background of experience and knowledge in making arbitration awards and determining the cause of damage by sulphur fumes, which would be available in the part of The Air Pollution Control Act which deals with damage awards for economic loss caused by other types of fumes. It seems to me that you are going to defeat yourself if you do not take the whole of the air pollution problem, including this Act, for so long as you are going to leave it on the statute books, under your department.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, I appreciate the views of the hon. member. Again, without making any apology, this is our view. I have not told my colleagues yet, but this is our view. We will take this in sometime, but certainly not right now.

Vote 805 agreed to.

On vote 806:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, earlier in the Minister's debates I had questioned the advisability of anti-suicide clinics. I had brought this up one year ago and I would like the Minister to comment at this time, concerning the suggestion made last year.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on a small point, before the Minister proceeds to comment. Can we sort out how we are going to handle these related votes? I notice that the Ontario hospitals are divided into separate votes now, with the hospital schools in a separate vote. Is it the Minister's intention, or the chair's intention, to go through vote 806 by these sub-branches? How does he intend to handle it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It would be preferable, Mr. Chairman, if we follow the same routine as we have been doing throughout the rest of the votes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well then, on vote 806 we can discuss matters of general policy?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, general administration.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, just before you proceed with that, another small point of procedure. Under which sub-heading of this vote would the question of purchasing drugs for mental hospitals arise?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: General administration.

Mr. Bryden: All right. General administration is the over-all vote, but on page 65 there are a number of divisions of the vote and I was wondering which division it would come under.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Actually, purchasing should have come, since it is a departmental activity, under the first vote of all, vote 801. We will take it under vote 806 because most of the drug purchasing—

Mr. Bryden: I just have one question which I—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Most of the drug purchasing is for the hospitals.

Mr. Chairman: The first sub-heading, then, would be the office of the executive director under general administration.

Mr. Bryden: Well, maybe I can ask my question now, Mr. Chairman. As I think most members are aware, the department some years ago set up a system of centralized purchasing of drugs for use in mental hospitals. I believe that that has resulted in quite substantial savings for the department and the government. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is in any position to give an estimate of the savings that have occurred over the years in which this system has been in effect.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I could not give that now. I can only recall that in the first six or seven months of the operation we saved in excess of $500,000. The next year, if I recall it rightly, we saved about a million and a third dollars. I do not believe that we have been keeping track of it now since we established the policy of having all drugs assayed, and all drugs purchased must meet certain specifications. I do not believe we have compared the price we have paid with what we might have paid if we had continued to buy in the old way, usually buying brand names.

Mr. Bryden: But would it be a fair assumption that, if anything your savings have probably increased year by year, in view of the fact that no doubt your expenditures have increased year by year as the requirements increased. Am I right in assuming that your requirements, as far as drug purchasing is concerned, has been increasing year by year?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh yes. That would be a perfectly safe assumption. And I believe it would a reasonably safe assumption that our savings have increased also.

I think we could get a rough estimate of what we have saved, but I would not undertake it to be very accurate.

Mr. Bryden: I do not wish to put the department to a tremendous amount of trouble, Mr. Chairman, but if sometime during the course of these estimates, the Minister could provide a rough estimate of the current savings, I would be very happy to have it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We will try to provide the information.

Mr. Chairman: Office of the executive director; carried?

Mr. S. Lewis: Well before you carry that, I have one question which has intrigued me slightly. It is on item 3, under vote 806, which is entitled "maintenance, including clothing for bailiffs." What does that mean, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I must say, that one intrigues me every year. I get it every year, and I forget what it is.

We have bailiffs who transport oftentimes difficult patients from place to place, and their clothing becomes damaged. I am not sure just how much of the $57,000 is for clothing, but they must suffer a lot. It is only a very few hundred dollars for clothing.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well-dressed bailiffs.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, really it is a small sum of money. Why are we actually asked to vote $57,000?

Mr. Chairman: I think, if the member will look at the various departments, the total of these various branches total $57,500—

Mr. Trotter: No, but that is singled out.

Mr. Chairman: —plus the $6,000 under professional services branch, and so on, comes to the $57,500.

Mr. Trotter: Well it is maintenance, including clothing. I suppose it is really maintenance probably more than clothing.

Mr. Chairman: Professional services branch; carried?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have other questions under the professional services branch.

I guess this branch would cover a great many things, but I want to ask the Minister, particularly, what plans he has—I guess, in a sense, this branch is key to the whole mental health division—what plans he has for attracting more people to the field of mental health, what training programmes he has underway in relation to discussions we had on previous occasions in this House?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There has been a very great deal of activity in this area. Indeed, as the hon. member points out, it has always been considered by us the key to a good programme. We set the division up under its own director. New arrangements have been made which will enable us to employ psychiatrists on a contract basis. The remuneration for part-time services has been raised. We are employing an increasing number of physicians now on a part-time basis.

Last summer we sent a recruitment team to England and have just started an extensive advertising campaign in the United Kingdom and throughout this continent. I do not know why they did not go to Scotland, they might have met R. B. Bennett there.

Similar efforts are being made to recruit psychologists by widespread advertising, and I would direct attention to a very imposing advertisement in the *Globe and Mail* of this morning, which outlined what we are doing and what we are attempting to do.

We have been endeavouring to strengthen our ties and relationships with the universities and each year employ a large number of university students. Many of these students respond to this involvement in our programme by joining our full-time staff. This is a direct effort we are making to encourage more students, undergraduates, to take up psychiatry or the various branches of medicine needed in the hospital programme.

There was some question during the earlier discussion about the number of psychiatrists. At the time I felt the figures were not up to date. On January 1, 1967, we had 176 full-time doctors, of which 113 are certified specialists, 81 full-time psychologists and psychometrists, 147 full-time social workers and assistants, and a large number of part-time professional staff. We are in much better condition for professional people than we have ever been. But we are still looking for more.

Mr. Chairman: Profession service branch; carried?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have other questions on this branch.

What proportion of those who enter the medical schools are now going through for psychiatry? Has the Minister a percentage?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think it still runs about 10 or 12 per cent.

Mr. S. Lewis: Is there any possible way within the early years of the medical faculty courses themselves of stimulating and increasing interest in psychiatry and associated subjects?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not believe so. I think we would find great difficulty in getting the faculty to do this because each branch, of course, feels that it is hard done by, and each branch feels that it wants to attract as many of the graduates or undergraduates to its particular area of service. Every specialty, almost every specialty at least at the faculty level, feels that his is the only branch of medicine and he should do everything to attract. This, however, is disappearing in large measure and more and more emphasis now at the undergraduate level is being put upon the training for family practice.

I still am of the opinion that a period in family practice is the best apprenticeship, if you will, or the best indoctrination prior to entering a specialty, and I have tried to put this view before the health and sciences deans or vice-presidents in the hope that this may be considered part of their training instead of the prolonged formal period of training that most specialists have to undergo.

Mr. S. Lewis: Are there any particular financial inducements from the department for the field of psychiatry by way of bursaries, loans, and so on?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, the psychiatrist, if he chooses to take his training under our bursary programme, is the best provided for financially of any graduate undertaking specialist training. There is the bursary first of all provided at the federal level. The basic salary of the residents is $4,700, we augment that by adding $1,500. So this puts him immediately in a preferred category to his confreres in some other specialty. If one comes to us for psychiatric training, having had at least five years in family practice, he gets his bursary augmented by $4,000 per year. If he is going to undertake our services as a career, he gets $10,000 to $12,000. There are very interesting inducements by way of salary offered to them now.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am hard pressed to understand why the shortage in some of the other areas should be so great unless there are forces in society, particularly at the university level, which are seriously resisting their emergence. For instance, why in the field of clinical psychology, why in the field of the child care worker should there be such an incredible shortage of trained personnel? Has the government negotiated with the universities in any concerted way?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think the simplest answer, and it may be too simple, is that these are young disciplines. Clinical psychology is a relatively new discipline and it has not been defined or stimulated enough at the university level until within the last few years. My staff advise me that we are trying to encourage this and we find a great deal of growing interest on the part of nearly all universities in this area. The same applies to the child care worker because there is some question yet as to a definition of the child care worker.

We have our own courses now. I believe we have three going on, where we have defined what, in our view, constitutes a child care worker, but I cannot say that this is completely accepted yet because there may be others who have a different definition, and their definition might be quite valid. The rundown on the training and clinical psychology at the University of Windsor indicates it should graduate its first Ph.D.'s in 1967. The University of Western Ontario has produced a large number of people who work in clinical psychology, but a shift in orientation in the direction of more basic research led to a decrease in these numbers.

We have noted constant pressure upon the universities and this has resulted in a decision to develop a clinical programme. The University of Waterloo is involved, it has probably reached its maximum level according to the notes I have here. It does not say how many they hope to turn out.

In the last three years, a great deal of time and effort has been spent by the staff in encouraging universities to develop and expand their programmes to train clinical psychologists. Concerted attempts have been made to involve service and training of a research nature since such relationships are stimulating to the hospital and act as an additional incentive to the university to provide more practical experience and applied training for psychologists.

There has been a gradual growth in joint undertakings, and major programmes of training in clinical psychologists will be undertaken in the next year. In other words, these efforts have borne fruit and are going to result in the provision of more facilities for the training of clinical psychologists.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I had the sensation while sitting with the youth committee that this area was one of the most critical areas perhaps because of the absence of clinical psychologists. No matter how much we talk about it we never seem to make any impression on the powers that be. We never seem to persuade the university community particularly that this is a matter of great social concern and that they have to enter the fray and begin to provide the resources.

I want to put on the record a very interesting letter. I am sure the Minister will find it of interest. It is on the letterhead of the hospital for sick children and it came to me quite unsolicited after the session was over last year and after these estimates were through. I need not read the first paragraph because it is irrelevant except to say that this person, this woman, had been reading about discussions of a crash training programme to fill the shortage of psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, and child care workers. The letter goes on:

> I am a Canadian with an M.A. in psychology from the University of Toronto and a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in psychology (1958). Since the fall of 1958, I have been chief psychologist at this hospital and lecture in psychology at the University of Toronto. When I took on this combined post I had little experience in children's work specifically, but considering the medieval state of mental health services in this province, in no time I was a local authority in all kinds of children's problems.
>
> It was not that I knew so much, it was that almost nobody else knew anything at all. Considering today's newspaper report perhaps both my university and my hospital experiences would have relevance to you.
>
> At the University of Toronto psychology department I had been assigned to the teaching of a variety of undergraduate and graduate courses in clinical psychology since that is my field of competence and interest. I have found during this period that students who are interested in developing confidence in that field have been regarded by the department as academically inferior. If they persisted in such an interest, they have been forced to go to the United States for their education. The course which I taught was gradually being eliminated from the curriculum. There is now almost no training available at the University of Toronto for psychology students which has direct relevance to mental health problems of any kind.

That is quite an incredible assertion for someone who was involved in the faculty:

> One has to ask where the crash training programme for clinical psychologists mentioned in today's article is going to

occur. I am only one person, but I am a person who has some teaching competence in relevant areas and, although I have a teaching appointment at the University of Toronto, there is no one to teach. This is occurring in spite of the fact that there are many students who want education in clinical psychology. Clinical psychology is not respectable, or respected, in the academic community.

At the hospital for sick children I have worked extremely hard of seven and a half years in what is the usual role of clinical psychology—diagnosis, teaching, therapy and research. I have developed a particular interest and some competence in diagnosis of cases of perceptual handicaps. I think you are well aware that these extremely numerous cases are complex and often involve the child's physical, neurological, educational and emotional welfare. I have reached the point to know enough about it to realize how little is known, how much basic research is needed. I have been ambitious to improve my own knowledge and to become the best informed professional person possible on diagnostic problems in this area. I learned that I am cited as a local authority to clinics and special educators in and around Toronto.

For years the pressure of requests for such diagnostic service on me and on my staff has been intense, in spite of the fact that we are well aware of our limited knowledge and facilities. I could indeed cite you, from my own personal experience over seven and a half years, large numbers of instances of every kind of example you would care to mention of the neglect of troubled children in this province. So what has happened? I have tried to obtain support in order that I might get some relevant training in the United States to come back to engage full time in research and clinical service in this area.

Although innumerable professional people inside and outside the hospital realize that this work needs to be done—that I am one of the appropriate people to do it—when it comes to the point of getting support which would make it possible, it cannot be done. It is clear one cannot blame the hospital. The blame is really a wider one which involves the public. I have resigned, and as a matter of fact tomorrow is my last working day at this hospital. I am going on an external aid project to Trinidad for a year and what happens then, I do not know. I do not know of any possibility in Toronto, or indeed anywhere in the province, of being able to do the kind of work I want to do.

I am in the typical Canadian situation of having only one logical road open—to the United States. I have realized for a long time that if I wanted to accomplish anything in the long view, rather than working with the complexities of disturbed and handicapped children professionally, I had better spend my energies working with whatever forces are available to increase public support. However, in the latter area I have no skill and perhaps I can only pass on to you my experiences for whatever value they may have in the uphill struggle. Must we continue to behave as though we were a poor country and could not afford good facilities for children?

Sincerely yours,

(signed)

I. Mary Hackney, Ph.D.
Chief Psychologist,
Sick Children's Hospital.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this letter was evoked by a newspaper article and it was directed in the field of children's services. I am not at that point in the estimates. There will be further opportunity, I am sure, in coming days for those interested in exploring the children's aspect of it particularly. What I am interested in conveying to the House and to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is that this letter tends to corroborate what the youth committee learned in its three years of study: that the shortage of such personnel was acute. That in the field of clinical psychology particularly, it was desperate. That whatever the best intentions on the part of the department, there were areas in the university community and areas in the hospital community which were simply not supported. Areas for developing people whose disciplines would actively involve them in the mental health field.

All of us were persuaded—I am sure the Minister is persuaded—that this is a situation which is so critical, so acute, that we are paralyzing our mental health services in the province for lack of professional capacity.

I am one, Mr. Chairman, who feels that perhaps we put an inordinate emphasis on the professional. In the field of the child care worker and with related courses like undergraduate courses in social welfare and community college courses for welfare workers, one can build up a reservoir of sensitive human beings alert and capable of relating to other people in difficulty, sufficient to begin to get over the present impasse. As it

now stands, we not only are doing virtually nothing in the field of the less-skilled professional disciplines like child care workers, we are in critical shape in all our very skilled disciplines particularly the triad-psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers.

I understand the reputation of Mary Hackney, the chief psychologist at the hospital for sick children and the professor at the University of Toronto is, or was, to say the least, eminent. It is a tragedy that in the entire province of Ontario such a person with such obvious channels could not find sufficient grants to be able to do research and come back and apply it in her home province. It is an equal tragedy that we have apparently lost her for a time—although her services will be well used in the Caribbean—and the fact that she contemplates going to the United States of America.

I am not sure—I do not want to work from the particular to the general in a cavalier fashion, and I am not sure how illustrative this is of the frustrations generally—but there is no doubt that in much of our university community the areas which will make life easier for the Minister simply are not attended to. We learned in this House, from no better source than the member for London South, that at the level of the medical manpower crisis in the universities we are simply not breaking through.

We know that the universities resist the idea of undergraduate courses in social work. We now have evidence to recognize that clinical psychology is a neglected discipline. The Minister would be the first to admit that the number of psychiatrists in the Ontario hospital division of his department is dropping at the level of 20 per cent per year for the full time posts. Those figures are in his own report. In other words, Mr. Chairman, we are reaching a point of no return.

We are reaching a point where the mental health apparatus is in such a shaky state it could be dismantled and I say to the Minister that some plan with all the creative and imaginative resources that are available to him, both from his own personal capacities and those of his civil servants, must be implemented. His colleagues on the Treasury benches must be persuaded that this is such a critical area of social need that everything else must take second place.

I do not think I can put it any more strongly than that without, perhaps, overdoing it. I am not going to, on this particular occasion, make accusations about the failures of the past. I say that I cannot believe that we are still in the position of making no appreciable dent at the present moment and again, as we learned the other night, there is no given plan for the future.

I do not know, sir, how long the mental health structure in the province can last under these circumstances. I would be exceedingly pessimistic in view of the present state of decline and deterioration.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this letter comes as something of a surprise. I do not mean that there is a surplus of clinical psychologists. Clinical psychology up to the present time, for some reason which is completely unknown to me, has not attracted people as psychology in industry, for instance, has. It appears to me that the great majority of those majoring in psychology turn to industry or to education. There has not been a great flow of clinical psychologists going to our hospital branches.

A letter of this kind is rather surprising to me, because this psychologist must know the procedure for at least applying for research funds. My staff does not have any knowledge of ever having received an application for a research project from this person either through her hospital or, on her behalf, through the university. I am advised that if such application had been received, sums could have been found for it.

The question of whether enough funds were available for bursary support might be brought in question, although I wonder that we ourselves provide $500,000 in our budget. We had available to us $600,000 in federal professional training grants. This year we still have that $600,000 and I have already received from this House $1 million for bursaries. This is a very large increase.

Therefore, we have placed ourselves in a position where we can allocate more money for bursary support, in the hope that this will attract more to clinical psychology.

Looking down the list of the universities, I can see that they are only moving into this area and are only beginning to evince some interest in it. Toronto, I believe, is largely research oriented and still does not seem to be doing more than talking about establishing a course in clinical psychology.

The other universities, however, all seem to have evinced a quite active interest in response to the efforts of my staff and therefore this combination of forces, we hope, will bring about an increase.

I was interested to have the hon. member's views—I believe he spoke, sir, of "sensitive,

dedicated" people—I may not have the proper adjectives—who did not have the professional training. Of course, this is really what we are aiming at in our child care staff courses. We like to get people with a degree if they are interested, but we do not demand a degree. I believe that we will take recruits who have grade 13, and the proper personal attributes that will fit them for such a course.

There might be an area in this direction that would be worthy of further consideration, although I question if we could develop in those an ability to carry out clinical psychology. However, they might act as a stop-gap.

Mr. S. Lewis: What about developing child care workers' courses at all the new community colleges, as a matter of course? At the moment, there is the child care worker course at Thistletown, which is the prime course in the province of The Department of Health. Would it not be possible to develop courses as long as there was some clinical field work available?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have Thistletown CPRI going and I think we have been so busily engaged ourselves in developing our own courses that we have not had time to look at this yet. The community colleges are only beginning and they have to have allied with them, or they have to be affiliated in some way with, adequate and properly established clinical facilities. This may be the problem. Here again, it is not an impossible problem. If a communty college is there and if it is interested in this kind of work and if the clinical facilities are readily available to it, we would be willing to do all in our power to stimulate interest in this direction.

We are already in discussion with one of them in Toronto, my director tells me.

Mr. S. Lewis: Do I gain the implication from the Minister's remarks that the University of Toronto has resisted somewhat the overtures of his department in the direction of clinical psychology? Is that what he was implying?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I do not think that I implied that they resisted, but I do not think that they are very interested. There has been discussion in the University of Toronto department of psychology about establishing a programme of training in clinical psychology. The people who would direct such a programme have been approached by the university, but as yet no decision has been made to appoint a director, nor to get such a programme under way. I think there is interest, but it does not appear to be too vigorous yet. We shall continue to encourage them all we can.

Mr. S. Lewis: The pity of it is that, as in so many things, the University of Toronto is taken as the leader by other related universities. If Toronto does not move there is not quite the same thing in some of the others—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, if I were to answer that I could be accused of bias.

Mr. S. Lewis: I will not press the Minister on the matter, then.

May I move next to the question of suicide prevention, but again, Mr. Chairman, I am confused about the way in which the estimates sort themselves out. Where can I raise this sort of policy matter? I also want to have a few moments on the report the Minister tabled earlier in the session.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The policy matters will have to be raised as we go through this vote 806 because—

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, it is rather obvious that we are not going to finish this Minister's estimates tonight.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): That is obvious.

Mr. Oliver: It is now going on to 12 o'clock; might we not adjourn for this evening?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves that the committee of supply rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Mines tomorrow and thereafter The Department of Transport and then The Department of Labour, and this arises

through the absence of the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) at a meeting in Ottawa in the morning.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, would it be considered presumptuous to ask if we can have an indication of when the Confederation debate will be?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I doubt if it will be this week; it will probably be the first of next week.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On another point of order, Mr. Speaker, that changes the estimates' lineup slightly from what was originally indicated. Do we take it that this new lineup is fixed now, that it will be Mines, Transport and Labour?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, does the government anticipate that any bills will be called tomorrow at any stage?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am glad the hon. member mentioned that as I think we may deal with some bills tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.35 o'clock, p.m.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report — Unofficial Version

Fifth Session of the Thirty-seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 25, 1967

Afternoon Sitting

No. 75

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 25, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 25, 1967

First report, standing committee on legal bills and municipal affairs, Mr. Kerr 2587

Questions to Mr. Wardrope re mining companies, Mr. Sargent 2588

Question to Mr. Robarts re Remembrance Day, Mr. Sargent 2588

Question to Mr. Wishart re the fire marshal's office, Mr. Sargent 2588

Questions to Mr. Wishart re alcoholics, Mr. Sargent 2588

Questions to Mr. Wishart re collection of fines, Mr. Sargent 2589

Question to Mr. Wishart re compensation to crime victims, Mr. Sargent 2589

Questions to Mr. Grossman re the Don jail, Mr. Sargent 2589

Question to Mr. Grossman re women in training schools, Mr. Sargent 2590

Question to Mr. Randall re housing in Renfrew, Mr. Spence 2590

Question to Mr. Connell re police detachment building in Renfrew, Mr. Spence 2590

Questions to Mr. Gomme re Burlington skyway, Mr. Gisborn 2590

Tributes to the late Dean C. A. Wright, Mr. Singer, Mr. Robarts 2590

Question to Mr. Robarts re immigration, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Renwick 2591

Questions to Mr. Robarts re the report of the federal-provincial tax structure committee, 1966, Mr. Renwick 2591

Questions to Mr. Robarts re Maurice Collins, Mr. Renwick 2592

Raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, bill to authorize, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 2593

Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 2594

Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 2594

County Judges Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2594

Police Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2594

Mining Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wardrope, second reading 2594

Law regarding security interests in personal property and fixtures, bill to reform and and make uniform, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2594

Sale of Goods Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2595

Assignment of Book Debts Act, bill to amend and to repeal, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2595

Conditional Sales Act, bill to amend and to repeal, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2595

Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act, bill to amend and to repeal, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2595

Bills of sale, bill respecting, Mr. Wishart, second reading 2595

Tile Drainage Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 2595

Ontario Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, 1967, bill to amend, reported 2596

Pension Benefits Act, 1965, bill to amend, reported 2604

Estimates, Department of Mines, Mr. Wardrope 2605

Recess, 6 o'clock 2620

THE SALE OF GOODS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 89, An Act to amend The Sale of Goods Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ASSIGNMENT OF BOOK DEBTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 90, An Act to amend and to repeal The Assignment of Book Debts Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CONDITIONAL SALES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 91, An Act to amend and to repeal The Conditional Sales Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 92, An Act to amend and to repeal The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

BILLS OF SALE

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 93, An Act respecting bills of sale.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, on these last six bills is the Attorney General going to send those to the legal bills committee? If this is so, I wonder if there should not be some reasonable sort of notice given, at least to members of the legal profession in regard to this, and probably to such people as collection agencies and other interested people?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, it would be my intention that these bills should go to the committee on legal bills, particularly Bill 88. The others are complementary to it and I would be glad to have interested persons appear. But I point out that this bill also is a study, as you know, resulting from the Catzman committee study; a great many people have had their say and before the law reform commission also. So it comes as a sort of final, almost I would think, as close to perfection as anyone will be able to get it without putting it into practice to see how it works.

However, I should think it should go to the legal bills committee, and the others can go along. They are just supernumeraries really.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is going to be any great problem to notify, say, the law society or somebody, and I would like to see this done. It may be there are representations to be made that have not been heard and we should try and hear them at the committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TILE DRAINAGE ACT

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves second reading of Bill 94, An Act to amend The Tile Drainage Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 11th order; committee of the whole House; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

> Resolved:
>
> That the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs on behalf of the province may enter into agreements with the Canada deposit insurance corporation for any purpose in connection with the issuing of policies of deposit insurance to loan corporations and trust companies incorporated under the laws of Ontario, and any such agreement may contain an undertaking by the province to indemnify the Canada deposit insurance corporation for any loss to that corporation occurring by reason of its obligation to make payment in respect of any deposit insured by a policy of deposit insurance where the obligation arises during the period specified for that purpose in such agreement,

as provided in Bill 97, An Act to amend The Ontario Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, 1967.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, before the resolution is put, I believe I understand what the Minister wishes to accomplish by this, but I think a word of explanation is

required when we are asked to pass a resolution by which this government will indemnify the Canada deposit insurance corporation against certain losses which may occur. I would specifically like the Minister to comment on whether he is talking about insurance which has been in effect for the period from the time when the Ontario bill came into effect until such time as the transfer envisaged by the amending Act takes place, or whether it has some further implication so far as indemnification is concerned.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, this resolution of course is a prerequisite to the bill itself because of certain potential liabilities or financial liabilities which might develop.

Firstly, may I say that I know of no liability, nor do I know of any pending liabilities against the Ontario deposit insurance corporation with respect to its operations to date. I know of no pending claims either.

With respect to the operation of the federal plan, there will be an agreement entered into between each of the provincial governments that elect to go with the plan, and the majority, save one to my knowledge, of all the provinces have declared they are going to participate in the federal scheme with respect to those companies under their jurisdictions.

Once that direction is given by the provinces and probably contemporaneously, an agreement will be worked out which may either be in the form of a formal agreement or an exchange of correspondence which will enable the transfer of this jurisdiction from the provinces to the federal corporation on the following basis.

Firstly, coverage will immediately be given to all depositors by the federal deposit corporation.

Secondly, an immediate inspection will be undertaken under the direction of the federal government and for the account of the federal corporation with respect to the status of all companies of provincial origin which are directed into the federal scheme by their jurisdictional province of origin. When a final certificate of acceptance—and this is a key point—at a certain stage after the inspection certificate of acceptance, or the equivalent will be given, and once that company has received that final sign of approval, then from that point on, there will be no liability on the part of the originating province.

Until that certificate is given, and it is possible in theory and certainly in practice, but the theory of the matter is that the federal scheme would cover the depositors. The insurance is in effect, but that final acceptance might be delayed either through the inability of the federal department to accomplish the inspection quickly—there is a period of up to a year—and I have to take this extreme position that the federal government might say we are not going to give that final indication of approval and we will reject that company from continuing under the federal scheme.

That would mean then that for the province of origin, two things would happen, that come under separate headings. Firstly, there would be the situation of what they were going to do if there was a claim. After it comes back to the province, then it would be up to the province. If a claim develops while the federal policy covers the depositors but before that final acceptance into the federal scheme is granted, then if a claim is made, it would be a liability of the province of origin.

This matter has been the subject of much discussion with the federal authorities, and this clause and this contractural liability will exist with respect to all arrangements with all other provinces under the federal scheme.

I can only repeat what I have said earlier, that the provisions of this bill set aside the operation of the Ontario scheme, but it preserves the right to bring it back into play, as it were, at a later time. In other words, they are not repealed, simply set aside, and it is against this contractural arrangement which is required by the federal Act and its by-laws that gives rise to the nature of this amending Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE ONTARIO DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION ACT, 1967

House in committee on Bill 97, An Act to amend The Ontario Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, 1967.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Section 2, Mr. Chairman, on page 2, item 23 at the top of the page. I remarked on this yesterday when we had debate on second reading on this bill and the Minister did not deal with it at that time.

I am sure the Minister will recall when the first bill went through—the original Ontario Deposit Insurance Act—that I suggested, in fact I moved an amendment, that that Act be made to apply to all corporations or trust companies registered under The Loan and Trust Corporation Act. At that time the Minister stated that his constitutional advisors had said that this was not constitutionally feasible.

I would like to know why it is constitutionally feasible on April 25 when it was not constitutionally feasible on February 10.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This is under section 2 of the bill and that has to do with the amendments to section 22, right?

Mr. Singer: Section 23.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Section 23?

Mr. Singer: The first two lines at the top of page 2.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Section 23 (1). "No loan corporation or trust company registered under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act shall after June 30, 1967, accept, receive or issue deposits unless it holds a certificate or policy of deposit insurance issued by the Canada deposit insurance corporation or unless its deposits are insured—" This is covered by the federal field, by the federal authority. It has to do with licensing. I know the point the member is getting at.

Mr. Singer: The Minister is far too good a lawyer to try to get me to accept that one.

Mr. Chairman: Is section 2 carried?

Mr. Singer: Is that the whole explanation?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, the point of the matter was when I said in February of this year that with respect to the wording and the extent of the coverage, it was confined to those companies incorporated in the province of Ontario. Is this the point the hon. member raises?

Mr. Singer: That is exactly right.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That advice was the best advice that I could get. This matter has since been resolved under discussion with the federal authority, and there is an additional point I think goes with this matter. There is the question of licensing within the province, regardless of whether you are Ontario incorporated or incorporated under another jurisdiction. That device of withholding a licence has been used, it has been advanced, and it is under that device that this matter will become operative.

The coverage on all companies is being offered by the federal jurisdiction, and to make it effective the question of licensing is the vehicle and the device which is now being used and advanced and I believe is acceptable, and will be accepted by all of the other governments in this country, provincial governments as well as the federal government. As a result of the position that is now taken, all of these positions of the various governments are now out in the open and on the table and we understand what is going to be done with the exception of Quebec.

We still do not claim to have jurisdiction dealing with that specific point and the technicality that is being raised. We still only have jurisdiction over Ontario incorporated companies, if we want to argue and continue that point. But the others are covered by Canada, and with respect to those over which we say we have jurisdiction—and this was our position in February—we are saying now we direct you under our jurisdiction to participate in the federal scheme.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just do not accept that. I do not know why the Minister does not say that he reconsidered the position and now takes the view that I advanced in February. It is obvious that this is what has been done, and I do not know why the Minister just cannot come out and say: "We have reconsidered our position, we have had other constitutional advice."

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We have. We reconsidered our position on a number of these points.

Mr. Singer: That is nice. If I was like the Minister, I would sit down and sulk while the Minister finished speaking, but I do not get offended at all by these interjections.

Mr. Chairman, I draw the Minister's attention to the definition in section 22 of the old Act, and this definition in section 22 said this: "For the purpose of this Act, every loan corporation and trust company incorporated under the laws of the province of Ontario and registered under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act are member institutions."

It was at this point that we tried to get through an amendment and pointed out that such companies as the Royal Trust Company and a couple of others, extraprovincially incorporated companies, carried on business in Ontario and apparently were not going to come under the old Act, and a whole flock of

federally incorporated companies, 10 or 15, in fact as I recall I said at that time. I pointed out that both in number and in assets, the vast majority of loan and trust companies were not being covered by the old Act. There was no answer at that time except that the Minister gave the opinion it was constitutionally improper for us to embark into that field.

Well then, I say to the Minister—and the Minister, as I say, is a good enough lawyer to be with me completely in this—if what he said on February 9 and 10 is in fact correct, how can he now put in a section, the section at the top of page 2 that says: "No loan corporation or trust company registered under the Act can carry on business unless they get into the federal deposit insurance scheme"?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There is an agreement from all the jurisdictions.

Mr. Singer: The Minister said on February 9 that you cannot regulate for them. You are now regulating for them on April 25. Very simply, all the Minister has to say is we have changed our mind. What was our constitutional opinion then is now different, that is all I want. I just wanted to establish the fact that occasionally from this side of the House we do get a valid idea that is later borne out by legal authorities and without all the gobbledygook that we were right and he was wrong.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not want to labour this point at all. I think there are many good ideas come from the Opposition, both the official Opposition and from the New Democratic Party, and during my tenure of office in the Cabinet I think that attitude has been apparent. I have tried to take whatever suggestions were made and there have been a good many of them. We try to work along in the public interest for the benefit of this province, but I cannot go along —I am not quibbling about this matter—in exactly those words that the member put.

The legislation that has now been worked out could almost be described as consent legislation with respect to all of the jurisdictions concerned. All of the jurisdictions with the exception of Quebec that is—the nine provinces and the federal government—are taking this position with respect to that jurisdictional or constitutional problem that this matter, by legislation, will work out.

It is still open to the member to take the position that his legal opinion on this matter which he expressed in February is still correct and I would not have any objection to him taking that position at all. I am not prepared to say it is correct, but the matter under this legislation is being resolved at the government level.

Mr. Singer: Maybe the Minister has just crystallized it into one specific instance. He says all of the jurisdictions except Quebec. We accept the first part of his argument just to allow the argument to continue. Quebec has not. Now what is the Minister going to do with Royal Trust? Is he going to tell Royal Trust, if the Minister maintains his position that he took in February, that we do not have any authority to tell you to register, but if you do not, I guess there is nothing we can do except to let you carry on business. This is not what the Minister is saying, is it?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, I am not.

Mr. Singer: He is going to tell Royal Trust that they must register in Ottawa no matter what the government of Quebec says.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Or take such other measures—

Mr. Singer: That is right. In other words the Minister is taking the position that for Royal Trust to carry on business in the province of Ontario they must do what he says about registration, which is the proper and correct position. I agree with it.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Carry some.

Mr. Singer: All right, there it is. This is what I argued on February 9, and this is the point I am making now.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Then if the practical result of what we are talking about is that if the province of Quebec—and I make no comment, I do not think any of us will as to our views on the Quebec legislation—but if the province of Quebec does enact its own scheme of insurance for depositors, then we frankly will look at those conditions of insurance. That open door, as it were, is there, so that we can cooperate with the province of Quebec in the matter.

Mr. Singer: In the meantime, you are telling Royal Trust, as you should, that if they want to carry on business in Ontario, they must do the same thing as all trust corporations that carry on business, whether they be Quebec companies, federal companies, Saskatchewan companies or Ontario companies.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is right.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, there are two or three minor points that I would like to ask the Minister about on this section. In the light of his comments about the preceding resolution, is the time period specified in item 3 of 22, the one year period, or is it anticipated to be a one year period, for the indemnification under the agreement?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Just a minute. We are talking about the resolution.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister's comments under the resolution refer also to the agreement provided under item 3 of section 22, which is under clause 2 of the bill. Any such agreement may contain an undertaking to indemnify, and so on, where the obligation arises during the period specified for that purpose in such agreement. It is that period of time that the Minister is speaking about; the indemnity period.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: One year.

Mr. Renwick: I notice, Mr. Chairman, that in item 2 of section 23 there is a provision for extending the time and the time period referred to in item 1 is June 30, 1967. Again, what is the length of time which the Minister believes it may be necessary to have available to him under such an extension? I do not think it would be proper to pass a bill which leaves the extension of time wide open for all time.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It has to do with giving us some degree of leeway with respect to the province of Quebec.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, this is a point that seems to me to require clarification, but I may be quite wrong about it. In item 23 (a) in clause (b) the Minister will notice, about five or six lines down, there is an excepting clause with a condition: "but not including any moneys so received or debenture, and so on and so on, unless the trust company or loan corporation is obligated or made by demand of the depositor to become obligated to repay the money within the five-year period".

I cannot understand why that excepting clause with the condition in it does not apply also to item (a) immediately above. I realize that is a drafting point, but it appears to me that it is equally applicable to money which is deposited under item (a). Surely it should cover time deposits as well as demand deposits and item (a) does not qualify the money deposited as being demand deposit.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There are a couple of points involved in this matter. First, section 23 (a), which replaces the previous section 23, is designed and drafted to meet the requirements of the federal scheme and with respect to the five year limit on deposits. First, we have to come within the umbrella or definition sections of the federal bill.

This, by the way, was the only section which required amendment in the Ontario bill to meet the federal requirements.

The difference between the subject matter of (a) and the subject matter of (b) is, firstly, that (a) deals with deposits and (b) deals with what I might call the distinguishing line between what are deposits, as defined in the by-laws of the federal scheme, and what are left to remain and be defined as securities. In other words, probably for the first time, an effort has been made in the financial world to distinguish between deposits and securities. That five year definition for this purpose of deposit insurance has been devised and included in the federal bill.

There could be some deposits—that is, cash deposits under (a)—which are left there for a longer period than, say, five years. Even so, if they were just cash deposits, subject to withdrawal at any time, then for the purpose of the federal bill and the operation of the federal corporation, they would be deemed to be deposits. Any debenture of less than five year duration or life would also be deemed to be a deposit. It also follows if that debenture is for more than a five year period as of that April 17 deadline, then it would, for the purposes of this Act, be treated as a security.

There could be deposits left for six years, but they are still deposits within the intention and purpose of the Act.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Minister a couple of questions. First of all, could he tell us the names of any of the loan and trust corporations, doing business in this province, that are incorporated in the province of Quebec?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes. They have been referred to during the debates. The two main ones are the Royal Trust Company and the Montreal Trust Company. I do not think they take deposits.

Mr. Singer: I think there is a third one.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That would be a smaller one than these two. They are the main ones.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: I wonder if the Minister could tell us if there are any loan and trust corporations doing business in the province—I do not know how they would be described—that are not incorporated under the federal jurisdiction or under the jurisdiction of any of the provinces. In other words they are truly foreign corporations.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes, there are. There are extraprovincial operations and there are several American companies which are registered in Ontario with a limited certificate operation. They are not receiving deposits. I think, in the case of one of the motor car companies, for instance, the American Trust Company deals with pension moneys or the administration of pension schemes. There is at least one—I think, two—American companies that are registered under this Act here in Ontario but only for that limited purpose. They do not take deposits. They would not be member institutions under these Acts.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: There is one other matter which I think is important as far as the public is concerned. As I understand the Minister's explanation of the new section 23 and the Minister's explanation of the resolution which the House passed just a few moments ago, the federal authority, the Canada deposit insurance corporation, has to issue a certificate before June 30, 1967, to a member institution under the terms of the new section 23, unless its deposits are insured in some other manner approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Otherwise, that loan or corporation or trust company cannot carry on business here in Ontario.

It is my further understanding that the Minister said that any such company doing business in Ontario will be covered automatically in some manner prescribed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council here in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The depositors are covered at the very beginning of the assumption of jurisdiction by the federal scheme.

I was correcting the use of a couple of words, which I think are key words, used when the member for St. George was talking about the position of the federal scheme when the Ontario companies or this bill become operative.

In the first instance, the depositors are automatically covered. That is the intention of all the legislation. They are protected.

Then there is the contractual liability with respect to the first year. If the federal deposit corporations did not give that final acceptance to any one of the companies, they would—under the arrangements which will exist with respect to the joint efforts of certain staff that we have and staff that the federal government has—be in close touch with these developments. They would notify us and say, "Look, we are not going to issue that final acceptance with respect to company 'A' or 'B,' in which case we would be getting ready to take such other action as might be deemed desirable in those circumstances. So, during that year, and up to the point when that final acceptance has been given, there is a contingent liability on Ontario.

The depositors themselves are protected, either by Ontario or by the federal scheme, after than final acceptance of the particular company has been made. It is after that final acceptance by the federal authority has been given that the federal deposit corporation scheme is fully operative. We have nothing more to do with it, regardless of what.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: I thank the Minister for his explanation. This is the point I wanted to make. In any event, whether it is under the federal deposit insurance corporation or under some provincially controlled scheme, the depositor is going to be protected.

If the certificate under the federal corporation is not issued, I was wondering if the Minister could give some undertaking respecting publicity, at the time. Then at least by June 30, 1967, I think the issuance, or non-issuance, of the certificates by the federal corporation is an important matter as far as the public is concerned. I hope I am not misinterpreting the motives of the Minister, but I am sure the Minister's intention is to have under the federal corporation just about all of these companies that it is possible to get under it. I would hope that he would use the services of publicity media to inform the public, if the federal people do not, of the names of those companies that are not meeting the requirements of the federal corporation.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: In the spirit in which that question was put the answer must be and is, "yes, that will be done". As soon as a definitive report is received from the federal authority about a company, that will be made public. But bear in mind that—let us take a company "A"—there may be in the structure of its investments, room for improvement. It is the hope of the federal authority to have these companies come under their jurisdiction because that is the spirit of the federal bill.

We take a company "A" where some improvement could be made. It will be the intention, as I understand it, and as this was explained to me last week in meetings here in Toronto with the federal authorities, that they would make every effort in cooperation with our people to encourage, I think is the word, such a company "A" to improve its own position. Some of that type of improvement cannot always be done in the matter of 24 or 48 hours; sometimes it might require an opportunity of some weeks to meet that.

We are not even talking about the position to which it might be improved. We are not saying at the moment that it is a bad position. But to get it up to a certain standard to which improvement is indicated, it would take, even with the cooperation of the company some days or weeks to accomplish. I point that out to the hon. member for St. George because these were some of the matters that were discussed last week.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Could the Minister inform us if the regulations under the federal Act as they pertain to these member institutions who are going to be under the Canada deposit insurance corporation have been issued yet by the federal authority?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The by-laws of the federal corporation have been made public. The important part of the by-laws so far has had to do with the definition of the word "deposit". The rest of it was procedural and mechanical. I know of no others including that of regulation. I think the question of standards to be met are matters that will be worked out and they will try to define them. They have their standards with respect to their own federally incorporated, or federally chartered, loan and trust companies. I would think that they would try to match those existing standards which are presently in effect. I do not think that a restatement of those standards as such has been made.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: No, but I am sure the Minister appreciates the thought in my mind that the companies themselves as well as the public should know as soon as possible what the qualifications for the issuance of these certificates are going to be. I think quite frankly that this House and this government should know as soon as possible what those qualifications are going to be because this is the meat and the heart of the whole matter.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I would think that every trust company official in this country is aware of the nature of what we are talking about today, but the point is well taken. I would be glad to get that material and table it in the House.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is in line with some of these questions the member for St. George has been posing in the last few moments that I was going to direct some remarks. Maybe the Minister will feel that he has answered these queries but I am more than a little concerned about the saving phrases in the last part of 23 (1) and the exception in 23 (2). You sound as though you have the absolute in the first part of 23 (1) and then in the last two and a half lines of 23 (1) you say:

> or unless the deposits are insured in some other manner approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Conceivably that could be insured in the law office of my hon. friend from St. George. You have given yourself that wide scope and this bothers me. Then in subsection (2) you say:

> in the case of any particular loan and trust corporation the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may extend the time for effecting insurance mentioned in subsection (1).

and again that is without limit so you might extend it. You have power to extend it for an indefinite period if you feel that is right. You mentioned a week or two or a few days or so, that you have left the door wide open, first, as to the kind of insurance. You say that it must be in the Canada deposit insurance corporation or something else that we approve without any limitations; you say that you may extend the time and you may extend it without limit. That it leaves it open to the suggestion that you can enforce this Act or not enforce it by the order of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and there is no limit on it at all.

The Minister is going to tell me that he and his colleagues will not do it that way. I know that, but the fact is that you have the statutory power to do it and this is a question of real concern. If you made a bad error in judgment—and this is possible, anyone can make it—and you have left the door open, you have allowed an alternative means of insurance, perfectly legally; but if you exercised bad judgment, then the people you are trying to protect are going to be in trouble. If you have extended the time unduly and without limit, again you are within your statutory right but the people suffer just as much. Leaving these two doors as wide open

as they are is a cause of very considerable concern. I would like to know what controls if any, the Legislature is going to have over these escape hatches.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Let us look at the province of Quebec, if that is the area we are talking about. I have not seen the final details of their plan but the basis as I know it and as it has been communicated to me by the responsible Minister of Quebec is that similar amounts of liability and responsibility as we contemplate will be enacted in Quebec. Let us say that situation happens, then there is no problem. I think that with the backing of the government of Quebec, the Quebec provincial scheme, in certain circumstances, would be acceptable to us after due examination.

That is the intention there and that is why that exception is provided. There is a theoretical consideration because there is very much of an involvement in Quebec as to the approach being taken in the technical procedures of offering this protection to depositors. It is a fairly involved matter. They call it a tax and it is not in conflict with other contributions with respect to deposits, if I could use that word, that might be made.

Now someone arguing the point might say that situation leads to double taxation or double premiums or double costs, a duplication idea. The Quebec authorities are quick to correct any such impression and point out that there would be only one premium; the other is the tax which is a provincial matter. They are quite different and stand on different feet.

Out of that somewhat involved situation in Quebec, the Minister himself has said and confirmed to the conference two weeks ago in Ottawa that—

Mr. Singer: Which Minister—Quebec's?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The Quebec Minister said that they would exert every effort to see that the commerce or the business of the community, whether it be in Ontario or Quebec, or their companies or our companies were facilitated.

What he was implying and meaning was that of their Quebec companies, insofar as their operation in other provinces were concerned, he did not have any fixed ideas that he would not put them in a straitjacket, and if they would work out something that was workable from everybody's point of view.

We have an interest in those companies, let us face it, and I admit that, because many of our Ontario depositors are depositors in the companies I have mentioned. Fortunately those two companies are quite reputable, with a long history of success which makes this debate a little easier.

The Quebec Minister and the Quebec government would endeavour to work out matters so that the whole inter-relationship of all the other provinces, their legislation, and that of the federal government, would be accomplished on a workable basis. Against all that, retaining his right to take such constitutional measures or establish their own scheme as they consider fit.

I am sorry to take up the time and give you that much detail, but against all of that, suppose that the Quebec company says we will cut off the Ontario operations and let them go elsewhere or for some other reason that led them. We would be willing to let them go, with respect to the Ontario operations under the federal scheme.

I do not know and I am only putting out all the possibilities that I could imagine, I suppose it is even conceivable that they might seek private coverage in a situation and advance that. I do not know how that would come in, but there would be the instance where we would have to see that the coverage was on an acceptable basis regarding the terms of the contract.

I do not visualize that, but I would be less than fair if I did not say that in thinking about these matters that at least there is a possibility.

Now, concerning the Acts of the main proposition of a Quebec scheme, I think in general we could say that they would be acceptable to us here. Then there is the question of the effective date, and that is the item to which the hon. member for Downsview makes reference. He says that I have left the door open with respect to time limits. We have a similar saving clause as other provincial legislations. In one jurisdiction I can think of, it is on the basis of, I think, three months' extension, but there is no limit on the three months' extensions. I do not think we are interested in any extensions other than the matter of procedural accommodation with respect, say, to the Quebec bill, and the timing of it, and the relation of it to ourselves.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can understand what the Minister says, and when he reduces it to the ultimate; when he says maybe they will be privately insured. This is what causes me great concern. The member for St. George could suddenly become an insurer and I wonder if I would be satisfied with this.

We used to be able to say a while back, no insurance companies in Canada have gotten into financial difficulty for a long time. But we have had two quite recently, and this is why we have government in this. If the scheme was good enough, all you had to say, instead of putting government into this—and I am sure our friends in Treasury debentures would have been happy if they had that much confidence—was that each company carrying on business in the province of Ontario must insure with a private insurer in a form satisfactory to us. But you have not done that. You have not done that for most of the—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I know you are having a little joke in your reference to the member for St. George, but I would think it is the nature of insurance that if it came from a private carrier that it would almost have to be in a form of something equivalent to a bond with deposits equivalent in hand.

Mr. Singer: The point of my constitutional reference was that you have control over these companies. I quite agree with you that Montreal and Royal enjoy the finest of reputations, but they carry on business in Ontario and they have to carry on in accordance with Ontario law. If they are having difficulties in their parent profits, and they want to continue to carry on, then surely they are going to have to satisfy the government of Ontario that they carry on the same as all the other trust companies are carrying on business in Ontario.

I can recognize there is difficulty, and I can recognize that you do not want to be unreasonable while inter-government talks are going on and that sort of thing, but I think very definitely you have got to reserve the right that after a period—an arbitrary period —that it goes on no longer. If they want to continue the privilege of carrying on business in the province of Ontario, good reputation or difficult reputation, they will have to do the same as everyone else does. That is point number one.

The second point is, no matter how good the intention of government is in this open door on times is concerned, I am concerned that it would leave to somebody on those benches an opportunity either today or some time from now to extend the time unreasonably for a particular company.

I am not suggesting this Minister is going to do it, but it leaves that door open, and it would be pretty hard to review because I would be surprised if that kind of arrangement would be reported publicly. It leaves that door open.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I would hope that the resolving of the matter with respect to Quebec companies would be accomplished in almost the immediate future, and that during the present session of this House I would have an opportunity of confirming that this has been accomplished.

Mr. Singer: Well, if as the Minister says the only problem is Quebec companies, why do not we just say Quebec companies in these two—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not think it should be. I do not think in the spirit that this matter—

Mr. Singer: Well, maybe not. But I am concerned about the wideness of these phrases, and I am not attributing any bad motives to this Minister or his government in this regard. I am just saying that there is a real danger if you leave the door that wide open in this statute. No one may ever resort to it. Probably no one ever will. But the possibility exists that in the future if it is enshrined in the statute books, as it is about to be, it could be badly used without even being improperly used, badly used to the prejudice of Ontario depositors who have invested in those companies.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, will these Quebec companies be required to insure under the federal legislation?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That depends on what comes out of the Quebec government's decision as to its own policy with respect to its Quebec chartered companies. At the moment—and I have heard nothing to change this since yesterday noon—the Quebec government intended to proceed with its own scheme.

Mr. Sopha: Are they not insured now under the Minister's scheme?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No.

Mr. Sopha: They have not joined any scheme?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The Quebec government now must work this out. It is the master of its own fate; it is sovereign in its own—

Mr. Sopha: Maître chez nous?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oui. Mais oui.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Be careful, the member for Perth (Mr. Edwards) may hear you.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: They have to resolve this thing very quickly, and if their insurance is going to cover the whole of the operation of their Quebec companies outside their own jurisdiction wherever they may exist, it may be all right when we look at it in those terms. At that point, that definition has not come about.

Whether or not the Quebec government will save its insurance for its own—the operations of those companies within Quebec—and leave their extraprovincial operations to that jurisdiction where they are operating, I do not know, but I hope that these matters might be answered within a matter of days.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to clarify one point which arises out of the comments of the member for St. George. Leaving aside the Quebec situation entirely, if a company—say an Ontario trust corporation—is unable to meet the requirements of the federal insurance corporation and, therefore, becomes subject to the prohibition against accepting any future deposits from anyone, and, therefore, does not have any certificate, would that company or the depositors in that company who had made their deposits up to the time that it became subject to the prohibition against future ones, continue to receive the protection under the statute of the Ontario deposit insurance corporation?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Let us just add then, a qualification to get the premise for this: Let us say that the Legislature enacts this bill, and let me choose a date that will clarify things. Let us say that our Ontario companies go right under the federal scheme. Then let us pick a company, "A", and there is a rejection of it on September 1. All the depositors within the $20,000 as defined into those limits, are protected.

Then, because it is within one year—the first year—a winding up of the company, if it got to that, would be a matter for the Ontario government to reimburse the federal fund within the first year. But the arrangements which we have with the federal government, I was going to say, will be liaising on an almost weekly basis, but that is not correct. The only way that this will work, will be to liaise and work with them on a daily basis. I think we will be well informed as to movements and trends. The depositors, in any event, are protected.

Mr. Renwick: Even after the date when the prohibition against accepting deposits comes into effect?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on section 3, is there a point in time where, if the right of a given company having come under the Canadian deposit insurance corporation scheme, say, for five or ten years, and then ceases to be covered under that scheme because it fails to meet requirements of one kind or another, and say it is an Ontario incorporated company, what happens at that point? Does the Ontario deposit insurance corporation come back into the picture, or is it entirely withdrawn from it?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The date factor in the proposition advanced, I take it, is let us say about five years hence. A lot of things in the first year will be clarified, but certainly every company that is in after one year is purely under the federal deposit corporation, and no matter what happens, the Ontario deposit corporation will never have anything more to do with it, it is a federal obligation.

Sections 3 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 97 reported.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill 70, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 70 reported.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report one resolution and two bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one resolution and two bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 27th order: House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF MINES

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you sincerely for giving me an opportunity to present the estimates of The Department of Mines at the present time.

This year, although there is a great deal that I could talk about with pride, I intend to keep these remarks to introduce The Department of Mines estimates as brief as possible.

First of all, I must confess to a feeling of some disappointment that the goal of $1 billion in production which we have nearly reached each year since about 1959, again eluded us in 1966. The complete compilation of figures for 1965 showed that Ontario's mining industry came within a mere $8 million of reaching that goal, and we had every hope that we could pass through the elusive barrier last year. Indeed as it happened, the industry slipped back by $28 million to bring the total production to $964.5 million for the year 1966.

That was a disappointment, but I suggest that the results do not show any weakness in the mining industry. The decrease in production just about exactly matches the decrease in the output of nickel and copper and the other minerals which form the basis of the gigantic Sudbury mining complex. That is to say, it just about matches the lost production resulting from a one-month closedown of the International Nickel Company's operations because of a labour dispute.

Now I wish to thank all members of all parties who have given my department and myself such great help during the year and assure them that it has been a pleasure to work with them.

It is to be hoped and expected that in this Centennial year, we can look forward to a period of industrial peace. Most of the major companies have completed contracts with their workers in the last year or so, and to the best of my present knowledge, no agreements that are likely to be difficult to solve are coming up for ratification this year.

This, together with the fact that development work has proceeded on a number of important mining operations to the point that several of them will achieve full productive capacity this year, leads me to predict with every expectation that my optimism will be borne out in fact, that 1967 will prove to be in nearly every way the biggest and most successful year that Ontario's mining industry has ever experienced.

At the end of December there were in Ontario 30 distinct mining operations undergoing development work preparatory to production. It would be too much, Mr. Chairman, to expect that, without exception, these prospects will become viable mining operations, but among them are some very big and important projects which will, without doubt, contribute a great deal to the economy either later this year or in the years immediately ahead.

In the Sudbury area, International Nickel is bringing four new mines into production and Falconbridge is developing two others. When the development work is completed it will mean that these two companies between them will have 24 mines producing in the immensely rich Sudbury Basin. In addition to this, Inco has another mine under development, I am glad to say, the Shebandowan Mine near good Port Arthur. Canadian Johns-Manville Ltd. is bringing in a new asbestos mine in Reeves township. This will replace the Munro Mine near Matheson which closed down two years ago and will again make Ontario an important producer of asbestos.

Two very big iron mines are now getting ready to produce. One is the Sherman Mine near Timagami which is being opened for Dominion Foundry and Steel Ltd. to produce pellets for its steel furnaces in Hamilton. The other is the Griffiths Mine at Bruce Lake in the far northwestern part of the province. It is a Steel Co. of Canada operation and all its production will be used in that company's steel mill in Hamilton. In addition to this, Steep Rock Iron Mines, having completed an agreement with the Algoma Steel Co. is completing a multi-million dollar pelletizing plant at its property near Atikokan. A similiar pelletizing plant at the neighbouring Caland Mine went into production last year. To my mind, Mr. Chairman, it is particularly encouraging that so many of these major iron ore producing enterprises are finding a market within our own country. It has always been desirable that the treatment of our minerals should be carried just as far as possible in this country, rather than exporting them as raw ore so that we Canaidans are obliged to buy back the finished product at a greatly enhanced price. Perhaps it is not too much to say that this is a step, an important step, toward buying back our country.

I have mentioned only a few of the 30 development projects I spoke of. Others, which it is hoped will be brought to active production, include silver, gold, copper and other mineral producers in all parts of the province.

Apart altogether from these operations on which development is more or less well advanced there are other matters of at least equal potential importance about which I think members should be informed. Now we have often talked about opening up the great north and I assure you we have made long strides towards that wish this year.

One, of which the announcement was made four months ago, has to do with the proposed exploitation of the very large deposit of lignite coal in the Onakawana River area in the James Bay basin. An agreement between the government and Alberta Coal Ltd. of Calgary gives that company exclusive rights during the life of a three-year licence to drill and prospect in the field which may contain an estimated one hundred million tons of lignite coal. The company has agreed to expend at least $25,000 annually in exploration work for the duration of the licence and, subject to further negotiation, it will be entitled to lease five per cent of the exploration area for a period of 21 years should the lignite coal deposit prove to be worthy of commercial development.

This could well prove to be of great economic importance and if a mine is developed on the site it would be Ontario's first coal mine, and the first mining operation of any kind in eastern Ontario north of Cochrane. Hon. members may recall that several years ago The Department of Mines carried out a rather extensive research programme at Onakawana, but under the then-existing conditions, the results were not conclusive.

The member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer), in his capacity as vice-chairman of Ontario Hydro is, no doubt, in a better position than I to assess the stated possibility that Hydro might establish an on-site thermal plant using this lignite as the fuel.

The James Bay lowlands provide the setting for another potentially very important development for which an exploratory licence covering 64,000 acres has been granted to Imperial Oil Ltd., Consolidated Morrison Exploration Ltd., Argor Explorations Ltd. and Goldray Mines Ltd. The target here is columbium which, because of its heat-resistant properties and strength, is in considerable demand as a space-age alloy metal, a very important metal and fairly new. To the end of last year, the group of companies had invested $695,000 in exploration work and they plan a further expenditure of a like amount.

An exploration permit has been granted to Madsen Red Lake Mines Ltd. for the development of a deposit of magnetic iron sands discovered on the bed of MacDowell Lake in northwestern Ontario. It is too early yet, Mr. Chairman, of course, to assess the importance of this deposit.

Another very interesting new development that might well prove to be of great economic significance is taking place in the northwestern corner of the province. There, exploratory rights on 986,560 acres were granted only last week to the Aquitane Co. of Canada, a wholly-owned subsidiary of a very large French oil-producing company. This organization is a major operator in the Rainbow field of Alberta and it has recently done preliminary drilling just over the Ontario border in Manitoba, that is on the eastern edge of Manitoba. It is on the basis of drill results in this Manitoba field that negotiations for adjoining land in Ontario are being conducted.

There are two other exploration agreements covering large areas of the province that I should like to mention briefly. But I mentioned those previous ones to show that our great northern part of this province is really beginning to come into its own as a producer of different minerals and ores.

The first is an exploratory licence which gives the Algoma Central Railway the right to explore for silica and kaolin clays in the Hearst area. Having completed a large part of the exploratory work, the ACR is now considering converting the licence to a production lease.

This is very important, Mr. Chairman, to the following—Canada Glazed Papers Ltd. uses large quantities of a particular sort of clay in its manufacturing process. This material presently has to be imported from the United States and so the company, seeking an alternative domestic supply, last week was granted exploration rights on deposits in Kipling and Wright townships.

During 1966 we saw the great Texas Gulf project begin active production from its Kidd Creek mine near Timmins. This big copper and zinc development is certain to add a great deal to the value of the total mineral output of the province. In addition to this, there were two separate mines started up by International Nickel in the Sudbury area; two silver operations near Cobalt; copper mines near Timmins and a zinc producer at Schreiber, up in my own area. Altogether, ten new or revived mining enterprises started up during the year.

I am sure that all hon. members will recognize that no mine, however well endowed it may be, or however large an ore body it may

have, is inexhaustible and there comes a time, I am sorry to say, when the biggest and richest mines find it is no longer possible to operate profitably. Thus, last year we had ten mines in Ontario suspend operations.

Unhappily, among these ten were three very old and reliable gold producers. McKenzie Red Lake Gold Mine, the Pickle Crow Mine and Porcupine Paymaster. There were two other small gold producers which had never really got off the ground and they too found it necessary to close up.

A moment ago I spoke of some of the principal developments in Ontario's mining industry. I wonder if the hon. members have any really clear picture of the enormous costs involved in bringing any mine, even a small one, into production. The Canadian mining industry is committed to spend more than $1 billion in capital plant development within the next few years. A very large share of that money is earmarked for Ontario and by far the greater part of it will be spent in Canada, in Ontario, to the direct benefit of the whole economy. Let me just quote a few figures to show what some of these operations will mean in cash, jobs and the general health of those sections of the economy that deal with the provision of the equipment and services which will go into these new mines.

For example, International Nickel in 1965 entered on a $279 million expansion plan in the Sudbury area. Capital expenditures on this programme are now running at about $70 million annually. Falconbridge in the same area is working on a $100 million expansion budget, $45 million of which is to go to the development of the big new Strathcona Mine which is scheduled to come into production late this year. Texas Gulf Sulphur is now in the final stages of bringing its new mine and plant into full production at a rate of three million tons annually. This has been a $60 million development operation. Early last year Caland Ore Company's pellet plant, which cost $15 million, began production, and the construction of a similar plant for Steep Rock Iron Mines is now well advanced. It is to cost $28 million. The Sherman Mine at Timagami is being prepared for production, probably late this year, at a cost of between $40 and $50 million and the Steel Company of Canada is spending $60 million to bring in the Griffith Mine in northwestern Ontario at Bruce Lake. Kam-Kotia Mines Limited is engaged in a half million dollar project to increase its milling capacity by about 10 per cent. At Elliot Lake, Rio Algom Mines Limited is spending between $8 and $9 million in sinking a new shaft to bring in another uranium mine on its Quirke Lake property. And I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that uranium is very fast coming into its own.

These are just a few outstanding examples which might show just how big our mining industry is and how important the effect on the whole economy inevitably must be.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may we consider the estimates in detail. I will just read this to you before we start going through them. The main office of the department, covered under vote 1301, includes the office of the Minister, the Deputy Minister, systems and procedures, public relations, personnel, the mining commissioner, administrative services and financial administration.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, it was a matter of gratification a few weeks ago when the Supreme Court of Canada upheld the verdict of the Ontario court of appeals in a case involving the right of the Ontario government to tax the profits from mining in the province. The case was basic to the validity of The Mining Tax Act under which a revenue of between $10 and $15 million is realized each year.

The same vote also is to provide funds for the special sulphur dioxide investigation which has been proceeding for several years and of which 50 per cent is recoverable from industry. It also includes the cost of research into ore dressing which is being handled by the Ontario research foundation. The most important item of this research consists of an attempt to find domestically a suitable binder for iron ore pelletizing plants to replace bentonite, the material that is currently in use. Bentonite is imported from the United States in very large quantities and at considerable cost. The research foundation is experimenting with materials based on peat moss, lignite, sulphides from wood-pulp, and native Ontario clays. Vote 1301 also includes the sum of $25,000 which will be used to engage the services of a qualified specialist to carry out research into silicosis and to bring all available information up to date. The total amount asked for under vote 1301 is $662,000.

This is an increase of $20,000 over the expenditure in the current year.

Vote 1302 covering all oprating costs of the geological branch amounts to $1,505,000. The fact that almost half the department's total budget is devoted to finding and disseminating basic information for the use of the mining public is, I think, sir, an indication of the basic purpose of The Department of

Mines. There have been great advances in recent years of the techniques used in geologizing Ontario and the work has been speeded up immeasurably. In 1966, for the first time, we employed a new method of air-lifting geological survey crews by helicopter from a base camp to the area to be surveyed. It was necessary to adopt this method becuse in the overburdened area there were very few outcrops and, to cover the same area in a comparable ground survey using the same number of people, would have taken about 25 years as opposed to four months, which it takes doing it with helicopters. The total cost for surveying an area of 28,000 square miles was $100,000, or about $3.50 per square mile. One comparable ground survey which was carried out in 1965 cost $11,220 for 1,189 square miles, or about $10.00 per square mile. Another, slightly more detailed survey, came to $12.00 per square mile. "Operation Kapuskasing" as the survey was called proved to be an unqualified success and on the basis of results and costs, it has been decided that a similar operation will be launched in 1967 in the Lingman Lake area in the far northwestern part of the province; that is north of Bruce Lake and that area up there. There is a road running over to it from about the centre of that area at the moment. Altogether, it is planned to have 28 field parties at work in varius parts of the province this year.

Twelve of them will be working in northwestern Ontario, 12 in northeastern Ontario, and three in southern Ontario. Another one will be making a special study of iron deposits in the province. In addition to these parties, resident geologists will be carrying on work in their respective areas. A new section of the branch, whose activities will be devoted to education and information along geological lines has been set up. The principal duties of this new section will be to set up and run mineral exploration classes, classes for junior forest rangers and to establish and operate data centres for the storage and retrieval of geological information from all sources.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, one of our greatest lacks today is men to work in the mining industry. We are short 6,000 or more and we are trying to do the best we can to attract young men into this industry which we know will be of great benefit to them in the future. We need men very seriously in the mining industry.

Funds for the operation of the mines inspection branch are covered by vote 1303 amounting to $435,000. In addition to its normal inspection services, the inspection branch is responsible for the operation of the cable testing laboratory and mine rescue stations. These stations are operated at no cost to the government. I am sure you will be glad to hear that, Mr. Chairman.

Vote 1304 covers the cost of both the laboratory branch in Toronto and the Timiskaming testing laboratory at Cobalt. The total requested for this work is $280,000. The major function of the Toronto laboratory is the performance of geological research services for the geological branch of the department. It also provides some assay service for the general public, principally on the basis of the coupon system provided in The Mining Act. The Timiskaming testing laboratory continues to offer a specialized sampling service for the mines of the Cobalt-Gowganda area.

Vote 1305 in the amount of $29,000 is to provide the funds necessary for the sulphur fumes arbitrator to carry out his duties in all areas of the province. All funds chargeable to sulphur fumes arbitration are recoverable from the industry.

Operating costs of the mining lands branch are covered in vote 1306. The total asked for in the fiscal year is $464,000. This branch is responsible for the administration of The Mining Act insofar as it pertains to the disposal of mining lands.

The total of all ordinary expenditures of the department for the coming year are expected to be $3,375,000. The increase of $332,000 from the total asked for in the current year can be mainly accounted for by staff and salary increases.

The capital expenditure is covered under vote 1307. It allows $1,000,000 for the construction of mining and access roads. This is an increase of $500,000 over the 1966-1967 estimates and can be accounted for by the fact that the federal-provincial roads to resources agreement has ended and it is anticipated that more of the same important work will be done directly by the province; in other words, the dominion government in their wisdom withdrew their half of that vote. We have not heard yet if they are going to come in again with any more money or not, but I assure you that we need the $1 million to open up some of the country that is very valuable, and we would like to get to work on it.

The principal construction work completed during the last fiscal year consisted of a 500-foot long bridge spanning the Otoskwin River, that is in the northwest part of the province. With this obstacle overcome a contract has been let and work is now in

progress on the rest of the road northwesterly toward Lingman Lake. The future 260-mile road from Pickle Crow to Lingman Lake will pass through potentially very rich country and the hope is, of course, that when access becomes possible, finds of great importance will result.

I mention the bridge across the Otoskwin River because that was the big barrier there. This road will run to the northwestern part of Ontario, and one of the largest iron deposits that has yet been found is in the Lingman Lake area, the North Spirit Mine. Whether we can get that going or others coming east from there, will mean a lot of money to us. We think it is good business to continue that 260-mile road as far as Lingman Lake to open up that very valuable part of the province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am ready, if you are, to go ahead with the estimates and I would like your permission to call my staff over here with me and we will proceed with the votes.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. A. H. Taylor (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, it is indeed regrettable that the Minister is unable to report increased growth in mining production in this province during 1966, and has advised us, on the contrary, of a reduction of $28 million for last year. While this would not appear to be very serious in a total production of over $900 million, it nevertheless reflects something more than the labour difficulties referred to by the Minister in his report. It reflects the closing of 10 mines, three of which were old-established producers. The reduction in our total mineral production came at a time when the demand for the minerals we can produce was at its very highest peak.

At the same time this government can take no credit for the resurgence of the uranium mining industry in this province. It played no part in the renewed interest and demand for uranium throughout the world. Only half-hearted attempts were made to find other uses for uranium by-products that might have bridged the gap in demand. It played no part in the stockpiling of the ore as an interim measure. This government made only a belated and halfhearted attempt to locate within our boundaries a heavy water plant, despite the fact that Ontario Hydro is destined to become the largest consumer in Canada of the end product produced. The province threw together a last minute proposal, complete with its usual fanfare, which it knew could not even be considered.

It is true, as the Minister has pointed out, that during 1966 mining developments have taken place within this province which will add substantially to our total production this year and in succeeding years. It is also true, as recently stated by Duncan R. Derry, a leading geologist and expert in exploration, that some of the growth in Canadian minerals may have been a case of partly living off the backlog of deposits found before 1950. He has warned that any proposed legislation, such as the Carter tax commission report suggests, should be examined very critically to make certain it does not have the effect of checking a necessary rise in spending on the search for minerals.

The record of the Canadian mining industry since 1950 shows that we have been finding about four and a half ore bodies a year which justified production without much delay. But we have been placing in production eight and a half new nonferrous metal mines each year, or ten and a half if reopenings and small operations of doubtful duration are included. Canada is depending on the "reserve shelf" for its ore deposits. I quote:

> This state of affairs is in spite of a marked rise over the past three years in the annual expenditure on exploration,

he said.

> The cost of finding each ton of new metal is increasing and will continue to do so. We have to look in inaccessible areas, look for deeper-buried ore bodies, use more expensive geophysical equipment and techniques and spend more in drill-testing the indications.

While we in Ontario are still the largest mineral producer of all the Canadian provinces, our recent rate of growth has not been commensurate with that of some of the other provinces. I believe that this government must bear the responsibility for our growth slowdown, because it has not kept pace with imaginative legislation to stimulate this industry. British Columbia on the other hand appears to be going ahead by leaps and bounds: more prospecting, more staking and more development work is taking place in that province than ever before. Part of this activity is certainly the result of some of the new and progressive legislation that is being developed in that province. In this connection I quote from a speech delivered recently by John C. Dawson, industrial economist for

British Columbia Hydro, to the American institute of mining, metallurgical and petroleum engineers:

> The development climate for any industry is created by the laws and political stability under which it must live, and its importance must not be underestimated. Governing bodies in Canada have recognized the importance of the mining industry, and the special problems that it must overcome in this large and underpopulated land. They have, as a result, designed laws and provided services that are most effective, and the Canadian experience has been cited as a model for other countries seeking a practical guide to mineral resource development.
>
> Tax incentives recognize the high risks and high exploration and development costs peculiar to this industry. These include a three-year income tax exemption for new mines, allowances for pre-production costs, and depletion allowances.
>
> In British Columbia, other laws ensure claim staking simplicity, and effectively guarantee security of land tenure to the humblest prospector and the largest corporation with a minimum of red tape.
>
> Services provided to the mining industry by that government are extensive. These include basic geological and topographical mapping, which we do here, air photography, mineral research on a broad scale, and economic studies and evaluations. Provision is also made for assistance with roads, air strips, power facilities, housing, and communications. Bona fide prospectors are eligible for grubstakes up to $700 per year.
>
> To encourage a free flow of the all-important venture capital needed by the mining industry, the government has had to balance on the fine edge of providing reasonable protection to investors, without at the same time restricting too severely the free-wheeling promoters who are so necessary for raising large amounts of risk capital. The investor needs some assurance that a fair share of his money is going into the ground, and not the promoter's pocket. This has been fairly successfully accomplished through the British Columbia Securities Act. This Act, perhaps better described as a "full, true, and plain disclosure statute", allows the promoters wide freedom so long as the investor has complete information, presented in plain English, on which to judge his chances.
>
> Transportation problems are probably among the severest the industry has to face. A good example of government assistance in this regard is the 432 mile development railway built in 1965 to the rich Pine Point lead-zinc deposits in the Northwest Territories. This line, at a cost of nearly $100 million, was built with public funds by the Canadian National Railways to allow development of a vast mineral deposit otherwise destined to lie unused indefinitely because of its remote location. The mining company (Pine Point Mines), guaranteed certain minimum shipments of concentrates for a period of ten years, with a special rate clause keyed to metal prices. Freight revenues will not completely cover the cost of the line, but long range returns from northern development and tax returns from the mine will more than compensate for the deficit. Already a number of small sawmills and grain elevators have located along the new railway.

Continuing to quote from Mr. Dawson:

> Another instance worth mentioning in which the government has helped an industry get started is in the development of export coal sales to Japan. It was known that Japan's steel industry had need for high-quality, low-volatile coals such as those mined in the southern Canadian Rockies. But costs of mining and transporting it on a small scale market development basis were prohibitive. Seven years ago, when the western coal industry was almost out on its feet, a special subvention allowed a subsidy to be paid on exported coal. This began at about $4.65 per ton, with the intention of phasing it out over ten years as coal sales grew. Payments are presently down to $2.75 per ton, and sales are up to the subvention's maximum of 800,000 tons per year.
>
> The coal industry is now negotiating with the Japanese for sales of two million tons annually, with possible increases to four or five million tons per year. Volumes of this size can justify large investments in highly automated mining and handling equipment, unit trains, and special port facilities, to the point where costs are low enough to make subsidies unnecessary.
>
> This serves as a good example of how government can effectively provide the initial boost needed in exceptional cases to help industry get started, then stand back and allow the industry to carry on unaided.
>
> In similar vein, to encourage the development of smelters, British Columbia has re-

and that must be four or five years ago now when the great flurry in the market occurred. We have not seen any smoke coming out of any smelter yet. They were treating their ore for a time at Kam-Kotia. I do not know if they are still doing that. They were shipping concentrates to Noranda for a period of time. Eventually they have to get around to building a smelter if they are going to fully develop that ore body.

I would say that the time has come for the Treasury benches or somebody else that occupies those benches in the near future, to get off our collective places where we sit and say to the company: "Let us get going."

In the Sudbury area, speaking analogously —and I hope Falconbridge Nickel Mines will not be too offended at this—every once in a while the president of Falconbridge Nickel Mines, in order to keep the carrot in front of us, says, "Well, the company is actively considering building a refinery." This is just to let us know that they have not forgotten that we are anxious that they do. In the meantime, of course, that company ships all their concentrates to Norway to provide jobs in Norway. I read in the paper that they are going to build a new dock at Parry Sound—that is great for Parry Sound—and presumably that is to facilitate the making of shipments of their concentrates to Norway.

I would not be at all hesitant if somebody invited me to go into the riding of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) in the forthcoming contest and repeat a few of these things about our expectations from Texas Gulf Sulphur.

I always have to live with the inevitable conclusion that the Minister of Mines is not a person to lean on anybody. He never uses the authority of the Queen—that part of the authority of the Queen that he carries around —that fractionalized part. The Crown is divided by 22 in Ontario and he has presumably got one twenty-second of it, but he never uses his twenty-second to lean on anybody. In fact, I do observe that in most cases he gets a kick out of calling these big shots in the mining industry by their first names, and if they call him George then that is just hunky-dory with him. Oh yes, a great thrill. They call him George and he calls them Bill, Harry and Pete and that is all great. But the Minister of Mines, as far as I can see, never is willing to put a little starch in his speech. To say to the people: "You utilize that ore body, but it must be utilized first and foremost for the people of our province. That is the obligation. That is the principle approach to our natural resources that I, for one, am willing to state that I will uphold as long as I am in public life." Having said all those things, we are still without a smelter in the Texas Gulf Sulphur area in Timmins. Lord knows how much longer it will be until a final decision is made about its erection there. The Minister of Mines, it is to be observed, does not give me much help or much information on when we might expect that that installation will finally appear on the landscape.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I would say to the member for Sudbury—and I might say that I always enjoy his talks and that I like being on a first name basis with these miners, as I do with the member for Sudbury. I would not feel very happy or very satisfied if I ended the day by calling him by his family name. I love the name he has and that is why I use it. I am joking, but seriously, Mr. Chairman, Falconbridge, as you know, has just announced that they plan to build a $40 million iron plant at Falconbridge. I know there is not any reason in my mind at all as to why the smelter that Texas Gulf will build will not be located in Ontario. In fact, it has not been indicated to me that it will not be. That is why I have not had to use the hammer and sickle that I might have, you know, because Texas Gulf are very, very fine people—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You mean sledge-hammer.

A hon. member: Hammer and tongs.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No. Hammer and sickle—well, all right. I have been assured that smelter—now this is not government policy, but I am sure in my own heart—that that smelter will be built right in Ontario and it will develop every bit of its ore there for the people of this province. That is an assurance.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): But you were sure that the pipeline was going to go through northern Ontario too.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am still sure.

Mr. Bryden: Your colleague who is in charge is not in favour of that.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well if you want to bet, do it outside the House because—

Mr. Chairman: I cannot see anything about Texas Gulf under vote 1301. Let us stay with vote 1301.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to—I am sorry I missed the Minister's remarks but I would like to understand this —how many smelters are there in Ontario that do their processing or refining in other than in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Would the member repeat that question, please?

Mr. MacDonald: That is a good question to ask him.

Mr. Sargent: I mean, what is the Minister's policy—how many mines do their processing in other than Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Does the member mean taking Canadian mineral out of the ground here and smelting it some place else?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, how many? Are there more than five; are there ten; how many are there?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: All copper ore taken from the province goes to Noranda, Quebec, zinc goes to Valleyfield, Quebec, and International Nickel has their plants right here. Falconbridge is the only nickel ore that is refined outside of Canada and that is done in Norway. So there you have it. It is all done in Canada with the exception of Falconbridge. But unfortunately Noranda's copper and zinc is done in two places in Quebec.

Mr. Sopha: The concentrates at Cobalt—most of them go into the United States.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh yes, that is one silver mine only. We have been trying for years to get that stopped, but have not yet been successful.

Mr. Sopha: Is the smelter at Gillies, is its experience profitable?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: At Gillies?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: There is a tie-up there that I ran into when I first took over the office of the Minister of Mines and they claim that it is more profitable to them to ship to Osarko in the United States. It may be because they may have a market for this ore right down there where the smelter is. But we have never been able to get them to use the Cobalt smelter, although we have tried everything within our power to get it done. All other silver ore is going to Cobalt except the ore from Osarko—that is what the member for Sudbury is talking about?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, who owns it now? Who owns the Gillies smelter now? Viola-Mac?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Viola-Mac, yes. Kam-Kotia.

Mr. Sargent: Does this include iron ore too?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Most of our iron ore is smelted right here. There is a small quantity of iron ore which goes to the United States, and we get some American ore up here that we smelt.

Mr. Sargent: I think this is an amazing situation. We ask the Minister these very basic questions, and he has to ask his assistants even simple things like this. I do not think he knows what is going on, to tell the truth.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I want to make sure I am right. I do not want to give the members any wrong answers so I ask our experts.

Mr. Sargent: I do not know whether the Minister is right or not, but I would like to ask him if he has a policy on this. Is it mandatory that the processing should be done in this country?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Take it easy, go slowly. If you did not you might kill the mining business.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Minister have a policy on telling these industries or these mines that they must do their processing here? Does he not have a policy on this? What is his policy?

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1301 carried?

Mr. Sargent: No. I asked a question.

Mr. Bryden: It is 6 o'clock.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister has not answered the question yet. Let him answer the question.

It being 6 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 76

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, April 25, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 25, 1967

Estimates, Department of Mines, Mr. Wardrope, concluded 2623

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 2654

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF MINES
(Concluded)

On vote 1301:

Mr. Chairman: I believe that, when we recessed at 6 o'clock, the Minister was preparing an answer to a question. Is that correct, sir?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, the Minister was going to answer a question on policy. But I understand there are not enough in the House to have a quorum. Are you counting, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: There are more than enough.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, I think the question was on the exemption of the export of minerals. Am I right there? After the claims before 1917, they were free to be shipped out of the province to another country, and after that they were required to have an exemption in each case before they could be exported to any other country but Canada. Does that answer it?

Mr. Sargent: No, Mr. Chairman. My only concern was the fact that you are charged with the major responsibility in this spending of $3,325,000 in a major segment of our economy, and we are taking our natural resources belonging to the people, allowing them to be mined from our soil and to be taken elsewhere to be processed, giving other economies the benefit of our wealth. I asked you in the first place, how many cases were there of this in the mining industry. I am given to understand that there are many, many companies doing this type of exporting for processing, yet you say there is only a very small number. I understand it is more than you say.

But regardless of this—this could go on into our lands and forests, into pulp and paper—but specifically in this field here, I asked you what was your policy insofar as it was concerned with telling the industry that they must, if they are going to mine our wealth, process it here, and that we have a policy which makes it mandatory that no company can export our resources, our wealth, elsewhere for processing. I think it is time that we had an understanding insofar as the government policy, or your policy is concerned.

Number two: If you are going to continue this, are you going to make a new policy and make it retroactive, to make this law that they cannot export our wealth elsewhere for processing?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is a very fair question and I might say that we have got to think of markets, too. We have got the raw material. We have got to think of markets and there is not enough domestic market to process all our ore in Canada.

For instance, some of the companies in other parts of the world will take these ores from the countries that have them and process them in their own countries. But we are endeavouring to see that everything is processed to its finality in Canada.

I think there is one silver mine that still exports raw ore.

Mr. Sargent: But how do you endeavour if you do not make a specific law that they cannot—endeavouring is not going to solve this. Are you going to put some teeth in this thing?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, yes, we are.

Mr. Sargent: But how?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We are working on this all the time. There is very little raw ore being exported from Canada. There is Osarko silver going south. Falconbridge has some of their material going over to Norway, where they have a tremendous smelter that they have had for years, and they have got millions sunk in that. You just cannot go along and say, "Tomorrow you quit shipping there", because we have not got facilities for it in Canada.

In every instance we are endeavouring to get our ore processed to its finality here.

You will notice, in the iron field, the last three mines that were discovered and opened, are all being processed to their finality in Canada, but there are some of them that still go to American plants because they have had that arrangement with us for years. For instance—I am speaking of the Sherman now—they ship their ore down to Chicago because it is their mine and they have got their steel plants there. They have been there for years and it would be rather foolish for us to say: "Starting tomorrow, you cannot have any more of that ore." That mine would shut down and we have no place in Canada to process the ore at the present time. So we have got to work this export problem out over the process of time. We are making an endeavour to see that all our ore is finalized in Canada as much as we possibly can.

Now I think—there is a law since 1917 that requires an exemption to ship ore out of the country. I was just wondering if you were suggesting that we make a law retroactive that has been on the books since 1917. There is that exemption, and if we did wipe it off the books now and say, "No more ore shipped from Ontario or Canada", we would certainly find ourselves in a bad mess because we would not have operations to finalize it here. Then where are our markets going to be? You see, one of our biggest markets is the United States and if you were to say, "You shut down your plants, we are not going to give you any more of our raw ore", they would say, "Boys, keep it, but you cannot sell it in this country". They might retaliate in that way and where would we be? We are getting all the time nearer to the point of finalizing all this ore in Canada.

Mr. R. A. H. Taylor (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, in that connection has your department given any consideration to—rather than take a negative attitude saying that no raw material may be shipped out of the country for further processing—taking a more positive attitude as has been done in British Columbia in connection with their Act, An Act with Respect to Bounty on Copper. They provide a subsidy for any company who mine ore in British Columbia and who also process it and refine it in that province. They have a similar Act called The Iron Bounty Act which was passed in 1957 with the same motive, insofar as iron ore pellets are concerned. Has our province given any consideration to a positive approach in this connection?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am told that all the ore and concentrates mined in B.C. are shipped out of the province, except Cominco. We took a stand with Texas Gulf, as you know, so all that ore will be processed in Canada. We have taken the same stand in many other cases. True, all the new iron mines are going to process their product in our own plants in Hamilton and other places in Canada. Steep Rock is now going to pelletize in Canada; Caland Ore is pelletizing in Canada; Bruce Lake—well it is pelletized here—but most of our big producers now are finalizing their ore right here. They are sending their pellets to Canadian mills, and I think that the only one exporting pellets is Caland Ore, which is an American owned company. They are pelletizing their ore at their mine in Ontario. They ship the pellets to the United States, but otherwise the pellets from that area go to Hamilton and other Canadian plants—that is as far as iron ore is concerned. Now I do not know what else there is besides silver. The Adams Mine is shipping ore in the raw state—no, in pellets, that is right—but I do not know of any others.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Where does Steep Rock go?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: They go to Algoma Steel at Hamilton. Caland, of course, goes to the American side in the form of pellets, and Bruce Lake will go down to Hamilton. All the others are going to be finalized here. Those are the only ones I can think of. Now in B.C.—which was mentioned—concentrates are shipped from the province in their raw state. I do not know of any other; if anybody can think of any let us know about it.

Mr. Taylor: I was referring specifically to copper in B.C. You are quite right that at the present it is not refined there, but I understand that as a result of this Act there is a refinery going into B.C.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That could be. Yes, there is some of our ore that is finalized in Noranda in Quebec. They are doing a lot of work down there, but I cannot think of another mine that is shipping their ore out in raw state. Of course, that is not our policy for the future. We try to get the raw material finalized here regardless of who mines it. The Anaconda and Can-Fer properties will come into production, perhaps, in a year or year and a half. They will have their pelletizing plants here as well. I suppose, in the future—I do not know how long it will be—there should be a steel mill up at the Lakehead—as my friend from Sudbury

(Mr. Sopha) said—you have to get the Americans to spend the money, you know, and I do not know of anybody that is interested in that yet. It will come, I am sure.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I have three unrelated issues dealing with policy that would come in the appropriate vote.

The first one I would like to pick up on the point that has just been discussed. The Minister has, in effect, said that policy is to encourage in his phraseology "the finalizing of the product here in the province of Ontario". He said, for example, in the instance of Falconbridge, that they are sending it over to their established smelter in Norway. It would take some time to build an alternative one here. By implication he was suggesting that they maybe are trying to encourage them. Well, it seems to me that there are two ways of encouraging—one is the kind of bounty arrangement that my friend from Timiskaming has mentioned—which I presume is in effect a payment; it is a partial return on the royalty.

I do not know whether we get enough in the first instance to make it really legitimate that you should pay a bounty to get these people to finalize the product within the boundaries of the province. I am wondering if the Minister has given any consideration, or if the government has given any consideration, since he says this is the policy, to adopting something of the same procedure that, for example, George Drew did back in the 40's, with regard to pulp. In other words, there was a phasing out over a period of 10 years. A proportion could be shipped out in the first year, and a smaller proportion in the second year. Then, by the end of the tenth year, presumably, you were going to have no exports at all of raw pulp. Is this not a procedure whereby you can achieve your objective instead of just rather drifting along and saying "this is desirable" but with no compulsion, no law, no firm directives laid down?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is what I would like to work to; but we will take Falconbridge, for instance, in Norway. I do not know how many millions of dollars they have invested in that plant over there. If you said, "You cannot get any more raw ore from Canada," it would put them in a pretty tough position. It would have to be done over a period of time, and I think that has been intimated to most of the big people here: that the time is going to come, or that we want them to work to the point of finalizing all their ore here in Ontario. Many of them have gone along with this. I would not say that anybody is adamant against it but it takes time to correct these things. I suppose it does upset their financial arrangements, and so on, but over a period of years I hope we will be able to process all our ore to the final stage in Ontario, or almost to the final stage.

Mr. MacDonald: With respect to the Minister, he is a very congenial fellow—he hopes, I hope—that means nothing. If Falconbridge is going to continue to export; it is your desire that at some point they are going to cease to export; they are going to continue to export from now until Doomsday unless you lay it down by law—1980, 1985, 1975. What is needed is not a sort of congenial little chat around a cup of coffee. Let us know where we stand, otherwise you are never going to achieve the policy. The Minister is very delightful in his friendly relationships but I can assure him that delightful, friendly relationship is not going to achieve the policy which he enunciates as the objective—not only in his own view but in the view of the government.

However, let me move on, Mr. Chairman, to a second point. I want to tie together two observations. The Minister himself, in his introductory statement, had his usual bouncy optimism about developments here and developments there and developments in other parts of the province, all of which presented a pretty rosy picture. I was interested in the comments of the Liberal spokesman, the hon. member for Timiskaming, where he, in commenting on mining promotion, was relying pretty heavily on the kind of policies that they have in British Columbia. He implied—if I am not doing him an injustice—that the Carter commission recommendations were going to cut down on the incentives to that promotion. I would like to go back and read his comments very carefully because I suspect that if one reads them very carefully there was at least an implied criticism of the Carter recommendation—that a lot of these very favourable tax exemptions and incentives to the mining industry should be eliminated. He presumably wants them to be continued, and therefore, in effect, pulls the rug out from the whole Carter approach to getting greater equity in our tax structure.

However, while dwelling on that I want to go one step further. I have no objection to the propositions of incentives for developing

new ore bodies—for discovering new ore bodies. As my colleague from Fort William (Mr. Freeman) pointed out, people high in the mining industry at that recent convention, or conference, in Ottawa pointed out that most of our ore bodies that we are working on today are ore bodies that were found prior to 1950. If we do not find new ore bodies we are going to wake up some morning and discover that we are beginning to run out of them. So the proposition of continuing to build up these proven ore bodies to maintain the future of the mining industry is a very important one.

However, Mr. Chairman, it is my impression that a great deal of the work in discovering new ore bodies is the effort of individuals. But once they discover the new ore body, you run into the problem of financing and in many instances what happens is that the ore body is then bought up by an existing company and it sits on that ore body until it is within the economic fortunes—or advisable in terms of the economics of that company—to proceed to develop it. Meanwhile, mining communities develop more and more into ghost towns, right within a few miles of proven ore bodies. But because it does not happen to suit the financial interests of the company that is sitting on that ore body, or who controls it, no development takes place.

This is where I think the kind of thing is needed that the New Democratic Party advanced a year or two ago—my colleague from Fort William presented it in the estimates of mining—of a Crown corporation, not to exclude private enterprise in the field, but to complement the efforts of private enterprise, to make certain that we do have adequate discovery work, and furthermore there is consideration now that they should move into the development field. It is my observation as a layman in this field, that movement into the development field is even more important because, if a company is going to buy up a proven ore body and just sit on it until it suits their interests, it seems to me that there may be time for consideration of a law that if they are going to sit on that body and not develop it, that if there are others who are interested in developing it, it should be made available. This is almost a rough parallel to the kind of situation we have in the forest industry, where we gave great forest empires to companies and they have been sitting on them in some instances since 1921, with a significant proportion of their limits still untouched. The result is that other people who are willing to move into a forest industry, cannot because they have not got the resource.

The mining counterpart is that they are sitting on it. Now, the opposite side of the coin of the Minister's very bouncy optimism about developments here or there, are developments that are not taking place. For example, when I was last up at the Lakehead, I was talking to somebody who is pretty familiar with the mining developments in the northwest. He drew to my attention that you have got the Shebandowan nickel deposits west of the Lakehead. You have got Anaconda iron deposits 80 miles north of Geraldton. You have the Can-Fer iron deposits 35 miles north of Geraldton. The Minister and others have been talking about the possibility of this development. Why it is not taking place, I do not know, but here is Geraldton in serious economic conditions, with a proven ore body within easy reaching distance, for purposes of revitalizing the whole economic development of that area, including Geraldton.

I am told that a very few years ago there was a find of copper in the area between Marathon and Schreiber. For weeks there were screaming headlines, and I can just see the Minister—this is the kind of atmosphere in which he is really in his element—talking with great unbounded optimism about the future of this kind of development. We have seen no development since. What has happened? Were all those just phoney headlines, or is there a development? Who has got it, who is sitting on it? Why cannot we have development?

I understand that in the Pigeon River boundary area there is a Montreal group that has another proven copper ore body. In the northern part of Lake Nipigon just a few years ago, once again there were headlines with regard to a proven ore body.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I am all in favour of the necessary incentives for adequate discovery of new ore bodies. But I am apprehensive and disturbed about the tendency for these ore bodies to be snapped up by a company which is not interested in their development at the moment, but 25 years from now, 50 years from now, when it suits the economics of that particular concern, then they will proceed to its development. Meanwhile, what happens to the mining industry which the Minister thought was going to break through that illusive barrier of a billion dollars and has missed it? We could be past the billion dollars many times

over, if there had been development of these various bodies.

So I come back to the proposition that we have put forward—and I do not do it in any doctrinaire sense—the proposition that in terms of the welfare of the province, in terms of an adequate development of our resources, in order to provide a diversified economy, in order to provide jobs, in order to provide an opportunity for youth to stay in northern Ontario instead of crowding down into the south, we have got to have development of resources that we know are there, as well as the discovery of new ones. If private enterprise will not do it, if they are going to sit on that resource, whether it be forest or mineral, then it seems to me there is an obligation on the government to make it available to those who are willing to develop it. And if private enterprise will not do it, this is where your Crown corporation comes into the picture, not necessarily to do it exclusively by themselves, but as my colleague pointed out this afternoon, it is often done on a cooperative basis, in a joint arrangement, so that we get Canadian financial resources that can be acquired to raise the necessary moneys to do the job and not in effect have to hand it over to American interests, for a still larger proportion of the domination of the mining industry by American interests in order to expand our industrial development.

Now, I have given a speech instead of asking a question, but implicit in my speech there are a lot of questions. I am wondering if the Minister can bring himself to comment on whether he thinks they are accurate or not.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: A lot of your thinking runs in the same groove as my own. You mentioned Anaconda. Anaconda have some $12 million of theirs in that property up in northern Ontario. The vice-president was in to see me the other day and he said, "You think that we are stalling on this; it is costing us over $500,000 in interest on the money we have spent and we are moving heaven and earth to get a market for that stuff and we hope one of these days." Now, that is Anaconda. So they are not stalling on it.

Can-Fer belongs to Algoma Steel, as you know, and they were having a look at getting it into operation, and then this Carter report came out. The Carter report suggests a tax on raw ore in the ground. Well there was something like that in the Mesabi range two years ago or more. I watched the Mesabi range, Duluth, Superior and those towns die because that situation mentioned in the Carter report was in the American law and they could not operate those mines successfully. Now, if we do something like that up here, and okay what is in the Carter report, some of these mines are going to take a very dim view about doing anything in the Lakehead area and I am afraid of that. I hope that it works out differently than I see it today.

Now then, the copper mine down near Schreiber, which you mentioned—I do not remember a copper mine, but we did start a zinc mine last year which is operating, the Zenmac, as you know. The nickel mine west of Fort William, which belongs to International Nickel is coming along very well. In fact it looks better than it did two months ago, and that may be our next producer up there.

Those were four places you mentioned, I think, and some of the others are under study and it takes quite a long time to develop these properties.

One of those you mentioned, about being a big one, with a smelter and its ore and so on, I know nothing about. I had no part in it and I think it amazed me as much as it did anybody else to find out that this was a tremendous property, very valuable, and that there was going to be a smelter built on the shore at Port Arthur, and so on.

Mr. MacDonald: Like your diamonds in the north.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well I had—I do not know whether I have got it here—a piece cut out of the *Financial Post*, a headline, "Diamonds in the north", just the other day. They are finding some black diamonds, and I still maintain that there are diamonds up in that area. I wanted to bring that paper to show the member that I was not as foolish as I sounded at the time.

But that is a rundown on the properties you mentioned and I am one that would like to see these properties in operation and producing wealth for Ontario, but there is a matter of money and markets and all these things. As far as a Crown company handling them is concerned, I do not know where we would get the money to do it, or whether it would be a big improvement or not.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I do not know how far I really want to pursue this tonight. The Minister says we do not know where we would get the money. We know of the money we gather in what my colleague described as "the gambling casino downtown"; 18 per cent of every dollar goes into

the development of the mine. Raise the money and put 100 per cent into the development of the mine, or 100 per cent minus the overhead and you will not have such a great amount of wastage.

You see, Mr. Chairman, the Minister in his delightful way once again said he hopes the Carter commission works out so that it will not discourage these mining people. The mining people have had the cosiest set-up of any group in history. They have always had a cosy set-up. They have been the favourites of Liberal and Conservative governments. We have been handing them our resources down through the years.

Mr. Young: They mine the people, not the rocks.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly. Now, the Minister, if he really wants these resources developed on behalf of the people of the province of Ontario must not listen to the song and dance, the weeping and the wailings of the mining industry, because they are going to try to scare you by saying that they are not going to develop it. If they will not develop the only answer is your Crown corporation. If private enterprise will not do it, unless you in effect hand them the resource for nothing, give them exemptions—no corporation tax for three years, give them depletion allowances; they give virtually no royalty, give it to them for nothing—well, fine, let us keep the resource, let us set up a Crown corporation. After a while the same kind of thing will happen that happened in Saskatchewan with oil, after a while they will find out there is enough in it if they are just willing to play fair.

You know, I hear these eulogies about capitalism around here. Three or four hundred years ago, capitalism operated by going out to India. They would not go out and operate in India if they did not get 300 per cent every year, and what you had to do was to civilize capitalism, so that the human beings could survive in it. Capitalism 150 years ago used to work kids six and eight years of age and women in the mines. We had to civilize it. And one of the civilizing projects, I suggest to you, in the capitalistic approach to development of minerals is that minerals are not gifts to be given to a corporation to develop while the people who own them get virtually nothing.

Now, let us not have the song and dance either from that side of the House or from the Liberal side of the House that the Carter commission recommendations are going to scare mining off. If they are going to scare mining off, let them go off. You can hire the skills in the mining industry and use them in a Crown corporation, as they are doing in the province of Quebec. You will find they will go off for a while but they will be back because they want to keep their finger in the pie too. But to put it in the vernacular, do not be a sucker for all their little scare stories about "nothing will be done". That is my comment on the Carter commission which Donald Fleming and all the magnates of the mining industry are going around—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): And Macaulay.

Mr. MacDonald: Bob Macaulay, sure, he has become a spokesman, he is in the game now too. "It is going to cut down the profit." However, Mr. Chairman, let me move on to a third and more specific aspect of policy.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can give the House any indication as to what the total municipal assessment of mining properties is in the province of Ontario, and what the total municipal tax would be if they were paying municipal taxes in a normal fashion? I noticed the Minister's advisors are shaking their heads, but I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, you should have it. And if the Minister does not have it, as a matter of fact every municipality will have it, we know what the exemptions are in the city of Toronto with churches and all these other things—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I think The Department of Municipal Affairs would have it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, you see, this is the old buck passing again.

Mr. Sopha: Your Mr. Lee was on the committee, he ought to have it, he was on that infamous committee.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We do not have it in the department, I have never seen it.

Mr. MacDonald: There are a lot of things in this department that have not been seen, and it is a calculated lack of sight because you do not want to find out.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Now, wait a minute, why would we be interested in that?

Mr. MacDonald: Because we have been trying for years—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, The Department of Municipal Affairs is handling it for the government.

Mr. Sopha: Well, your Mr. Lee was on the committee, he was on the Clasky committee. Surely he would know it.

Mr. MacDonald: I will let my hon. friend get in afterwards if he wants to take over the mopping-up operation, but just let me pursue it.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that instead of keeping this all vague, and confused—which suits the purpose of the mining corporations—you get the figures out. Let us know exactly what is the assessment of the mining corporations in the province of Ontario and what would be the revenue that they would be paying if they were paying municipal taxes in the normal fashion. The reason why I would like to know it is this—on the eve of this election the government has made another handout. The rebates on the mining profits tax, which, last year, with the total taxes in the range of $15 million, last year were just under $6 million are now going to be just under $8 million. It is up approximately $2 million.

But what I would like to know, Mr. Chairman—and no ifs, ands or buts, is this: You are returning to the mining municipalities just under $8 million on the revised formula, but what would the mining municipalities be getting if the mining corporations were paying municipal taxes in the normal fashion? That should not be impossible to find out, though I concede the Minister may not have it immediately. But I put the question to him and if he has not got it now, I will give him fair warning that in about one week from now I am going to ask him before the orders of the day. What is the assessment of the mining corporations and what would be their normal municipal tax if they were to pay it?

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, may I add by way of comment on how best to handle this. The member for Sudbury suggested that they should pay it locally into the local municipalities. If we had regional government—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: What is so funny about that, that I made that statement? Shall we tell the city council of Sudbury that the Minister laughed?

Mr. MacDonald: I will tell you why—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, I would just like to know why it has not been done. Why did not the member get after it?

Mr. MacDonald: Why the Liberals did not do it when they were in power?

Mr. Sopha: I will stand by what is in *Hansard*, for eight years I have been talking about it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the reason why it would be grossly inequitable to have the mining tax go to the municipalities where the corporations happen to be, is that in the odd case some little municipality would look like an—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: A millionaire against the pauper.

Mr. MacDonald: Arabian potentate, it would have so much. If you had regional government so that the money would be distributed to all of the municipalities—

Mr. Sopha: Now the member is talking.

Mr. MacDonald: —within which the people happen to be living, then I think this would be an appropriate approach. We have not regional government and therefore, for better or for worse, I think we have to rely on this government to collect it, but I suggest that this government should collect the total municipal tax and return the total municipal tax, not collect merely a part of it. And I suggest you even chisel on the part before you hand it back. Now, if I am wrong—I will await the figures to find out what the total municipal tax would be on the mining corporations. I hope we can get it within a week or so from now if the Minister does not have it at the present time.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I find it incredible that the Minister—the moment my friend, you see, began to ask him this very germane and very penetrating question, the advisors, whom I did not invite here to the floor of the Legislature, begin to shake their heads, like Diefenbaker. I find this incredible, and I do not want to pursue them because one of the chief advisors was on the Clasky committee and what I now have to prove what I am suspecting and that was that the Clasky committee—well, there is a delightful way I can put it but I dare not put it that way—the Clasky committee did not know what it was doing. Or the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) could tell us, he said to the Clasky committee "Look, go away for three or four months and don't come back. When you do come back, throw them a herring like you throw something to eat to a trained seal in the zoo, because it is an election year and we want to

make a little increase in the mining revenue payments".

Another thing I am satisfied of is that the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) and my friend, the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers) were something less than virile and courageous gladiators in the deliberations of that committee. One would have thought—to put it in the kindest way, I say to the member for York South—that the first thing the Clasky committee would have done was to ascertain the total assessments of all the mining installations in the province, and then to calculate on the basis of an equalized assessment and equalized mill rate throughout the 59 mining municipalities what the amount of money would be that the mining companies would have to pay if they were assessed.

One would have thought that would have been the very genesis of their inquiry. But one of the chief members of that committee, to which, mark you, no Opposition member was invited to make any deliberation at all—and let me just say in parenthesis that the only contacts I ever got with the committee and as I said, *Hansard*, in eight years, will record my observations, eight years of them, every year, twice a year; they are to be found there, the remarks I have made about this sin of neglect committed by this government against people of dignity who live in these mining municipalities, the only contact I ever had with them was in demonstrating some impatience about the delay of that committee. I sat down and wrote a letter to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner).

Being a politician, although the letter was addressed to him, it was not really for him; you know the technique, I say to the member for Grey South, the letter was to the newspapers, the television stations, his name was the vehicle, he was the entree; I posted the letter and sent it to the local media, then I made some reflections about Inco's obligation, having created the population there, to dig the ore out of the ground, to pay their equitable share of municipal taxation. That was a statement of principle. Inco has not even quarrelled with that statement. But last Saturday I was inaccurately quoted in the Sudbury *Star* where it says that I said "Inco has chastised me." That is wrong; what I said at Creighton Mines was "Inco has not chastised me." They have not—just the opposite. Inco has never quarrelled with that proposition that they should pay municipal taxation. To their credit, no one from the company has ever called me up and criticized me or offered me any contrary arguments of any nature or kind against the statement of principle that they are morally obliged to pay their equitable share of the services.

That thought never occurred to the Clasky committee, that is for certain; that penetrating shaft of light never got through the doors to them. But perhaps they ought not to be blamed because maybe—and I suspect the whole deal was that the Prime Minister said that the idea in an election year is to throw them a herring—so Sudbury comes out with some $700,000 more—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): That is some herring!

Mr. Sopha: —which is about one third of what they should have gotten.

Mr. MacDonald: How much of a herring does the government get from Inco at election time?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Nonsense! You open your books and prove it; they are paying insurance to the Tory party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, can I have your protection against these subsidiary wrangles?

Mr. Chairman: Please proceed.

Mr. Sopha: It is not part of the main issue—

Mr. MacDonald: It is a very important part of the main issue.

Mr. Sopha: It is a third, as I was saying, $700,000 is about a third, and let us put on the record, the comfort and the support I got, because after the city council—and you will remember in the House; my friend, the member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) may remember, when the Prime Minister read the figures I leaned as far as I could get over the desk and I said to him, "It is not enough!" —and I had the comfort that the council of the city of Sudbury in a solemn, formal meeting—

Mr. MacDonald: Including the Tories on it.

Mr. Sopha: No, I have to relate what happened there. They passed a resolution directing the city clerk to write to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and express their own discontent about it. The four Tories voted against the resolution. Four of the Tories on the city council voted against it, so I have

some pretty respectable support in raising the issue here again.

Now, as I have said many times before, and the last comment to make about the Clasky committee—and this shows that the Minister of Lands and Forests and the hon. member for Nickel Belt did not know what they were doing. They went into this thing blind. In my view, had they acted responsibly in it, they would have said, "Out with all formula; out with the formula."

Mr. MacDonald: Their eyes were wide open; they knew what they were doing.

Mr. Sopha: "Out with it entirely." And, of course, the reason for the attraction of the formula in this is that it enables the Minister of Municipal Affairs to get more than his just deserts for this town of Timmins, which is the apple of his eye and the object of his primary dedication. The Minister of Municipal Affairs is going to look after his community first, and he is going to get a willing ally in the Minister of Lands and Forests, who is just next door to him; he is going to be his helpmate in that and similarly with Kirkland Lake. In respect of Kirkland Lake, of course, the formula in its original inception was called the McBain formula. That name is enshrined in it for the history books and McBain, of course, was the clerk treasurer of the township of Teck, so there you have the approach.

Now let me say, hastily, that I am not strictly against sharing the wealth with those other less fortunate communities, and I do not ever want to give the idea that I am parochial enough to say that Sudbury should hog it all; I do not mean that at all. But I do say, that the proper method of approach here ought to be—as I have said, and the member for York South has borrowed from me tonight—the institution of a system of regional government in the Sudbury basin.

Mr. MacDonald: I borrowed this from you?

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes—a system of regional government, whereby the assessments of the International Nickel Company and Falconbridge Nickel Mine are made available to all 16 municipalities in the basin. Then, if it is the desire of the government, as it should be, that special assistance be given to such mining municipalities as Timmins and Kirkland Lake, Red Lake, Cobalt, Atikokan—

Mr. MacDonald: Pickle Crow?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. And then the mining tax can properly be used for that. But the mining tax would then remain unencroached upon by Sudbury because the basin municipalities would no longer have any claim upon that fund as a cornucopia from which to draw the financial payments in lieu of municipal assessment. It could be shared according to the discretion of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) among the other 43 or 40 mining municipalities in the province.

Let me encapsulate it by saying this: In the Sudbury basin, of course, there is a growing body of respectable opinion that supports this, and from all quarters of business and political life in the basin, you now see emerging a coalescence of will and intention that this will be brought home to the government, whatever government it may be, and the approach to government will be upon that basis. We are an economic unit.

Let us unite in some form of regional government and let us integrate this industry, which gives us our sustenance and our wealth here, and let us recognize the principle that it pays its fair share for all the municipal services that we have to provide to the population. That is the direction in which we are going.

The Clasky committee did not help; it did not help that at all, and it does not show any sign that it was interested in it. This was a formulatic committee—maybe some of these people were descendants of Einstein or his admirers or something, that they were imbued with the formula; so they just juggled a few vulgar fractions around in it and the way they juggled them around allowed them to come out with $700,000 more for Sudbury.

It is interesting to note—I say to the member for York South—that the payment for Timmins doubled.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: On the vote, please.

Mr. Sopha: The payment for Timmins doubled.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): This year?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. It went from $200,000 to $400,000. So maybe there was a little juggling with the figure, and as soon as I have the time, I am going to figure out how much this formula gives *per capita* to the inhabitants of these municipalities; I have not had the time yet, but there it is.

We will continue to struggle and will hope that after the contest at the polls, there will be a new group taking a look at this problem.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: I want to add a little more to this debate in this respect. The government of Ontario is collecting the mining tax from the mines and is rebating part of it back to municipalities.

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: Under what vote does this come?

Mr. Chairman: Under vote 1301. I think the members have been speaking about—

Mr. Young: The main business of the—

Mr. White: I think not, Mr. Chairman. I think the debate is out of order and that these remarks should come under The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, with respect, the money is raised by this department and it is spent by The Department of Municipal Affairs. Another of our problems, Mr. Chairman, is that for years we have had difficulty catching this elusive topic between two or three departments which again, is just the way the Tories want it.

Mr. Young: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that a year ago we tried to raise this issue under The Department of Municipal Affairs, and we were told that it would come under mining. We are now at that place.

Mr. MacDonald: And because of this inefficient system, we will debate it on both.

Mr. Young: We raised this under these estimates last year and it was perfectly in order at that time.

Mr. Chairman: It would seem to me that the members are speaking about the mining municipalities and the matter of municipal taxation thereon, and it seems to me that it is all irrelevant to the whole area of mining. I believe that I do recall, however, that they were told that they could bring this matter up under The Department of Mines.

Mr. MacDonald: That settles the Whip.

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order; it is obvious to me, sir, that there is nothing in vote 1301 about grants to municipalities and yet there are sections under The Department of Municipal Affairs, more particularly vote 1405, that relate directly to grants to municipalities and I am perfectly sure, sir, that this debate is out of order on this vote.

Mr. MacDonald: On the point of order—on page 110 of the annual report of The Department of Mines, there is a section called The Mines Tax Act, and it points out that presumably we are raising 12 per cent from those mines whose profits are in excess of $5 million. I would like—if the Whip insists—I would like to pursue this even further, because Inco's net profits last year were $150 million.

Mr. White: That may be so, but not under this vote.

Mr. MacDonald: Twelve per cent of $145, is about $18 million and the total we got from the whole mining industry was $15 million.

Mr. White: You are talking about revenue. It is not under this vote. This is out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: What revenue?

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Revenue of Inco.

Mr. MacDonald: Twelve per cent of their net profit.

Mr. Kerr: We are dealing with expenditures—the vote is on expenditures, not revenue.

Mr. MacDonald: What are we talking about? The Mines Tax Act happens to be in the annual report of The Department of Mines.

Mr. White: We are on vote 1305, this is out of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: On that last point. Those profits of International Nickel are from all over the world, they are not Canadian.

Mr. MacDonald: I say to you that nobody knows the breakdown because we have never been able to get from the Minister what we get from Inco. This is another part of the hugger-mugger game. We never know.

Mr. White: You are out of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. It would seem to me that if the members in the Opposition parties agree that they could properly discuss the matter of mining municipal taxation in The Department of Municipal Affairs, it would be in order to defer it until then. Otherwise I do believe that they have had

an intimation in the past that they could discuss this matter under The Department of Mines. It says in the statement of the Minister, we are dealing with administrative services and financial administration.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, supposing I leave the matter of municipal taxes for the moment. I would point out to the hon. Minister that a business of any kind, operating in any other segment of the economy, has to pay its municipal taxes, but it also has to pay for its raw material.

Here we have a situation where, in the Sudbury basin, and the other areas where this company is operating, or other mining companies are operating, they get their raw material, in effect, free of charge from this province.

Mr. White: That is ridiculous.

Mr. Young: They pay a mining tax which is in lieu of municipal taxes and as far as the raw material is concerned—

Mr. White: Ask the member for—

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, they are handed back on a platter. This raw material is vested in the Crown, owned by the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: It costs money to get it up—

Mr. Young: If a private individual owned that, he would be charging International Nickel a hefty sum for use of that material. We do not do that, because we chose, in this economy, to divide the mining income in the form of dividends rather than forming the companies to purchase their raw material. We do not charge the people who use it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Do you know any place in the world where they do charge it?

Mr. White: Ask the member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) about that.

Mr. Young: This has been pointed out to this government, by this group, for years, and it is high time we began to realize something of the potential income that is there, under the ground, for the people of this province.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You might as well leave it there if you force the mine to stop operating through excessive taxes.

Mr. Young: What we could realize on a charge of this kind would pay for education costs.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You have got to get the minerals up above ground.

Mr. Young: Certainly you have to get it up above ground. You see, most companies pay for any raw material that goes into any manufacturing plant. Automobile plants, for example, have to buy steel.

They have to process it, they have to get it into their plants and they have to process and turn out the final material. But they pay for their raw materials.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, they do not.

Mr. Young: Here, in Ontario, the mining companies do not; and we have not been able to find out from this government, and it is high time we could, how much International Nickel pays for the nickel ore underground. Anything or nothing. All they pay evidently is a mining tax.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You do not understand mining. That stuff is worthless until you get it up and put it in a product that can be sold, and so on.

Mr. Young: All right, well then—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: What good is it to you in the ground?

Mr. Young: Why do we not give the rights to the mines then to International Nickel; to all the stuff underground—free? Why do we keep it vested in the people of Ontario? I would hope that one day a new government in this province will see to it that that company—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is what scares people away from you.

Mr. Young: —will pay for the raw material that they use and pay a fair price.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is what scares people away from your party.

Mr. Young: —or anyone else. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would simply point out to the Minister, in addition to the mining tax, we should be levying a price for the raw material which we own; and, in that way, cut down perhaps on the education burden, and the burden for highways and the other burdens, that the people of this province have to carry through their municipal taxes.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1301.

Mr. White: Even your leader cannot believe that.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, if the Whip would kindly try and follow this thing, he would not interrupt so rudely.

I think the motivation, so far as the Opposition is concerned here, Mr. Chairman, is to show, if we can, that this department, of this Minister, does not know what it is doing properly—or it is falling far short of the goal it should be doing.

Insofar as the Minister's statement with regard to letting iron ore go outside the country for processing, he stated that they were closer, maybe it was "getting closer" to making it mandatory they could not leave the country.

I think we should—the stuff, the process and material. Specifically, I would like to ask the Minister, what is the law insofar as the policy in this regard? He says he is getting closer to it. What does he mean, "getting closer" to it?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You are away over my head.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you are away over my head. I think that you occasionally show sparks of knowledge on this subject. I think you are like a farmer, you are outstanding in your field.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Could be. Could be.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): That is the best thing you have said tonight. The only thing.

Mr. Sargent: In this big subject of mining, there are such things known as exploratory licences. Considering the concessions disguised under this misnomer here—exploratory licences—these were recently granted by the Ontario Cabinet to certain private companies, the general public and, in particular, all prospectors whose living is dependent upon free opportunity to explore, discover and stake out such lands.

I would ask the following question of the Minister: during recent years the Canadian taxpayer has footed a bill of over $18 million for aero-magnetic surveys on a cost sharing basis between the—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I wonder if the member does not think that this should come under vote 1302, exploratory and geological branch?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Let us get one vote through anyway.

Mr. Chairman: Let us stick to vote 1301.

Mr. Sargent: All right.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1301 the Minister mentioned in his introductory remarks the research that was being done by the Ontario research corporation on a substitute for bentonite. I understand that that project has gone on for a period of three or more years.

Could the Minister report to us just what success they have had to date in finding a substitute to replace bentonite for pelletizing and also what moneys they are expending this year, for further research; what northern clays have been considered—or what deposits of northern clays have been considered as possible substitutes? You treated it under vote 1301.

Mr. Sargent: You need some help, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: This is going over a whole new field and that is what balls me up. Finish one item and then we will consider another.

The work to date is encouraging—$24,000 to be expended this year. We are getting a very comprehensive report, and this by the way, is for the member for Timiskaming, when he asked the question, and we did not get a chance to answer it—a very comprehensive report on "Clay Resources of Ontario" is completed and will be published very, very shortly.

I did mention bentonite in my original remarks and that is what we are speaking of now—it is a clay that is taking the place of what we thought might be better a few years ago. I think we will have greater success with it. Is that not right, Mr. Deputy? Yes—some encouragement—now we are not at the point yet where it is finalized and decided on.

Mr. Taylor: Are you talking about bentonite, or a substitute for bentonite?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, I am talking about bentonite. The substitute for bentonite—the most important item in this research, as I said, consists of an attempt to find, domestically, a suitable binder for iron ore pelletizing plants to replace bentonite—that is what we buy from the United States, you see, and we are trying to replace it with something of our own, found in Canada.

Mr. Taylor: Yes, what northern clays are being tested?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We have several. We cannot answer that right now but we can get the answer for you.

Mr. Taylor: In my remarks, I suggested that we have a great variety of northern clays and I recommended that. This is a very important substitute that we are seeking, because it represents terrific expenditures by Canadian industry to use these clays as a binder for pelletizing. It would seem to me that if it was at all possible to use any of our northern clays for this purpose, that they all be tested to determine their suitability.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes. We will get that for you. We are experimenting with various Canadian clays.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, my apologies to you on this. I would like to qualify to the Minister that there is a fantastic multi-million dollar industry for ports such as ours in the Georgian Bay which could be recreated if you had a policy in blocking the iron ore going outside the country for processing.

If we could say to these companies that are exporting this for processing, "You must process this in Canada", then we would set up brand new industries for the ports I am concerned about. I say most respectfully that you state you are getting closer to it, and I want to establish now that you do not have a firm policy insofar as teeth to make this thing work—if you have I would like you to tell us right now.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The answer to that—if you will remember it was brought up before. There is a law which we have had in the books since 1917 that requires an exemption to ship out of the country. Is that what you are referring to?

Mr. Sargent: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Are you suggesting that we make a law retroactive that has been in the books since 1917? That is what we have and I do not know what we could bring in that would make it any better than that.

Mr. Sargent: Why is it still being shipped out, then?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No market here for it, that is why.

Mr. Sargent: Let me say that this is a seller's market. You have the key—you have the prime product here and nothing can happen until they mine it. And you are allowing these companies to take it outside our economy to strengthen another economy because you have not the guts to stop it. You say that you have an exemption for that—I do not understand.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: What would we do with all our nickel if we did not allow it to be exported?

Mr. Sargent: I am not talking about that, I am talking about the raw material.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, I know, but nickel is raw material.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Nickel in its original state is raw material.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am not exactly stupid. We have this material here?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: You are shipping it outside the country for processing—some of it?

Mr. Chairman: I think I should point out to the member that these questions were all raised earlier in the estimates.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want to establish that he does not have a policy—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The Minister did answer identical questions earlier in the discussions.

Mr. Sargent: I say most respectfully to you that he is trying to cloud the issue; that he has a policy when he has not a policy. This thing is drifting. No one is calling the shots to protect the Canadian people, and if he can tell me what he is doing I will sit down.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I thought I had just explained it to you. There is no more explanation.

Mr. Sargent: You have told us exactly nothing, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, I said that there is a law since 1917 that requires an exemption to ship out of the country. Now I ask you—

Mr. Sargent: Will you qualify that? What does that mean? All right, here we are in 1967, 50 years later, using a law that was made in 1917. And our economy—everything is changed, and this government, this Minister, has not seen any motivation or—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Are you asking—are you suggesting—that we make a law retroactive that has been on the books since 1917?

In other words are you wanting us to make a law that will not allow us to ship out of the country at all? It is of no value to our people to have raw materials in Canada that cannot be of any use. We are trying at all times to make our raw materials profit Canadians and when possible produce all the end product in Canada.

Mr. Sargent: There are much better brains than mine on this, Mr. Chairman, but my colleague suggests that you apply the law.

An hon. member: I will go along with that.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: May I read this to you then? This is The Mining Act. I will give you the whole thing—RSO 1960, chapter 241, with amendments. Now is that enough?

An hon. member: What about the verse?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The verse? Well, no; 106 says this:

> All lands, claims, or mining rights leased, patented or otherwise disposed of under the Act, or a predecessor of this Act on or after the 12th day of April, 1917, are subject to the condition that all ores or minerals raised or removed therefrom, shall be treated and refined in Canada so as to yield refined metal or other products suitable for direct use in the arts, without further treatment in default whereof the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may declare the lease, patent, or other form of title of such lands, claims, or mining rights to be void, and the order-in-council so declaring shall be registered in the office of the local master of titles or registry office as the case may be, whereupon such lands, claims, or mining rights revert to and become vested in Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, freed and discharged of any interest or claim of any other person.

Any more?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, I think the—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is book, chapter and verse.

Mr. Sargent: That is good reading. All the Opposition is asking, Mr. Chairman, is that you apply the law and forbid any exports. That is all we are asking.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: What are we going to do with the material?

Mr. Sargent: Now that is a silly question, because the majority of your processing is done in Canada, but the 25 per cent or 30 per cent that is going out represents hundreds of millions of dollars and that is a question you should know the answer to yourself.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We would have to shut the plant down and put everybody out of work. Would you like that?

Mr. Sargent: Oh, this is ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That would be the ultimate.

Mr. Sopha: Let me ask the Minister whether he agrees with this principle. In 1917 the government decreed solemnly and formally in this Legislature that after that date all materials extracted from lands would be required to be processed and refined in Canada. That was a statement of principle by a government. Now what is wrong in the way the government dealt with the Algoma Central Railway last year? What is wrong with extending that principle to the point where the Legislature now says that on and after 1985—which is 18 years away—all minerals extracted from lands in Ontario must be refined in Canada, smelted and refined in Canada. That puts it as simply as it can possibly be put. What is wrong with the principle?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I cannot say definitely. I would say there is only this wrong with it: you would frighten every company out of Canada; they just would not come in here to produce. Can you imagine the capital expense there is in these plants, processes and so on? Are they going to come in here and spend $200 million for 18 years? Probably the total of the ore is not worth any more than that; that is the danger.

Mr. Sopha: Just a moment. I am talking about refining. Those cars that come across the Ambassador bridge at Detroit, through the tunnel and come across at Port Huron, all have chrome on them. Do you believe that? They all have chrome on them, and they have several hundred pounds of steel in them. Now do you seriously believe our American brethren are going to suddenly decree because we pass a law requiring the refining of our ores, that they will say, "We are not going to manufacture any more motor cars"? Do you seriously believe that?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, but they can go to other countries and get this ore, you know.

Mr. Sopha: Where?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: There are plenty of other places in the world they can get it.

Mr. Sopha: Get Nickel?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: Where?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Finland is over here now dealing with us, to show them how to get their nickel—

Mr. Sopha: You should see the look of consternation on the face of the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), when he knows that we produce 70 per cent—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I agree with you.

Mr. Sopha: —of the free world's nickel.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I have not disputed that.

Mr. Sopha: The only other major deposit in the world—in the free world—so far as I know, is in Cuba.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, all right, you are going to put laws on the books here that are going to force them to look in other parts of the world for what you have.

Mr. Sopha: Let them look.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You are going to find yourself in the final analysis out of business; that is what will happen.

Mr. Sopha: They will not.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh yes, they will.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister of Mines is the logical heir of Douglas Abbott who, back in 1945 when he was still in the Mackenzie King Cabinet, said, "Our natural role in the economic life of North America is to be producers of raw materials". I deny that proposition.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I do not agree with you. How much raw material are we shipping out? We are manufacturing to the zenith most of our ores here today.

Mr. Sopha: You are not serious?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Certainly we are.

Mr. Sopha: You are not serious, when we are cognizant of the fact that the vast bulk of nickel and copper we produce in this country goes south of the border to be manufactured into products.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh, I grant you, what we cannot handle ourselves. And then, where do we get our markets? They have them down there; they shut off our copper and other things. You are getting into a fine hornets' nest.

Mr. Sopha: Let me end it up. I am not going to extend this. I want a government of this province which has control of natural resources.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We have.

Mr. Sopha: I want the government to plan for the future so that this country, Canada, will be able to support a population of 50 to 75 million.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Now you are talking.

Mr. Sopha: That is what I want.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is what we are trying to do, too.

Mr. Sopha: And we cannot do it as long as we continue to take our national resources and give them away to others.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member for Sudbury please address his remarks through the chair and the hon. Minister as well.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, we do not do that; you know we are not doing that. We are a small country, are we not?

Mr. Sargent: No, we are 100 years old.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: And we are not exporting any ore that we can finalize here and we are making efforts every day to see that it is finalized here. If we brought out an edict tomorrow that no more ore was going to go out of Canada, do you think it would do us good or harm?

Mr. Sopha: It would do us good.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Now, look, you are not talking sensibly; you know far better than that.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, come off it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You cannot do this overnight.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, come off it, really! Are you so naïve that you believe that exporting concentrates in whiskey barrels to Norway would not deprive us of jobs that might be created here?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh, I am not talking about that.

Mr. Sopha: That is what I am talking about.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: If you had one of your Canadian companies with millions of dollars invested in a plant in Norway, would you shut them down?

Mr. Sopha: Eventually, yes.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: All right.

Mr. Sopha: Eventually.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Now you are talking about eventually. We have had very serious talks about these things, but we figure it is to Canada's advantage to keep that plant going; that is Canadian money invested in Norway. If you shut it down there you are asking them to do the same thing if we shut them down here. There is some reciprocity in these things, you know.

Mr. Sopha: I am asking you to accept the principle that the first obligation of government is to provide the climate that creates jobs for our own people.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I agree, I am not disputing that.

Mr. Sopha: You see, that is the principle I enunciate.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am not disputing that at all.

Mr. Sopha: That plant in Norway—they have probably written that off by now five or six times; they have depreciated that plant. They would not lose a dime, probably, if in 10 or 15 years we required them to terminate the operation.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, there was a lot of money put in there again this year.

Mr. Sopha: There is another thing I would like to say and I say rhetorically, do you not see that our American cousins have used up their resources? The Mesabi range is depleted, much of their base metals have been depleted, to satisfy the wants of 200 million people. And now that they have used up theirs, of course they look northward and across that invisible line, and they look covetously at ours. They want ours, do you not see that?

They come here and they are delighted that we are content to continue to be hewers of wood and drawers of water and to assist them. Do you remember the history of the development of Steep Rock? You ought to; you come from there. This government put millions of dollars into the dock and the railway to assist Cyrus Eaton to cart the iron ore away from Canada.

I went to the Minister's own constituency and I said, as I said here, that we ought to have a steel mill at the Lakehead. Two newspapers up there put that on the front page of each of them, that I said it. And nowhere in the editorial columns did they say a visiting nut came to town. I said that in the Minister's constituency.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, you said that I should be down talking to Cyrus Eaton to get a steel mill on the shore at Port Arthur.

Mr. Sopha: I did not say Port Arthur.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: And the next night you had a meeting in Nipigon and you had 23 people there.

Mr. Sopha: That is not so. That is simply not so.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Now you are talking about nickel not being outside of Canada. Nickel is found in Australia, Venezuela, Caledonia and the United States; they all have nickel. If we upset the big valuable complex we have here and say, "no, you cannot have any more of our nickel", look out, that is all I can say.

Mr. Sopha: They may have nickel, but we produce 70 per cent of the free world's nickel.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I agree.

Mr. Chairman: Could we get back to vote 1301, please?

Mr. Sopha: What is wrong with this debate?

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, just a further word in this respect. The reason these corporations are in Canada is because the ore bodies are here.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. Young: There is depletion in other parts of the world. We have the assets. But I think the one thing the Minister has to recognize is that this world and its wealth is expanding constantly. Our gross national product is going up here in Canada, it is going up in Norway, it is going up in the United States. Year by year our people are demanding more goods of all kinds and

demanding more chrome; they will demand more things made out of nickel.

If we could set a deadline, 1980 or 1985, whatever the deadline is, by that time expansion will have taken place in the nickel processing plants either in Norway or in Canada or in the United States. Where is that expansion going to take place? This is the question that the Minister must ask himself. Is that expansion to take place here or not?

If we continue the present process of allowing our nickel ore and other minerals to be exported, the fabrication expansion is going to take place south of the border, in Norway, in other places. If we can set a realistic deadline and say that gradually over these years we will demand that our minerals be fabricated here within our own nation, then that expansion will be phased by these corporations so that it takes place here.

And I think this is the fundamental truth, that this government has to face. This is the fundamental truth that I think the federal government has to face even more than the government of this province.

And so I think these fundamentals in the economic life and expansion of our nation and of our world, and the increased gross national product of all the nations, have to be taken into account. And if we are going to plan for the expansion of the fabricating plants within our own nation, then we had better have the word passed on to Ottawa, as well as to this government.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I agree. But do not forget, if you look back over the past 10 years and compare the growth from then until today and see what is happening—well, do not do anything to stop it, because it is going to be the greatest thing Canada has in the future.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: Very briefly on this, Mr. Chairman. The 1917 law which was designed to protect the citizens of Ontario was probably passed by the Liberal government then and this was set up to protect the people. I would suggest to the Minister, that the users or processors of this ore for the end product should be told that the policy of this government is such and such, to make the law stand up.

If The Department of Economics and Development went down to them and negotiated —not give them an ultimatum but say, "Here is our plan; we would suggest to you that you do your processing in Canada, and this is the wish of our government"—then we would have the happy situation where all phases were happy, and our economy would become millions and millions of dollars richer because of the fact that we were processing our own raw products.

That is the only point I will leave with you, that in the end I want to suggest to you that your policy is good if you are activating the law as it is written, but now you are leaving it up in the air and no one knows where you stand.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, concerning the financial assistance to individuals going through for mining engineering, in viewing the public accounts I see no place where the department has assisted individuals in specializing in mining engineering. Does the Minister not intend to give some type of help to encourage individuals studying mining engineering in our universities?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, we have been working very closely with The Department of Education. Of course, that is their field. We are getting quite a few from them but not nearly as many as we would like to have. We also have the Haileybury school of mines and other institutions of learning, as you know, but The Department of Education has been a great help to us in the last two or three years, although we are still short many engineers.

They are being trained on the job in the mines themselves, and if they look as though they are going to be a success they will send them to university and pay the tuition themselves.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in looking into the public accounts I see nowhere that there has been assistance given to anyone to obtain an education in mining engineering by way of scholarship or financial assistance.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: All these things are done by The Department of Education; they are offering scholarships and so on.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister attempted to recruit mining engineers from other jurisdictions?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We have several in our own department and the mines are advertising in other countries. They have men in

other countries and are going to bring them here and we have been very fortunate in getting some of those people in our department.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1301.

Mr. Sopha: The select committee on mining on page 12 of its report took note of the fact that the mining engineers graduating from Canadian universities remained in the low thirties for several years, though it is expected to rise to 36 in 1966 and then drop to 24 in 1967. The decline in registration was effective in the decision to close the teaching facilities in mining engineering at the University of Toronto. This decision leaves Queen's University, Kingston, as the only university granting a degree in mining engineering in Ontario. Among the committee's recommendations are, and I quote:

1. That the problem of the supply of engineers for the mining industry continued to receive close attention by the Minister of Mines, the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis) and the mining industry.

2. That the government cooperate with Queen's University in their objective to build a prestige undergraduate course in mining engineering.

3. That the government cooperate with universities in the development operation of continuing education courses for university graduates for those at lower educational levels.

4. That universities be encouraged to develop inter-disciplinary postgraduate training to prepare graduates from any university course for employment in the mining industry.

Now, may I ask what has been done in connection with those four recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We have activated them all.

Mr. Sopha: In other words, we are A-1 go!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: In fact, this is one of my pets. Queen's University will have a new $2 million mining building, grants by industry and The Department of Education.

They will be in a position, I hope, to turn out a lot of mining engineers and we are constantly talking to the universities and The Department of Education about men we need, and we are getting some of them.

Mr. Sopha: How many will it graduate, say, in 1970?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh, oh, you will have to wait a minute.

Mr. Sopha: Is there going to be any improvement over—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh, yes.

Mr. Sopha: —this 24 that will graduate this year? My understanding is that the International Nickel Company alone could take the whole crop from the whole of Canada, each year.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right. Some of their men are in the university of Toronto, I think, and they are paying them themselves. You know Johnny McCready, of course; he is one of the boys they put through university. Well, they are doing the same thing this year. I cannot tell you the number.

Mr. Sopha: Unless there is someone else who wants to comment on that, can you tell us in respect generally to the recommendations of the select committee on mining—I would not ask the Minister to say anything about the mining revenue payments because we have dealt with that extensively.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I was going to do that on our—what is that vote? I had it here yesterday and I did not get on. We had the select committee on mining and I have all the information.

Mr. Sopha: What vote? Certainly not under geological mines inspection laboratories.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: It is over in my main office, but I had it here last night and I could not get on with it, and it has the answer to all those things in The Mining Act which you are going to ask.

Mr. Sopha: The select committee report?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right. It is part of our legislation and I have it all there for you and if I can get it on tomorrow I can give you all the answers to it.

Mr. Sopha: About the prospector and—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: Then we would be particularly interested in this—where is he going?

An hon. member: He is right here.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You have me going round in circles here; I have to have everything.

Mr. Sopha: Well, it is our practice in carrying out the role of Opposition to straighten you out.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I have the questions and answers here for you. What is the first one?

Mr. Sopha: The first one is "prospectors" and there were six recommendations.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We do not have that here; that is on legislation.

Mr. Sopha: Are you talking about Bill 87?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: My note in the front reads:

> These amendment fit into three general categories. Some of the proposed changes are an effort to implement recommendations contained in the report of the select committee on mining. Certain of the sections deal with such matters as the grouping of claims for work and the acceptance of certain types of work for credits. These have been asked for by industry. The remaining changes are of a housekeeping nature.

Now this is it here. If you want to go on with this now—

Mr. Sopha: I read Bill 87, and it does not say anything about conducting classes for prospectors, which is the second recommendation of the select committee—that a class for prospectors be conducted annually in the home area of each resident geologist. Are you doing that?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is on vote 1302, the geological branch, which is coming up next to this one.

Mr. Sopha: I suppose the ones on the quality of implant air and the environmental all come under mines' inspection, do they?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: Fine, I will leave that. There is just one other thing that I want to quietly raise with the Minister. During his absence last night when I was talking to the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), I was telling him something about the participation of the officials of the Minister of Mines in a very explosive situation in Sudbury, and I am speaking very responsibly.

And as this involves the main office and the administration of his department and his responsibility for his people in Sudbury, he must remain responsible for them.

In the early stages of the negotiations, the International Nickel Company made an offer to the union and it was rejected out of hand, and from then on the atmosphere became much more volatile in that community. As you know, it came to the point where there was a shutdown at the Levack Mine which spread over the whole basin and every one of the 14 installations of the International Nickel Company was shut down.

The Minister of Labour, now the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), was striving mightily in that myriad to try to get some reason and get an agreement, and he deserves every credit and I am the first one to lay the credit at the door of the then Minister of Labour for what he was doing. And I want to say to this Minister: that electrically-charged atmosphere was not helped by the intervention of his Mr. Hoffman, the chief engineer of mines.

I have no doubt in my mind at all that Inco said to Hoffman, "Come on out to Levack and have a look underground", which he did. And I have no doubt that they said to him, "Write us a letter about what you found", and Hoffman obliged; he wrote them the letter, about the cut air hoses and various other departures from normal safety standards. And then the next thing we knew, Hoffman's letter is published in a full-page advertisement in the local newspaper. There it is, signed by H. M. Hoffman, chief engineer of mines. And the implication in that letter is sabotage.

Now, it is small wonder at about that time that the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), acting very responsibly, moved 200 policemen in there on a Sunday and, let the Lord be praised, we were very fortunate to escape serious incidents in that area.

I say this to the Minister of Mines—that it certainly struck me as being very anomalous in those circumstances. Here we have the Minister of Labour and the Attorney General, both trying to restore an atmosphere of order, common sense and reason, and you have an official of The Department of Mines adding fuel to the fire—that is exactly what he did by releasing that letter, and if he did not know the company would publish the letter in the paper, he was naïve.

Not only did they publish it in a full-page advertisement, but they sent the letter to every employee, with a letter from the general manager, enclosing Hoffman's letter. Take a look at this letter, take a look at it. That letter almost goes to the point of saying that what has gone on at Levack Mine is an

attempt by the workers to sabotage the operations of the company.

It is no place, I say to the Minister, it is certainly no place for an official to be in. It would have been better if Hoffman had left town in those circumstances. I was down at the provincial police station when the 200 arrived under the command of a very capable officer.

He said that in no event should anyone in authority do anything to aggravate the situation, or to unnecessarily apply the law, or start to prosecute anyone because the situation would have blown up like a tinder box. Through the good offices of those provincial, highly-trained and skilled police officers, under very capable command we fortunately got through it.

But I just say to the Minister, in the future no official of his department is to be at the beck and call of one of the protagonists. Because here was the reply of the union; they read that letter in the paper and immediately they delved into their files and said, "How many times did we write to the engineer of mines pointing out safety hazards, and he never came down to see them at our behest", to write us a letter about them. It was nothing more than a naked taking of sides by an official of this department.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, on vote 1301, there is one question I would like to address, through you, to the Minister. I am a bit confused about this; it is information I am looking for.

With the situation at Metal Mines Limited at Gordon Lake, it is quite close to the Manitoba border and I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether or not that is the property where we do not have an access road into the mine?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is in Manitoba, right on the boundary.

Mr. Freeman: It is in Ontario, of course, but it is quite close to the Manitoba border. Is there any plan on the part of the department involved to establish an access road in there?

I think we discussed this a couple of years ago, with regard to the Indian population in that area, and suggested that, with the approximately 4,000 Indian people who are in there, this might possibly be thought of as a good winter project, or a project some time throughout the year, for the employment of those people, or a number of those people.

Has any thought been given to the development of that area by way of further access roads?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I should have the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) answer this, I think he was the one who got it through. But, anyway, the reason that road was left so long is that the mine was shipping its ore to Manitoba and then it was being shipped down through Ontario.

It was cheaper for them to ship it into Manitoba, and ship it from there, than it was to pay their share of that road. That is why it was not built before.

Since there is a new member in Kenora, I am given to understand that he has impressed the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) with the importance of that road and it is now going to be built by The Department of Highways from the mine into Ontario.

Mr. Freeman: I thank the Minister, Mr. Chairman, for the information. I was a bit concerned about the product being shipped out from the mine, but I was considerably concerned about the fact that it was most difficult for our Ontario suppliers to get supplies into the mine.

While the resource existed in this province of Ontario, all of the values that generated from that area were going into the province of Manitoba.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): The supplies were coming in from Manitoba.

Vote 1301 agreed to.

On vote 1302:

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the Minister: The Keevil mining group and the Gold Ray Consolidated Morrison-Argor group, are they still holding exploratory licences?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Could I have that question again, please?

Mr. Sargent: Yes. Are the Keevil mining group and the Gold Ray Consolidated, Morrison-Argor group still holding the exploratory licences in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, they are.

Mr. Sargent: On what basis are they awarded these three separate licences? Each one, I understand, covers an area of 100 square miles.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We will give the member the answer to that in just a minute.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, these exploratory licences were granted in 1964 and, at the time they were granted, it was on a three and a half month basis.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Wait a minute now, we will get the member the information. I think it is a three year basis, not three months. Just a minute and we will give the member the information. This was in my talk today, if I may reread it.

The James Bay lowlands provide the setting for another potentially very important development for which an exploratory licence, covering 64,000 acres has been granted to Imeprial Oil Limited, Consolidated Morrison Exploration Limited, Argor Explorations Limited, and Gold-Ray Mines Limited. The target here is columbium which, because of its heat resistant properties and strength, is in considerable demand as a space-age alloy metal. To the end of last year, the group of companies had invested $695,000 in exploration work and they plan a further expenditure of a like amount.

Does that answer the question?

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. I think that these surveys were really the start of this development, which was underwritten by public funds. The public paid the whole shot for this and no one has the authority to award them to private interests.

Mr. Chairman: Have you finished your question?

Mr. Sargent: I am just starting.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I think this would be on vote 1302.

Mr. Sargent: I realize that the minds can only absorb what the seat can endure, but this is a very important aspect of the fantastic use of the public wealth for a few friends of the government.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh, really.

Mr. Sargent: You are laughing now, but will you laugh tomorrow?

During recent years the Canadian taxpayer, as I said before, has footed a bill of some $18 million for aeromagnetic surveys on a cost sharing basis with the federal government—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. Sargent: —and the provinces. Why should these interesting anal—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Anomalies.

Mr. Sargent: I cannot say it yet, but they are mighty good outcroppings anyway.

Why should they be the preserve, and further benefit, of private interests, creating a monopoly on the stripping of the individual natural rights of Crown lands?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Could I answer that in this way? An exploration permit can be obtained by anyone.

Mr. Sargent: I do not want any answer yet. I want to tell you while it is in my mind.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh, all right.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): That will not take long.

Mr. Sargent: I will tell you what is in both minds and it will not take any longer.

The Ontario public is also about to foot another bill to send government geologists into the Pre-Cambrian area. Now what use will their maps be and findings be to the public? They will be, however, of much value to the companies bent on private gain under special licence. Must we pay for our own explorations by subsidizing private companies with the free survey of Crown lands—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Somebody has written this for him.

Mr. Sargent: —lands from which the public owners have been prohibited use? Yes, somebody has written this, a very knowledgeable person.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am trying to follow it.

Mr. Sargent: Try and follow it, please.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Who was the author of this essay?

Mr. Sargent: Piecemeal application of this section of The Ontario Mining Act has been juggled, in what appears to be an attempt to justify this reprehensible action.

Now from section 205 (1), a three year exploratory licence may be granted, and it quotes: "where terrain, due to paucity of rock outcroppings or for any other reason, cannot be prospected or explored".

We read that most of the area being granted is covered by swamp and overburden. Why? There are many known outcroppings and the detailed, public-financed aeromagnetic maps show that this porous is close to

the surface. Besides the modern prospector carries his own geophysical equipment. And quotes:

> For any other reason—one has been stated—certainly inaccessibility could not be proven here.
>
> The Cochrane-Moosonee line of our northern Ontario Northland Railway runs through the heart of our James Bay anomaly, the outcropping. But the network of the rivers interlace the area, which is publicized as an interesting tourist area by the province.

Now in any case—

> The time for licences to explore is past. Our aeromagnetic surveys have already confirmed the presence of vast outcroppings. Free staking, the income from licences, registrations, sale of maps, and so on, will ten times exceed the fees concessions would be required to pay for the same area, over the same period of time.
>
> From section 42 of section one of The Mining Act, invoked on behalf of the companies involved—thus excluding the public from such lands, while protecting them for private interests until an order-in-council could be shoved through, giving the official support of the Cabinet to the monopoly applied for – we learn that Crown lands need be withdrawn from prospecting and staking out and from sale or leases.

In the related section 44, it is stated that:

> Mining rights so withdrawn until reopened by order-in-council shall remain withdrawn and shall not be prospected, staked out, occupied or worked except by or on behalf of the Crown.

Now in the case of the said exploratory licences, the concessions have been dated for the convenience of the companies concerned. At this very moment, the public lands are being held completely tax free until when—how long are they tax free?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Do you want me to answer what you have just read?

Mr. Sargent: Okay, I will let you.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Do you know if you want to come over to our department, you are perfectly at liberty to see all those things. You are perfectly at liberty to pick out the property you want. All you have to do is be sure you have a licence and, pay the dues that anybody else would.

It is as free to you as it is to anybody. The geological maps that we have would show that all that area can be bought by anyone, and that an exploration permit can be obtained by anyone with a miner's licence.

My friend, you are as welcome as the flowers in May. You could have got it, if you had come over to our office and applied for it, the same as those men you are speaking of did. There is still lots of area up there, if you are interested, come on over.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, developing this point further, these public lands are being held completely tax free at the pleasure of the private companies—and they were granted for three and a half months in 1964.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is not so. Let me make that quite clear.

Mr. Sargent: All right. I doubt that. You told us so many things that you did not know anything about tonight, that I think this is true.

Mr. Oliver: This situation is far worse than I ever dreamed it was.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Me too. I did not know about it.

Mr. Sargent: We will never know until you tell us how bad it is.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Come on over and we will—

Mr. Sargent: You make that statement. You know it will never happen because you are dealing with the big boys. You are almost on—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, no. That is wrong. That is what I am trying to diffuse from your mind. That is not so.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, when you have 100 square miles, belonging to the people, given tax free for renewals, and renewals and nothing ever happening, how long are you going to hold these deals—to infinity? Nobody seems to be running the show over there.

You are spending a million dollars this year on development roads.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: This mineral you are talking about, columbium, that is 90 to 100 feet below the surface. You cannot see any rock.

Mr. Sargent: How do you know?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I know, I have seen the maps.

Mr. Sargent: Somebody told you.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I have seen the maps. I have seen the diamond drill core.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think that this concession granting should be revoked at once by order-in-council to rectify the gross errors committed by the Cabinet in the handling of our public property.

When our elected representatives fail us in this regard, we must stand up and speak out, because here we have seen that the Minister does not even know, insofar as the terms of the agreement, whether they are paying taxes or what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Now just a minute, I will give it to you as soon as you sit down.

Mr. Sargent: All right, sir.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I read it in my original submission: Another very interesting new development, that might well prove to be of great economic significance, is taking place in the northwestern corner of the province. This is what you are reading about.

There, exploratory rights on 986,560 acres were granted only last week to the Aquatane Company. Now, the rent is $2,500 per year and they have to spend $25,000 per year on exploration. The report comes to us and the deposit must be put down too—$25,000 deposit is in the department before they start.

Now you say they are given it for nothing. This fellow who wrote you the letter might not have been fortunate enough to get it—and he is giving you what he thinks happened—but if you wish to see it, come on over to our office and see it.

Mr. Oliver: You said anybody could see it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Anybody, yes. Sure. We do not care, we would like to have you too, sir. We are always pleased to have you

Mr. Sargent: I thank the Minister for his information but it would seem to me as a novice, I am not knowledgeable about the business—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I know, but I am not ridiculing your talk—remember that. I am pleased that people are interested to the extent you are, to ask these things, because, goodness knows, there are enough of them happen. We are glad to see them cleaned up and keep our skirts clean and all I can do is thank you for the information you have given us.

Mr. L. Bernier (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, under what vote does the mining recording offices come, or has it gone past already?

Mr. Chairman: Mining recording. Does the Minister have a comment on which of his—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Vote 1306.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1306—mining lands branch.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want to say this in summary. It would seem to me, not being knowledgeable about the business, that insofar as the development of these great wealths, the only people who have access—who have the moneys—to develop that wealth are the wealthy firms. Until you develop a policy of incentive to the small prospector, the wealth is going to continue to go to the bigger firms, and I see progressively that our wealth is channelling to the people who can develop it and you have no incentive policy for the small prospector. It is time you set up a programme in which the small people in this province can take part.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Where you are referring to, nobody can get up there on foot. I mean it is—

Mr. Sargent: Well, it is your job to get them there.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: These people fly up there and it is a very, very isolated part of the province, and we would like to see something done there. We have three new outfits going in, and as I suggested in my opening talk there is nothing to prevent a small prospector from staking Crown lands any place in the province. He might stake them on ten feet of overburden and then there is not much chance for him to get a sale, because he cannot do any work on it. But he can stake them any place where the rock is exposed—he is not stopped at all if he has no money, as long as he can get a licence.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, if you are sincere in the distribution of wealth for the small prospector—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am.

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not set up a fund, say, of $1 million a year which they can draw on against their exploration—give them a chance to acquire some of this wealth instead of it going to the big corporations.

Vote 1302 agreed to.

On vote 1303:

Mr. Young: On vote 1303, Mr. Chairman, we had quite a discussion last night on the situation in Sudbury. We seem to be running to Sudbury, perhaps because that is the biggest mining operation we have, but at that time we were asking the Minister of Health certain questions about the situation in the Sudbury complex with respect to carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide.

The Minister has already given us some answers in the House about this but at that time the Minister of Health said he cooperated with the Minister of Mines in inspection service and giving advice, but that the Minister of Mines was responsible and that he was the person from whom we should get the answers.

I have raised this at various times within the House and was assured that something was happening. In the last issue of *The Searcher*—the local 6500 united steel workers of America for March, 1967—we have the verdict of all the action they have undertaken in this respect, and I would like the Minister's comment on it because it does seem to indicate that less is happening than they had hoped. They call this, and I quote part of it:

> An exercise in futility. These are the words that best describe the efforts and time spent in trying to convince Inco and/or our provincial government—at times they seem to be one and the same entity—

and this was backed up to some extent by the hon. member for Sudbury tonight,

> —that they ought to take action to reduce the amount of gas and dust concentrations in and about the mining operations in the Sudbury area. The steel workers have had many meetings with Inco management complaining about these bad conditions but the company's position has always been the same—the concentrates of gases has always been within acceptable levels. But they do not say whose level of acceptance they refer to—obviously their own.
>
> In addition, the steel workers have met with representatives of the provincial government on three different occasions in an effort to get them to do something constructive to relieve the situation. Each time the union representatives were well received; the government officials listened patiently for hours on end while mountains of data relating to the intolerable conditions imposed on Inco employees were shown to them. After each meeting the results were the same—a big, fat nothing. Yet all that is requested is that the concentrations of gases not be allowed to remain too high. Action is required to curtail the production of the gases so that they will cease to be the continuing hazard they have been—a hazard to the well being and health of the community in addition to a drain on the citizens' pocketbooks—

and so the article goes on in this vein. Again I would like to ask the Minister about the standards mentioned here by the company and about the standards that I would hope the Minister or this government will set—The Department of Health has that responsibility—and about progress which may have been made within the last few weeks since this article appeared in connection with the gases in and about the plants at Sudbury. I wonder if the Minister has any comment?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I have done nothing but comment on that in the last 10 days and hold conferences, and so on. We are concerned a great deal about it—you know that there are some 18,000 or 19,000 men there, and if there is anything we do not want to see it is anybody affected with gas, where their lungs would be damaged and so on.

I have here tonight my safety engineers in charge of that to hear what is going on. My Deputy and I, last week, spent five hours, I think, with the group—with the Attorney General and other Crown officials—on these different things about safety and we certainly are not neglecting safety in any way. To our knowledge there has never been a compensation accident due to SO_2 gas—that is sulphuric acid, as you know. And you are not discussing a hazard; comfort is what we are speaking about, I think, in that article.

We are very, very delighted that there are no SO_2 gas indications. Mind you, there is some gas. We all take a little bit but there is a limit above which you cannot go and we watch that very religiously, and all other safety features, and you know yourself that the unions up there have some very able safety men. Our men try to work with them and with a complex that size we do not fool, because we do not want to see anybody, regardless of who it is, gassed so that their lungs are hurt permanently or anything of that kind.

We are very fortunate in having the assistance of top men in The Department of Health as our advisors. When the union complains about these things, not only do we send our men up but we get some of the top advisors in The Department of Health to go along as

well and we hope that the situation will not get out of hand. Mind you, we will never get to the point where the union and ourselves and management will sit down together and put their arms around each other and say "that is it, we are all set now." Because these things come up from time to time and the union at International Nickel, to my way of thinking, has some very valuable men as well who are constantly watching for things that are detrimental to health.

What is that little dark fellow's name, do you know?

Mr. Sargent: Sammy Davis.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, no. Your mind is in the wrong channel. He is a chemist—a very clever little fellow, and he watches it very closely and I have talked with him quite often, but I assure you that we are not letting it go. We are as much alarmed about it as the union is.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, some time ago when we were discussing this in the House, I mentioned Cominco in British Columbia, and I understand that they have pretty well licked this whole problem in their plant. The Minister said at that time that he had not heard of this, but would look into it. I wonder if he has any information about what has happened at Cominco, because they certainly have cleaned this situation up pretty well.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: My Deputy tells me that investigations are still going on. We are working together on it.

Mr. Young: I wonder if somebody would fly out there and have a look at it to see what they have done, because it is not that long a job, after all.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, just to finish this off, that this delay is inexcusable. It has been going on there for years and years. The situation has been cleaned up some, we know, and the death of vegetation is not as bad as it used to be, but for men to have to work under the conditions these men do, which the Minister has admitted he knows about, is inexcusable. Certainly a company which is making the kind of profit that company is making—$118 million last year and $143 million the year before—has funds that can be used in a hurry to clean up the situation.

If Cominco has done it, then the equipment must be known, it must be available; and this company should be really squeezed by this government to get on with the job and clean up the situation. Evidently the men who are working there are becoming just a bit fed up and a bit desperate about the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am told that they have just about the best safety record in the world. Now that is a very broad statement, you can check that, but that is what I am given to understand.

"It is twice as safe to work on the job as it is at home." That is a significant statement. They have lost twice the number of men off the job as they have lost on it. That is the record of Inco.

Mind you, I am not saying there is nothing wrong underground. There are times when there is gas. The last casualty I discussed with them concerned a shaft underground. On one side of the shaft there was only four inches of freeway; the other side had three or four feet. This fellow walking down the track heard a train coming and instead of taking the side with four feet of clearance, he took the four inch side and was killed.

Now those are things that can happen, but their record has been exceptionally good. The only difference is that they have a very active group in safety who are inclined to do everything they can for the men because they are fellow workers. Anything they bring to me has a look of danger. I am very glad to hear about it and do what I can to correct it.

Mr. Sargent: To check mild market fluctuation in a mining stock, the Quebec securities commission requires companies to maintain a daily log of their drill cores. Is this done in mines throughout Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That comes under The Attorney General's Department, that is security.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about a daily log of drill cores in the mines; I am talking of mining. Do you have a daily log of the drill cores in the mines?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The mining companies get it, but not us. It is no business of ours what they are striking until their report is presented to us.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about mine inspection.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We have nothing to do with that. They are the mining companies' cores and we have nothing to do with the daily logs.

Mr. Sargent: You certainly should have something to do with it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Why?

Mr. Sargent: We are talking about what comes out of the ground.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Our duty is inspection for safety only. Now that ore you are speaking of comes out of the ground and goes through the usual process. There are inspectors for that and so on, but the daily logs are not our job.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, with all respect you should be concerned with the fact that the mines are taking a daily test of the drill cores just after these fluctuations in the market.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Not us, we have nothing to do with the market at all.

Mr. Sargent: You have to deal with what comes out of the ground, that is mining! I think that the Quebec government insists on a daily check of the drill cores of what is being mined. You should know what is being mined up there.

Mr. Chairman: Is this under vote 1303?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, mine inspection! It is not done in Ontario and you had better pull up your socks.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Do you not think that the mines are honest enough? We know where all the cores go.

Mr. Sargent: You know what Windfall mining did.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is an example of somebody perhaps purposely doing wrong, I do not know. We cannot attend to those things; that is the securities commission again. I think what you are talking about is the same thing; it is not for us, for this department.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1303 carry?

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I would say first that it may not seem that the Opposition is giving the hon. Minister a hard time tonight, but it surely seems to me we have been going through the chairmen of the committee in a hurry. We have had four already, but they have all been very amicable.

Mr. Chairman, I have the 1965 review of The Ontario Department of Mines. I take it that this is the latest report there is—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: There is a later one here, 1966. Have you got one of those?

Mr. Gisborn: No, I have not seen it, but anyway I will have a look at it. I would think that it might reflect what I found in this one in a brief perusal.

On the first page is, of course, the foreword of the Minister. The first sentence says this:

> This review of activities for 1965 cannot fail to reflect the surging tide of progress in Ontario's mining industry.

I would quote, as well, the last sentence of the third paragraph:

> In this province mining has always been in the forefront of exploration and development. Many of northern Ontario's most progressive towns and cities have been built around the mines they were built to serve.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that in listening to the debate on vote 1301 under the main office, many of the speakers attempted to deal in total with northern Ontario. That is the effect, or lack of effect on the mining communities and, of course, rightly or wrongly, they were brought to order by the Whip of the government and the chairman of the committee. I had a few things to say about the effect of the mining industry on the communities, but I will abide by the ruling and we will deal with those things under The Department of Municipal Affairs; and I think that there is a lot to be dealt with.

I would ask the Minister to remember that under the wage statistics in this province almost all of the communities in northern Ontario are far below the average income on a wage basis—

Mr. White: You are out of order, now.

Mr. Gisborn: —you will find out that the cost of living is that much higher. I will let it go at that, but I just wanted to remind the Minister because I know that he has an interest in the communities as well as being centred on the mining industry.

Mr. Chairman, we are now dealing with the mine inspection branch and I think that is the one that deals with safety and health of the mine workers. I think at some time it is proper in the estimates to refer to the people who produce the stuff from under the ground.

In looking at this section of this review, I am not satisfied that we have done the job, an appreciable job, in the field of safety, that is reducing appreciably the number of fatalities and the number of injuries in rela-

tion to man hours of work. I do not think we are budgeting enough money in the inspection branch to start with.

I look at the makeup of the mines inspection branch on page 132, and the Minister will correct me if I am not right, we have 14 officers in that branch. I will not quote them all, but they are made up of engineers, district engineers, electrical and mechanical engineers and so on. We have 14, and if that is the total complement of the branch which has to do this job, I do not feel it is enough.

Just referring to some of the things in this review—and I am sorry I was not able to get the 1966 review in time to see it, there is no appreciable difference in statistics. But I am interested in the paragraph on the mechanical division on page 134 of the review and it refers to the use of ultrasonic testing devices in the mines. Of course, this kind of testing device is being used quite extensively in the construction industry at the present time. I do not know whether it is completely being used, but it is being used extensively.

I was interested in what this paragraph says in this review, that:

> The use of ultra-sonic testing of metal parts became widespread throughout the industry during the past year. Shafts on hoists, motors, cranes, sheave wheels, ball-mills, crushers, and other equipment were tested as well as suspension gear in shaft conveyances, brake tie-roads, crane hooks, and so on. A number of faulty items were discovered and, in fact, one large production hoist was found to have a severely cracked pinion shaft.

And this is the sentence, Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention to:

> Many mines are arranging for yearly ultrasonic inspection of their equipment. Where anomalies exist and the part is under suspicion, more frequent testing may be required.

Those last two sentences leave some doubt in my mind as to whether they are really taking this situation seriously. I think once we found that this kind of testing was effective enough to find these defects, then there should have been a mandatory rule laid down, on a periodic basis, for the use of this kind of testing—not just to say that many mines are arranging for yearly inspection of their equipment in this manner.

I think it is a very sound way of testing, but it should be used more extensively if we are going to do the job that has to be done in mine safety.

I mentioned that I could not find any appreciable decrease in the fatalities, or non-fatal accidents, based on the per man-hour rate of work. I draw your attention to the chart on page 139, this is "Mining Accidents in 1965".

The Minister might inform me if I am incorrect in my submission, or if there is a different picture shown in the 1966 review.

Firstly, we do not talk about those accidents that are not handled by the workmen's compensation board. We have the fatal accidents and we have those which are paid for by the workmen's compensation board—those are the only ones that have more than three days' loss of time.

I would ask the hon. Minister if he would tell me if they have a record of all accidents under three days, and if these are reported, so we can get a clear picture of how many people are off one day with an injury, and back to work within the three-day period, before they qualify, to give us a better picture of some of the minor accidents.

I would quote the second paragraph on this page 139, "Mining Accidents in 1965":

> The report shows a fatality rate of 0.26 per million man-hours, which is a decrease of 0.03 from the preceding year, and a decrease of 0.14 from the average for the last 25 years. There were 34 non-fatal accidents per million man-hours, an increase of 5 from the 1964 total, and an increase of 4 from the average for the last 25 years.

What makes me feel we are not doing an appreciable job is this statement on employment:

> The total employment figures show an increase of 3.5 per cent from 47,309 in 1964 to 48,979 in 1965—

an increase of 1,670.

If we are doing the job with all the new methods of safety prevention, I feel there should have been a greater decrease in both the fatalities and the non-fatal accidents in the mines. It stands out, as has been said, in the Sudbury mine, where we had 22,157,000—is that correct?—for the total of the Sudbury man-hours, and we have a total of non-fatal accidents of 1,342.

I think the average there is pretty high and it might be admitted that much more has to be done there.

But if the figure is not correct, just to hold even is not enough, with the importance laid on this field.

As the Minister said, in answer to a question by the hon. member for Grey North, the record is the best in the world—that may be so. He said that we lose half as many again, twice as many people off the job, as we do on the job.

I do not know whether he is referring to non-fatal accidents or fatalities, and what he has taken into account—those who die of old age, or from silicosis, or from all of the lung diseases that are contracted in that kind of an industry, plus drownings and hunting accidents and so on.

I do not think that is a good criteria. I think, if we have an accident prevention programme, and we have this department which applies itself strictly to that, either we should be able to produce an appreciable decrease, or we should find out why we cannot and we should incerase that department's manpower and try to do a better job.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I agree with the member for Wentworth East that one accident is too many. I think he would agree with that and so do I.

We have a record of compensation accidents and we regret that, in 1966, we show a slight increase; 0.31 fatal accidents per million man-hours, and 37 non-fatal accidents per million man-hours. That was the record of 1966, and I agree with the member that one accident is one too many, but we do think that we are striving to cut them down as much as we possibly can at all times.

We have a tremendous amount of men, as you know, in this field, and you are part of it. You know that great care is shown by your own groups in the plant to prevent these things, and we are doing the same. Pollution is a tragedy in any place but in Inco the men there seem to be quite a bit upset about that.

We had a meeting with them just last week and we are trying to do everything we can. Frankly, the company itself is greatly concerned. One of their head men came in to see me not too long ago and he asked, "Just what are we doing wrong that there is so much talk and so many men that are upset about things? We cannot understand it."

We have men up there and they do not always report to us, but we discussed that last week and we hope that we can go some way toward correcting that situation.

Frankly, together with you, we are concerned about our mines and all the men in them. Among these men are some of my relatives and friends which gives me a personal interest. I sympathize with the member's interest and know his feeling about them.

Mr. Gisborn: Am I correct that there has been an increase in the mine inspection branch personnel from the 14 shown in the 1965 report?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, there is an increase of 9. There are now 23.

Mr. Gisborn: Did the Minister catch the question I raised as to a record of non-compensable accidents?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We just have a record of compensable accidents.

Mr. Gisborn: I picked this question up from the steel worker's brief some time ago. They were concerned about the fact that some of the industries have, what they call, a safety competition where an employee goes for so long accident free—I do not know what the formula is—and he receives a bonus or some form of recognition for not having accidents. If this is correct, I would strongly urge the Minister to do everything to discourage it. I do not think that it is as conducive to safety, as some might think. Small injuries can be covered up for the reason that a record might be spoiled, but that injury might develop into something more serious at a later stage and then the employee is in trouble both on a monetary basis and on a health basis. I do not think that health and safety should be prejudiced and I would urge that this practice be discouraged.

What is the employment situation in the mining industry today? I know that a year and a half ago, newspapers carried stories that they were having a tough time keeping up production in many industries, because of the lack of semi-skilled and unskilled employees. Has the situation changed to date, or is it still serious?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We still have a shortage of both skilled and unskilled men. The last I heard, the number was some 6,000 and whether they have improved that in the last few months, I do not know, but that is the figure right now.

Mr. Gisborn: If this question was in order, what has the Minister's department been doing about it? I have my idea as to why they have a shortage and I think it is strictly that

in the nickel and gold mines they are not paying the wages that should be paid and the conditions are not being supplied. We would like to know what the reasons are.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, in the interest of—

Mr. Chairman: I think the Minister is answering a question.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I was just going to say to the member that it hard for the gold mines to compete with others. Because of the amount of money that they get for their product, it is very difficult for them to keep up. I think that is one of our problems, but even the mines that are paying top salaries and so on, are having trouble to get men. That problem is found all through the industry.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: My colleague, the member for Algoma-Manitoulin wants to speak on the same thing.

Mr. Farquhar: I want to pursue the matter of safety just one more minute, if you do not mind, Mr. Chairman.

We are concerned with it. I have much to do with compensation cases in my area and anything that we can do to narrow down this incidence is very important. The Minister says that he has a breakdown of compensable accidents per man hour, and I wonder if we could not establish a pattern by a further breakdown by mines or by areas to see where these weaknesses are, if there are any.

Does the Minister have this kind of a breakdown?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, we have. You know our mine rescue competition that operates all through the year. Our men are in the mines and they train groups to take charge if an accident happens. We go to great lengths in safety. These teams go all through and finally they get down to the winner, and they are given prizes—very expensive prizes, too—by both the mine and the department, and honours of different kinds. We try to bring to the attention of every miner that he should be part of the team that is going to prevent accidents in his mine.

I think it is in your area, is it not? It is not? Why would that be? Oh, I see. Just one mine is up there, so there would be no competition, but they could enter against any of the others, and if you are interested in being kept advised of every part of it, knowing you, we think that you would do a real job.

Mr. Sopha: Why do you not engage in these competitions in British Columbia?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I wrote a letter about that yesterday. We were asked to be in. The industry pays for all this; we have nothing to do with it, and that is the reason—

Mr. Sopha: You seem to be drawing the blame for the lack of participation—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I think that is right; we always do.

Mr. Sopha: That good Conservative newspaper, the Sudbury *Star*, is laying the blame at your door, saying that it was your obligation to encourage participation—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We do.

Mr. Sopha: —in this national competition. How is it that Ontario is not to be represented? We are the leading mining province in the country. Why, when they have their run-offs later this year, should we be absent? Do you want to join the Minister of Tourism and Information, and the Minister of Economics and Development, in not knowing that the Centennial is taking place this year? You do not want to be in that undignified company.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, I have had correspondence about it and was advised by my staff that this was not done. I do not know whether it was to conserve money. Our competition is on at the time, I am told. We have nothing to do with it as a government. Why would they ask us to go out there? We have never done it before and we just sent a very polite letter saying that the industry looked after this. I do not know why the big row came up because we have never had it happen before and I have, for the last few years, been there at the different mines to present the prizes and the cup to all the men.

Mr. Sopha: Naturally, your picture is always in. We have a book of pictures of you; you are always there, there is no question about it and the camera is not far behind you.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: If I was as good looking as you—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: I asked the hon. Minister if the salt mining operations in Essex county come under his jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, they do. I was up there a little while ago.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the Minister what inspection is conducted by his department on brine mining, the operation where water is pumped in and the brine is taken out?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am told that we license them for drilling those holes; that is all we have to do with them.

Mr. Newman: There is no way at all that your department can inspect to see if there is any undermining of the land in the vicinity of these operations?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am told that the salt is usually down 1,000 feet or more.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, about 10 or 15 years ago we had settling in one area there where several buildings completely disappeared. I wonder if there is any danger of a similar thing happening once again.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You are speaking of the Canadian Industries accident? That is the only one we have ever known to happen. We have nothing any place else.

Mr. Newman: There is no danger at all of this—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Apparently not.

Mr. Sopha: Not in election year.

Votes 1303 and 1304 agreed to.

On vote 1305.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1305, concerning the sulphur fumes arbitrator: Could the Minister tell me what companies are refunding this amount of money to the government or part of this amount of money?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: There are two, International Nickel and Falconbridge.

Mr. Young: Two. Then the money is paid out, first of all and then refunded. This, I understand happens. Then where does the money go? Is it being paid out to—well who gets it?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, what is paid out is salaries and maintenance to our men. We pay all that.

Mr. Young: But does no one recover for damage by fumes then? I though this money was in order to pay for damages that may be caused.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is paid by the companies themselves. They pay for that over and above salaries and maintenance too.

Mr. Young: Then this means that this $29,000 is simply for the civil servants who administer the Act? And they order companies to pay certain damages?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. Young: Do we have records of the people who collect these damages? I presume we do.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, we do.

Mr. Young: And these are available?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We have no records unless it goes to arbitration, and there has been no arbitration instance in the last four or five years. We used to get—I know when I first became Minister, we used to get—calls from the farmers about their fences rusting through from the fumes, and the cows out in the fields lowing and mooing and so on. But that is four or five years ago. We have not had anything since that time to my knowledge.

Mr. Young: Damages are paid, though? But only when it goes to arbitration do you get a record of it?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. Young: Then this is a private record of the companies. Well now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether or not he feels that this action should now come under The Department of Health, under the new air pollution legislation which is now being evolved? It seems to me that the time is here, with the new Act, for this Act now to go out of existence and the whole matter of air pollution be dealt with through The Department of Health. Is this not the logical time for it to happen?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am told this is exempt under their legislation. There is no cost to the taxpayer and at one time, some few years ago, we used to work with The Department of Health on this same thing. We do not any more. But I can remember being at many meetings when both the health officials and our own were there.

Mr. Young: Well this means, Mr. Chairman, that only a few companies are exempt as far as the new air pollution by-laws are concerned? They are in a special category under the Minister of Mines?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Only two involved at the present.

Mr. Young: Well it just seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that with the new air pollution legislation coming forward under The Department of Health this becomes an anachronism. All the air pollution control should come under The Department of Health under the new legislation. I simply register that and point out to the Minister that he ought to be shifting this responsibility at this time over to the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well I will see that this is brought to the attention—

Vote 1305 agreed to.

On vote 1306:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1306, may I ask the Minister first, am I correct that September 1, 1963 was the cut-off date beyond which when a man staked the mineral rights he did not get the surface rights along with the mineral rights?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I do not think so. I have never heard of this.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, when was the cut-off date? There was a time when you staked the mineral rights and you got the surface rights. At some point there was a cut-off date.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The year?

Mr. MacDonald: Date, year, whatever it is.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You still get them both.

Mr. MacDonald: You still get both?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, there was never, to my knowledge and my officials tell me no, there was never a cut-off date.

Mr. MacDonald: Well I have had one specific case drawn to my attention. I do not know whether the Minister or his officials can deal with it specifically.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We will try.

Mr. MacDonald: It is the case of William S. Hay, who staked a couple of claims back in 1962 or 1963 in the township of McGarry. He made the necessary payments and all the cheques were returned. In fact I have a photostatic copy of a cheque that was returned by you to the man on December 13, 1962. What explanation is there for it, when a man stakes a claim and then suddenly discovers that he is not getting the surface rights?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No letter with it?

Mr. MacDonald: He came to see you and you assured him that you would settle the whole thing. But you did not settle it, you sent the money back.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh, with no explanation?

Mr. MacDonald: No. He came to me because he had not gotten satisfaction elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I do not remember it but I will be glad to look it up.

Mr. MacDonald: I will give you the two claims. They are L-63313 and L-63314.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: And his name?

Mr. MacDonald: William S. Hay.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Right. You will have an answer tomorrow.

Mr. MacDonald: Good. I will look forward to it.

Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the remarks made a few moments ago concerning the Gordon Lake property and the road into that property just north of Kenora, I would like to remind the members that The Department of Highways in their estimates voted the sum of $600,000 for the first portion of this road, and I am sure that when we can convince the mining authorities that they need this road, then we can convince the government to complete the last section.

Now Mr. Chairman, the select committee on mining made certain recommendations in connection with the amalgamation of certain mining recording offices. In their recommendations, in their wisdom, they recommended that Sioux Lookout be eliminate as a mining recording office point and it be amalgamated with Red Lake and Kenora.

I want to commend the Minister and his department on assuring the people in the Sioux Lookout and Hudson area that this mining recording office at Sioux Lookout will remain as is, and will look after the Patricia and the Kowkash areas.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Good old Sioux Lookout.

Votes 1306 and 1307 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of Mines.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to deal with some of the bills that are on the order paper. There are certain third readings. There are some I would like to have given Royal assent tomorrow and I have asked His Honour if he will be present. We then will go to the estimates of The Department of Transport, if there is time. The private members' hour will take place on Friday.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:45 o'clock, p.m.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 77

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, April 26, 1967

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 26, 1967

Ontario heritage foundation, bill to incorporate, Mr. Auld, first reading 2657

Question to Mr. Bales re 19 members of local 1005, united steel workers, Mr. Nixon 2657

Question to Mr. Robarts re water pipeline from Lake Erie, Mr. Sargent 2657

Questions to Mr. Connell re steel used for Queen's Park complex, Mr. Sargent 2658

Question to Mr. Robarts re expropriation and compensation in urban renewal schemes, Mr. Renwick 2658

Questions to Mr. Wardrope re mining corporations, Mr. MacDonald 2658

Question to Mr. Wardrope re surface and mining rights, Mr. MacDonald 2658

Questions to Mr. Gomme re Burlington skyway, Mr. Gisborn 2659

Question to Mr. Yaremko re provision of drugs to persons requesting assistance, Mr. Sargent 2660

Question to Mr. Welch re aging of beer and wine, Mr. Sargent 2660

Question to Mr. Welch re hiring of LCBO staff, Mr. Sargent 2660

Third readings 2660

Estimates, Department of Transport, Mr. Haskett 2660

Royal assent to certain bills, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor 2678

On notice of motion No. 25, Mr. Worton, Mr. Carton, Mr. Bryden, Mr. Bukator, Mrs. Pritchard, Mr. Singer 2678

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 2690

Appendix 2691

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in both galleries, east and west, students from the eastern high school of commerce, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

ONTARIO HERITAGE FOUNDATION

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to incorporate the Ontario heritage foundation.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to incorporate the Ontario heritage foundation for the purpose of preserving property of historical and architectural interest.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Labour. Is the Minister aware that 19 members of local 1005 of the united steel workers of America were exonerated from charges of slander against the international union by members of their own local at a union meeting recently? If so, does the Minister intend to investigate the subsequent recommendation by the international commission of the united steel workers of America for suspension of union rights of these same men for a period of one year?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the leader of the Opposition, I received a telegram from a spokesman for the 19 members of local 1005, to whom the leader of the Opposition refers, and I have instructed my officials to contact the men and to look into the whole situation.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister,

Will the Prime Minister please advise if the government promised to provide a water line to the Ford Motor Company plant outside St. Thomas and, secondly, why would the Lake Erie water line be considered at a cost of $14 million when the city of London has an ample supply only five miles away at a capital cost of only $400,000? There is quite a difference, $13,600,000 difference.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): We can subtract, too.

Mr. Sargent: Good! In view of all this, they have to pay triple water rates in St. Thomas now. Why did not the OWRC let the Ford build its own water line?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there are a good many technical matters involved in a proper answer to this question. I will take this as notice and answer the question fully with all the technical aspects that are involved in it when I have the information in the form in which it should be presented to this House.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, yesterday, before the orders of the day, the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson) rose on a point of order and stated that the House may have been misled by my reply to his question of April 13.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I assure you I had no intention of misleading the House and indeed I do not feel the privileges of the members have been abused.

The hon. member read into the record a letter from Mr. Gary McLaren, news director of CKCO-TV in Kitchener, in which Mr. McLaren states that his television station did not request a film clip of the statement by one of the private members. However, he says, the station did, in fact, use this clip on February 8.

To this I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that the service does not send out television news clips of private members' statements gratuitously. The recollection of the director of the service, Mr. Fairbairn, is that this matter was

discussed over the telephone with Mr. McLaren or a member of his news staff.

So it boils down, I guess, to who telephoned whom. These matters are always handled by telephone because of the perishable nature of the commodity and no written records are maintained detailing these calls.

Mr. McLaren states that no television film has been returned by his station. I am informed that this is correct in the case of CKCO-TV. I am informed it is not the policy of the service to pressure those stations to replace the film, Mr. Speaker, but usually they do as a matter of courtesy.

Mr. Sargent: I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Works. Will the Minister advise why European steel was used in the building of a major part of the new building in Queen's Park instead of Canadian steel?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, a very minor part of the structural and reinforcing steel for phase one of the project was European steel. If this European steel had not been used—

Mr. Sargent: What does the Minister call a minor part?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Seven per cent. If this European steel had not been used, owing to the short supply of Canadian steel, the overall construction of the project would have been delayed by several months.

Mr. Sargent: May I ask a supplementary question? Was that seven per cent of the cost of the whole building or seven per cent of the steel?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Seven per cent of the steel.

Mr. Sargent: Why did not the Minister buy it in Canada?

An hon. member: He just told you.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I think I am average, I can hear a bit of what goes on here, but I did not hear that.

Hon. Mr. Connell: The reason we used it, and I will give it verbally and look at the gentleman across there, is because there was a shortage of steel at the time. We used about seven per cent of European steel and it would have caused several months' delay if we had not used this seven per cent.

Mr. Sargent: How much money in dollars are we talking about?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Oh, I have not got the figures broken down into how much the steel cost. The contract was $28 million for this portion of the building.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, another question to the same Minister along the same line. What contracts were let to the architects for the Queen's Park complex and how were these architects chosen?

Hon. Mr. Connell: One contract engaging the professional services of the associated architects for the Queen's Park project. Second part of the question: The four firms of architects were chosen because of their capability and experience in the planning and construction of large projects.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

When will the government meet with the city of Toronto on the matters relating to expropriation and compensation in urban renewal schemes as outlined in the letter of Mayor Dennison to him dated March 16 last, and the further letter to you from the commissioner of development dated March 29 last?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, this appointment is being arranged. In view of many other commitments we have I hope it will be at the earliest possible moment. I do not have a fixed date now but I hope that I will have one set and will be able to give it to the city very shortly.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I have answers to three questions asked me during my estimates yesterday.

The first one is in reply to the member for York South, the leader of the New Democratic Party: Mining properties have never been assessed because under subsection (5) of section 35 of The Assessment Act such properties are not assessable and The Department of Municipal Affairs or any assessor therefore never did have the right to make an assessment.

The other answer, sir: Mining claims L63313 and L63314 in the township of McGarry. At the time that Mr. Hay applied for title to these claims, the form of grant prescribed under The Mining Act was a patent. If the applicant could show that he had acquired some or all of the surface rights in order to develop his ore body, the Minister had authority to include them in the patent, otherwise it was required that the patent be limited to mining rights only. Mr.

Hay applied for both surface rights and mining rights. Although he was subsequently afforded every opportunity to do so, he was unable to produce any evidence of an ore body on his claim. As a result, when the patents were issued in 1962 they were limited to the mining rights and Mr. Hay was given a refund of that portion of his payment that was intended to cover the surface rights. Effective September 1, 1963, the legislation was changed. Patents are no longer granted and the form of title given is a mining lease. Although the applicant can now ask for and obtain the surface rights if he wishes, the leases contain a provision to the effect that they may be cancelled if they are used for other than mining purposes.

I note in my correspondence that Mr. Hay was advised that, if at some future date he could show that some of the surface rights were acquired in connection with his mining operations, consideration would be given to the granting of a special lease of the surface rights.

Mr. Hay has apparently not taken advantage of this offer.

I would like to send these both over to the gentleman who asked the questions.

One other item, Mr. Speaker, was in regard to the remarks which the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) made concerning W. A. Hoffman, district engineer of mines for Sudbury. Hoffman's report on his inspection on July 6, 1966, of the Levack Mine, International Nickel Company, was read and discussed by R. L. Smith, the chief engineer of mines, on July 11, 1966, with Hoffman. The chief engineer of mines made the decision that, owing to the breaches of The Mining Act of Ontario creating dangerous conditions to the employees of this mine, a report of such should be forwarded to the superintendent of the Levack Mine and circulated to the employees.

The Sudbury *Star* dated July 6, 1966, remarks on the labour unrest at the Levack Mine.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Would the Minister permit a question with regard to the first answer he gave?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: As I understood his answer—and I have not yet had a chance to read it—he said that under a certain section of The Municipal Act you do not have the power to assess mining corporations. My question to the Minister is this: I understand that locally the mining corporation in Sudbury is assessed, and indeed they do pay taxes for welfare and for libraries. The assessment figure is in the range of $140 million so that if they paid the regular 80 mills for all municipal services, some $11 million would come in other taxes for that area. How does the Minister explain the fact that there is a partial assessment for limited purposes if the Act does not permit it?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Speaker, can I give the answers to those tomorrow? It is quite lengthy and I will get them in *Hansard* and see the member gets them.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), and perhaps when he returns next week he will answer this.

Do Ontario housing corporation's rent-to-income rates vary across the province according to the cost of living and income in the various regions or are they the same for the whole province?

If the rates do not vary would the Minister consider changing the rent to income scale to make it more flexible?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to the questions which the member for Wentworth East asked me yesterday.

1. To what extent was the original road construction faulty on the Burlington Bay skyway bridge to necessitate repaving at this time?

The necessity to repave the Burlington Bay skyway bridge was not as a result of faulty construction or design when it was originally built in 1957. The most modern methods and materials available, at that time, of sealing the concrete before the application of the asphalt paving was used, but in spite of this, moisture penetrated the asphalt course and it was found necessary, to prevent the possibility of serious damage to the structure, to remove the old pavement and apply the more satisfactory sealants which have been developed since the bridge was constructed.

This type of maintenance is general in all jurisdictions for structures such as the skyway, after they have been in service and subjected to severe weather conditions and heavy traffic volume.

2. What is the cost of the repaving contract?

The contract was awarded to the low tender which was $288,784.

3. Who is the contractor?

King Paving and Materials Limited, of Oakville.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Public Welfare.

Will the Minister advise what steps are being taken to provide drugs for indigent persons on welfare, elderly citizens on pension, and persons in low income brackets?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would mind if the Minister of Social and Family Services were to reply to that question? The regulations under The General Welfare Assistance Act are in the final stages of preparation and they, when completed, will indicate the manner in which drugs are to be made available to persons requesting assistance through municipalities.

The hon. member will know that the municipalities now have the power of a $20 per month supplementary, and this will continue to be available for persons who have extraordinary expenses such as the purchase of drugs and medications.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Minister. A question for the Provincial Secretary and Minister of immigration. Would the Minister advise whether he plans to amend the liquor laws to assure the proper aging of beer and wine similar to European methods? Secondly, how are the staff of the LCBO hired?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, these are two related questions. I find the first question very interesting in view of the hon. member's question to my colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), dealing with European steel. Now he wants to impose European methods and standards insofar as good Canadian products are concerned.

Sufficient to say that I am advised that there is no legislation to cover the subject which the hon. member asked in the first question and, insofar as the second is concerned, we follow the usual government practice of interviewing interested applicants and choosing for our work, those who are best qualified to perform the job.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister answer a supplementary question then? Would you take a list I supplied to you and hire them from that list?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that if any members of this House have the names of people who, they feel, would be qualified, that they would let the personnel people of the liquor control board of Ontario know, because they would certainly be given the same opportunity as anyone who had indicated their interest in working for the liquor control board of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to table answers to questions No. 2, 7 and 18 on the order paper. (See appendix, page 2691)

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third readings upon motions:

Bill 69, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Bill 70, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Bill 72, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Bill 75, An Act to amend The Human Tissue Act, 1962-1963.

Bill 80, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Bill 81, An Act respecting the township of Cornwall.

Bill 97, An Act to amend The Ontario Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, 1967.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): In submitting the estimates of The Department of Transport for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968, I propose to give but a brief summary of the department's programme to place these estimates in perspective and leave the detail for the ensuing item-by-item consideration.

Four elements of change have been particularly important in developing our programme in the past year and in making plans for the year ahead.

The first of these changes is basically one of volume—the continuing population explosion in vehicles and drivers, the growing

volume of traffic, and the corresponding increase in the toll of collisions. I reported these figures to the House on a recent occasion. They emphasize the continuing challenge to make traffic safer for our citizens. This is one of the most difficult challenges, and one of the most vital, in our society today.

The other elements of change are: (1) the growing impact of the motor vehicle on many aspects of our lives, such as its influence on where we live and how we live; and (2) the increasing importance of inter-relationships on motor vehicle matters among all provinces and indeed among all jurisdictions on the continent; and (3) the need to plan for the automobile in conjunction with other forms of travel, such as the commuter rail line and certain aspects of air transportation.

The Department of Transport is analyzing these challenges of change, and responding to them. We are expanding and innovating. In addition to continuing the existing programmes that have been proved effective, we are taking vigorous new action on vehicles and drivers in the interests of safety; we are working for greater uniformity among various jurisdictions; we are undertaking broader responsibilities to better serve the needs of the people of Ontario for the entire, complex mosaic of transportation.

In regard to vehicle safety, the progress of the past year could be summed up in one sentence: Ontario has been one of the leaders on this continent in achieving an improved level of vehicle safety.

Last year The Highway Traffic Act was amended to give The Department of Transport authority to mandate devices on vehicles that could affect their safe operation. This legislation provided a firm basis for our highly effective negotiations with the automobile manufacturers in Ontario.

A few weeks ago, the United States federal authority ordered a total of 20 safety features and devices on new vehicles. As at that date, 17 of the 20 were already standard equipment on all new vehicles manufactured in Canada. In the United States, only eight were standard equipment; the others will not be required on United States-made cars until January 1, 1968.

This comparison points up the fact that Ontario has obtained action for safer new vehicles more quickly than any other jurisdiction, including the federal government of the United States. In the year ahead we will press for further advances in the production of safer vehicles.

Tires are a separate factor of the subject of safe vehicles. As I advised the House earlier in the session, regulations have been established to set standards and specifications for tires that are permitted to be offered for sale in Ontario. The V-1 sandard is now required, and further regulations are being developed.

Inspection of vehicles is another facet of the campaign for vehicle safety. The programme of compulsory vehicle checks, in cooperation with the Ontario Provincial Police, was expanded substantially in the past year. The department's mobile safety-check lanes were used for these 38-point checks. Police concentrated as much as possible on cars whose mechanical condition was suspect, and they stripped the licences from 3,341 vehicles and removed them from the road as "unsafe".

For further expansion of this programme in 1967, we have increased our fleet of mobile safety check lanes by 30 per cent in addition to the permanent lanes at Downsview.

For commercial vehicles, several important changes in licensing were effected in the past year. These resulted from a study by the Ontario highway transport board.

Most collisions are caused by the action of drivers. Therefore a large proportion of the department's activities is directed at driver control or driver improvement. Examples are licensing, driver examination, the demerit point system and a diverse programme of safety education.

Driver instruction in secondary schools has gained momentum. These extra-curricular courses in good driving are now being offered in 215 secondary schools, a substantial increase over last year. There will be another substantial increase in the next school year, bringing the total to well over 50 per cent of all secondary schools in the province.

Firm action has been taken to control the drivers of another kind of vehicle—the motorcycle—in the interests of the safety of all users of the road. A special examination now is given for the operator of a motorcycle, and since April 1 a special driver's licence has been required. Ninety-day instruction permits are no longer allowed for motorcycle operation.

Under this year's extension of driver re-examination, all drivers who accumulate nine points, under the demerit point system, are required to take a complete driver's test. It is expected that about 30,000 drivers will reach the nine-point level during 1967 and will bring the total number of re-examinations

in Ontario to well over 100,000. This programme is going into effect as additional examiners are recruited and trained.

In 1968, when we have had a chance to observe the effectiveness of re-examining drivers at the nine-point level, we will assess the value of this procedure and give consideration to further extension of the re-examination programme. In this way we will be sure that re-examination is given its correct priority in the campaign for safety.

The motor vehicle accident claims fund continues to be one of the highlights of the department's operations. Through this fund, Ontario residents have excellent protection against financial loss when they are the innocent victims of accidents for which, through no fault of their own, they cannot collect damages. In the last fiscal year, the fund paid out more than $4,000,000 to 2,571 such persons. If an uninsured motorist is the cause, he must repay the fund in full. Two of every three cases do not require court action, and in these cases the settlement usually is made in a matter of a few weeks.

One of the new concepts in the services of this department is exemplified by the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study. This study is concerned with the broad impact of transportation on our people and our economy.

One result of the transportation study has been the recommendation for a commuter rail service, government of Ontario transit. Work now in progress includes a detailed analysis of GO-transit success and effects; and traffic and economic projections for the future, up to the year 2000. Further reports on findings will be made during the current year. Results of the study will guide planning of the region covered specifically by the study, from Guelph to Oshawa and north to Barrie, and they also will assist in planning of other urban areas throughout the province.

Another aspect of travel that is under study is air transportation in northern Ontario. Consideration will be given to landing strips, airports and related matters with a view to formulating an appropriate policy. This development is an example of the broader responsibilities being undertaken by The Department of Transport.

As I mentioned earlier, the inter-relationships of various jurisdictions make it desirable to have close liaison and, in many matters, to aim at uniformity. The campaigns for safe vehicles and safe tires are continent-wide, with Ontario playing a leading role.

An important new dimension in inter-provincial coordination was introduced last fall when Ontario sponsored the first conference of Ministers responsible for motor vehicle administration in all provinces. Five inter-provincial technical committees were set up to study safety education, school buses, accident reporting, vehicle registration and driver licencing. Their reports will be considered by our forthcoming conference of provincial Ministers, to be held in Quebec city next month. The Minister of Transportation and Communications for Quebec has invited me to preside over the sessions. These conferences represent a major stride forward in nation-wide uniformity for the benefit of all the citizens of our dominion.

In summary: The estimates for the fiscal year 1967-1968 total $11,135,000, an increase of 15 per cent over the year just drawing to a close. In the vital field of transportation, The Department of Transport will continue its vigorous modern programme to serve changing modern needs.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, I notice in this vote this year we are asked to increase the vote from $11 million to $16 million, an increase of $5 million in one of the most important agencies in our economy. I notice that the main office is up $1 million, sir. The motor vehicle administration branch up $1.2 million, but the claims have jumped from $4 million to $5.2 million, an increase of $1.2 million in claims, but the increase is only $75,000 for highway safety. This is an increase of 11 cents per capita. Eleven cents per person in Ontario to give us a safer, broader aspect in safety for our people.

This Minister is charged with the safety of the lives of seven million people and he increases this vote by $75,000 this year, an increase of 11 cents per head.

The Minister heading up this most important agency has in the past demonstrated apathy and apparent desire to do nothing—or lack of desire I should say—in a get-tough policy with the manufacturers to conform to many more safety standards to save human life.

He does not believe that he should use the power of his office, given to him by the government, to say to these manufacturers, "We refuse to license your product, we will refuse to let you drive your cars on the roads of Ontario unless you conform to certain safety standards recognized by safety authorities across the world". I say that this Minister is too much of a gentleman to get tough. He

seems to think that the word "GM" stands for great men. I think that in view of his performance in the past few years in this department, as will be revealed in the next few months, that in view of the press reports about the wolf problem, he would be a good candidate for the Minister of domestication for wolves.

This is a job, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot do on Thursdays. It is a job that requires a dedicated desire for a crusade to save human life. Ralph Nader in the United States, stated, and he is talking about the United States picture:

> Why does not the government have the same responsibility for setting safety standards for all motor vehicles as it does for airplanes, ships or trains which account for only two per cent of the injuries and eight per cent of the fatalities in transportation?

It is a known fact in the flying field that you cannot fly your plane one day over your licence period without a certificate of air worthiness. The plane must adhere in every respect to safety standards. But we have thousands and thousands of jalopies on our roads today, jeopardizing human life, because of the do nothing policy on the part of this government.

In press reports a month ago the headline is: "Thousands of Defects Listed in Canadian Cars". American Motors had to call back 17,000 cars. General Motors had to call back 12,633 cars. That is the Canadian picture. GM had to call back 28,000 Chevs and Pontiacs and the Olds F-85; the 4000's and Toronada have to be called back for faulty construction. They have called back 20,000 '64 Chevelle's and Beaumonts.

Going on, Ford said drive shafts were replaced on 11,000 of 1965 Meteors and Mercurys; and all dealers have been sent replacement parts to fix a possible steering system failure on 27,000 cars of the 1965 models.

This goes to show that we have death bombs on our highways. The government is including an increase of eleven cents per person across the whole broad province to work on increased exposure for safety.

The Ontario motor league, representing some 300,000 motorists in all parts of the province, have made substantial submissions to the Minister and, Mr. Chairman, it is a shocking thing to get into this picture to see what a lack of performance this government has under this Minister.

A very important thing that a lot of parts of Canada have accepted as being a good safety factor is the luminous licence plate. It has been tried here, but the Minister, insofar as this safety factor is concerned, it is a wonder how he can sleep at night, knowing the stupidity of the people that make these decisions.

In 1949 the state of Maine was the first state to require luminous licence plates. Now more than half of the states in the United States have adopted this requirement. In Canada, the Northwest Territories and the provinces of Newfoundland, Alberta and Manitoba are now ready to fit them this year. It goes on to show the pluses in this. Dr. Shulman says that this is a must to fall in line with other progressive jurisdictions.

The evidence states that the picture in this regard in the United States, the evidences of its effectiveness, are in the state of Minnesota where, after reflectorized plates were introduced in Minnesota in 1957, rural auto deaths were reduced from 24 per cent to nine per cent. Urban deaths involved collisions with parked cars dropped from 28 per cent to seven per cent.

In 1959 the Iowa state introduced this and they found it very successful.

Maine has used this since 1950. In the 15 years since they were introduced there has been a reduction of 70 per cent in rear end collisions.

Now these plates are more expensive than painted ones, said Paul Macdonald, the secretary of the state of Maine. But it is hard to put a price tag on human lives.

Now reflectorized plates, Mr. Chairman, are more expensive than the painted ones but they are still a sound investment in safety.

Maine's Macdonald says his state saved $100,000 by using six year plates—using a plate good for six years—and recommends this approach to the Canadian provinces. The initial cost, he says, is the biggest hurdle. Once this is taken any state or province can actually save money over a five or six year period.

Another additional feature of this, Mr. Chairman, is the luminous plates. They help police in their law enforcement duties.

Now let us have a look at the attitude of this government. The B.C. government has adopted this. They say it is very sound and very simple to get into business—it is very simple to adopt. It goes on to show what the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba are doing in this regard but in the province of Ontario the officials claim that results of the recent tests on these reflectorized plates

do not justify the estimated increased cost. Fifty per cent of the American economy say they are a good deal with millions of millions of dollars of know-how, excellent authorities in this field say it is a good deal, but the province of Ontario did a test on 3,000 vehicles and their result was that it was economically a good deal even though it would save lives, but the province of Ontario is not convinced yet of the need for luminous plates to save human life.

Over the years the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) and myself have covered most of the bases in this business.

I do not think, sir, that the House wants to hear a repetition of the different things we have covered. In fact I do not think that we should have to do this. I think the Minister should have the intelligence to say—eventually we will adopt these things—they must have some intelligence in them. The area of these bombs on the highways is so far reaching, it involves many facets of law. An editorial broadcast by CHUM, I think, boils down the need for changing some of our laws.

In the last few days—

it said,

> —in Toronto we have had some good and bad police work both connected with high speed chases through city streets.
>
> There is nothing quite so hairbrained as a chase with a fugitive and the police travelling up the street at 90 per hour. Yet we had another of these keystone cops spectaculars this week. Death could have resulted from the car-thief suspect, or the police pursuing him, or innocent pedestrians.
>
> As it was, a motorcycle officer narrowly escaped missing cashing in his chips when the chase ended in a crash between the stolen car, a tractor trailor and bus.
>
> On the other side of the ledger there is the case of P.C. Carl Breaker, who gave up a chase yesterday because of danger to children who were just leaving their school for the day. Instead of pursuing the wanted car at excessive speeds, the constable went to the driver's home and waited for him there. He got him too. No fuss, no flying feathers, no lives endangered.
>
> CHUM takes this stand. The arrest of a suspected car thief is not worth injury, or death, to police or ordinary citizens. These pursuits should be stopped before innocent people are mangled in the wreckage.
>
> CHUM commends Constable Breaker for using his noggin and hopes his example will be followed. The law is written that the constable must stop or apprehend the person and they cannot use a licence to give him an arrest.

Mr. Chairman, these are some of the figures of this department that we would like to touch upon, but in the Throne Speech, the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) says, on page 14:

> In recognition of the importance of landing strips and airports throughout northern Ontario, investigations are being conducted with a view to formulating an appropriate policy. The resulting facilities will provide new opportunities for the further development of this important part of our province.

Now, I am very interested in knowing what is going on. If the Minister would like to interrupt and tell me what is going on—I would be interested in hearing—has he any plans in this regard for airstrips?

What is going on in this field?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will reply afterwards.

Mr. Sargent: I hope you will not forget the answer to that because that is a pretty important thing.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I mentioned it, you noticed.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the key to a lot of accidents is unsafe tires and you will recall here last year how I sent a ruptured tire across the House to the Minister. I do not think that sank home at all because the submission of the Ontario motor league is deeply concerned about the operation of cars that have not installed rubber on them.

Last year, 1,332 accidents resulted from blow-outs or punctures. Fourteen of these resulted in fatalities, and 436 accidents due to blow-outs, ended in personal injuries to 882 people.

They recommend that no person shall operate a motor vehicle on a highway unless tires on the motor vehicle are in a safe condition to be operated on the highway.

In the United States, a press report on March 31, stated:

> The nation's tire makers have agreed to caution motorists that 75 miles an hour is the fastest safe speed for passenger car tires carrying maximum loads for sustained periods.

The warning applies to all tires, no matter what width or grade, except in driving situations where tires are carrying less than maximum load. This move was disclosed by the top tire firms of the nation—15 major manufacturers and 22 tire rim makers.

Until now, there has been no recommended safe speed limit on tires for high speed cars. A few states have speed limits as high as 80 miles an hour and I think it is a great area for study that the government should say to tire manufacturers, "You specify what the limits of this product are, in its operation on our highways. How fast can you drive with this type of tire?"

Further, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the vehicle should be fitted with tires having sufficient load carrying capacity to operate safely. With all the specifications, there should be a decal or a plate indicating, on the windshield of the car, that that car is shoed or tired with proper rubber to let it operate at certain speeds. This is a very important factor in the saving of lives.

Mr. Chairman, a sore point with many people in rural urban areas such as I live in, is the fact that they come into town on Saturdays to get their plates—and they cannot get them because the facilities are closed.

I do not know what we have to do to let the government know that the government is there to serve people. Their first responsibility Mr. Chairman, is to the people of this province, and to run these offices, not how you want them run, but how the people want them run.

Specifically, these offices should be made to stay open, especially at peak periods like the first three months in the year, or maybe the first four months in the year, to serve people —and not at the whim of your staff.

You would never run a business this way but you can run your government the way your people tell you it should be run. I am telling you, as a taxpayer, that I have the right to say that I can go down and buy my plates on a Saturday when it is convenient to me—and not when it is convenient to you, or the Tory you have running that office for you —and do not forget that.

This is important to people; to have things working for them, and not the people working for the government all the time.

Further, I have a letter here insofar as the driver examinations are concerned. It says:

> I would like to forward this letter to you with regard to The Department of Transport. Enclosed is a letter from The Department of Transport which I received as a reply to my complaint about the opening hours of examination centres. I draw attention to the sentence which I underlined for you. When a worker wants to obtain an operator's licence he must leave his job for a considerable length of time. If the test is failed, he must leave work for the number of times required to get the licence.
>
> If a workman's wife or child wants to get an operator's licence, the workman must leave work. The wife will leave work if she is not a housewife, or the child will leave school, if he or she goes to school. Now the situation is a mess. The enclosed letter talks of the administrative problems. I say these are only Conservative problems—

This is probably from a good Liberal, or NDPer – nevertheless they are people and your job is to serve people.

> I say that why they cannot stay open, or cannot give service, is a Conservative problem. I feel the examiners will work on Saturday just as do many other types of employees, like firefighting experts in The Department of Lands and Forests, or the Ontario Provincial Police. They all have to work shift work on off-hours on weekends and I would appreciate knowing your opinion on the matter and would like to know if you can incorporate the issue in your Opposition in the Legislature.

I know what I am going to tell that gal—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): We know too!

Mr. Sargent: There area lot of people who drive cars in this province and a lot of people who are taking licence tests. They know the hokey-pokey they have to go through at the discretion of your Tory henchmen in getting these things. I say that here is another area where you can pull up your socks insofar as serving people is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the most important tool in a household or in a man's job is the ability to drive a car and to have a licence to drive a car. And a component part of that licence to drive is insurance. The growing arrogance of the insurance companies in being so selective in what risks they will take in setting themselves up as a judge and jury as to who shall be driving a car under the assigned risk plan and furnishing proof of responsibility—turning down people from all walks of life for the smallest reasons and for no apparent reason at all, refusing to give coverage—causes me to make an observation that I

hope will never come in this free enterprise system: that these insurance companies must be brought into line and told they must serve the public in doing the job that they are granted charters to do, and what is equally important, at fair and reasonable rates.

I think that if the government does not take some steps to protect some people in giving them the right to drive a car, then I hate to suggest this, but we do not want to break down our free enterprise system, but the government will have to take some hand in getting some form of insurance with the licence plates when people buy them.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What exactly are you saying?

Mr. Sargent: I do not want to go so far as you have gone, but I think this government—

Mr. MacDonald: You have gone that far; is this Liberal policy?

Mr. Sargent: No, this is my idea; this is not Liberal policy. I am speaking as a private member and I am saying that it is the responsibility of the government to find some way to give people the right to drive a car so that they will have insurance coverage.

I am not going through all this—

Mr. MacDonald: NDP policy is the answer.

Mr. Sargent: The member has good points along the way, but the government must broaden its thinking in terms of people again, and I think that this government must be beholden to the insurance companies in some way. Do the insurance companies have you in their pockets? What goes on? Why can you not tell these people that we have people here in this province? How many cars have you got here? Are there 1.5 million in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There are 2,700,000.

Mr. Sargent: But the government says, "The public be damned." The insurance companies have the right to fleece the public and so you go along with them in the Act and in no way do you intervene and take the part of the public.

Mr. MacDonald: Very interesting, coming from the Liberal Party.

Mr. Sargent: I am speaking as a private member. The public is getting fed up with this tagalong policy. The only time you ever move on anything is when the people become informed and aroused. Then you will get off your—and do something.

I am taking too much of my friend's time, but I do want to say that black is black; it is not grey. A thing is either right or it is wrong, and the most precious thing in our history of the democratic system are the laws that we have built up. These laws are made by the people, but they are not for the people right now; they are for the insurance companies in this province.

I think, Mr. Chairman, we must have a programme, a crusade, in this province. I think that the C should stand for the concept of selling safety and selling safety know-how to people. The R should stand for resourcefulness, open-mindedness, new ideas in how to sell safety, such as the signs throughout the United States say: "Drive safely, our squirrels do not know one nut from the other". This could apply in your promotional piece in this great province. The next letter is S, sensibility to the needs of people in the broad picture of opening the driving examination centres when the people want it opened; opening the licence plate offices when people want it, not when you want to or when your employees tell you when they are going to work or not. You have to run this show; that is your job. If you ran a business this way, you would go broke in a week.

The next letter is A, the ability to study and learn the technologies of other jurisdictions and how they can be adapted here. If we wait on the same ratio as the United States are going about it, in 1968 they will have their standard—that is complete insofar as safety built in at the manufacturers' level is concerned, but the ability to learn and adapt these things for our people is also important. The D is for dedication to serve people in selling safety. More than being a policeman, give them service.

The E is for enthusiasm, to do a job that will save lives. I have spelled "crusade" but I have left out one letter; that letter is U. No one can do it but you.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I welcome the reinforcement from the right in this whole struggle for car safety and for automobile insurance on the highways. We are delighted to know that the ranks are now breaking a bit and that what we have been fighting for, for years in the field of automobile insurance, is now starting to percolate. I would advise the hon. member that he think about this more seriously and realize this is the only way he is ever going to get what he wants. Then perhaps he can come

and talk to us about some further moves that he ought to be taking in his political career.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Would you accept him?

Mr. Young: Well, that has to be assessed. Would you like to get rid of him?

Now, Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we heard from the Minister of Transport again in the fields of automobile safety and insurance, regarding the various matters with which he is concerned. He has painted us a rosy picture, and I do not know why the hon. member for Grey North and I waste our time talking about it if, in fact, this is actually as he painted it. But I suppose we are a little sceptical of this. That is the reason why we are on our feet today, and we may have some criticisms to offer.

Certainly we congratulate him on the progress he is making in respect to driver training. I think this is one of the crucial factors in the whole field of safer highways and the cutting down of the accident rate. Drivers are the people who cause the accidents, as the Minister has said, in some measure, not in total but in some measure. And I have been one of those who for years have been advocating that in the high schools of this province we should be regarding the skills to be taught in respect to the automobile, as important as many of the other skills that are taught there. Because, after all, the automobile is a vital part of our civilization.

Every young person, we would expect, is going to drive one and realizing that the automobile is one of the most lethal weapons these young people will ever handle, many of them, then they ought to be taught respect for it and they ought to be taught how to use it properly.

So we have been advocating that this be incorporated into the structure of the curriculum. Young people will be willing to come after hours and over weekends if necessary and a speed-up ought to take place. But when the Minister informed us that 215 secondary schools are now teaching driver-training, he did not tell us if all the young people in these schools, that is the upper grades as they go through, are being taught. I hope they are, but his report says this year that 15 per cent of the young drivers are learning this way. But 15 per cent is not a percentage of which the Minister ought to be proud.

And while the Minister says that we are heading in the right direction, that may be true, but we are not heading with the speed we ought to be heading. Again the same problem emerges here as in so many other phases of government activity: we are just years too late in getting this process under way.

And the fact that we are now proceeding is not good enough; the fact is that we are proceeding on a course that we should have undertaken a decade past.

Now, the second matter which concerns us very seriously in the whole field of highway safety is that of inspection. The Minister has told us something of what is going on in the Downsview inspection service on the highway. And something of the complete inadequacy of Ontario's automobile inspection system is understood by the fact that the Downsview inspection lanes last year carried out 38-point mechanical inspections on 36,762 cars, if the figures are accurate. In addition, eight portable lanes did almost 72,000 cars, provincial police carried out 23,342 at 35 weigh-scale locations; a total of 132,000 cars.

A great many of those inspections were inadequate in discovering whether or not these cars were safe. When we consider that there are well over 1.5 million passenger vehicles on our highways, this means we inspected just under eight per cent of our cars and left 92 per cent without any form of public inspection.

And, Mr. Chairman, this is just not good enough. With rising traffic accident tolls, it becomes increasingly necessary to see that unsafe cars do not clutter up the highways and smash up their own occupants as well as users of the highways.

Already about 20 American states have mandatory safety inspection, as well as at least two of our provinces. This process is under way in Canada and it ought to be speeded up here in Ontario.

I was privileged last summer as were you, sir, and another member of this House, to meet with the garage operators association in the Canadiana motel. At that meeting, you will remember, Dr. Alfred Mosley showed us slides and gave us a very illuminating lecture. And out of his investigations he told us that he has altered his opinion as to the number of motor car accidents caused by drivers and the number caused by faulty vehicles, either new or used. In reading the Toronto *Daily Star* of November 22, 1966, I read these words:

> Dr. Alfred Mosley of the Trauma Institute, Lexington, Massachusetts, said that vehicle failure or defects may play a

role in 60 to 70 per cent of all traffic deaths. But in most cases, he told the garage operators association of Ontario, at the Canadiana motor hotel, police are satisfied to take a few notes, remove the bodies, and sweep up the mess. Medical examiners, he said, usually do not bother to collect evidence that would reveal the actual cause of death and often ignore evidence that was collected.

A five-year study of 124 fatal accidents by Harvard medical school, he said, showed that nearly 25 per cent of them were not accidents at all. Twelve of the victims committed suicide, 10 and possibly 12 other death vehicles had been sabotaged and five others had been deliberately crashed.

Now, in addition to that study I have a report of a Harvard road study. It states:

As many as half of the 50,000 motor vehicle deaths that occur throughout the nation each year may be the result of mechanical failures of automobiles, according to a study made public in New York city by Dr. Robert Bushbaum of the Harvard medical school. He said the implications of the study contradict the automobile manufacturers' contention that 90 per cent of car accidents are the fault of the driver. Bushbaum told the American college of physicians that he drew this conclusion from the relationship he found between required public motor vehicle inspection and motor vehicle death rates.

Mr. Chairman, this is a serious study. These are two serious studies undertaken by responsible people and responsible organizations and their results cannot be turned aside lightly.

Just recently, March 22, 1967, a jury brought attention to what is happening on our highways. A coroner's jury ruled that a 22-year-old youth was killed because his $20 car was unsafe. It recommended changes in Ontario's laws to require regular inspection of all cars. I realize that in this case the new legislation respecting the certification of used cars and their sale may tighten this up to some extent. But there are literally thousands of cars on our highways already bought and owned by people of various income levels; cars which are dangerous.

The jury found that the youth, Louis Cote, of Rockland, contributed to his death in a highway collision last November 13 because he failed to maintain his 1964 car in safe condition. It was a case of maintenance. The car's front suspension was terrible and apparently collapsed just before the crash in which Cote veered sharply to the left into the path of a car driven by Armand Reaume, 73, of Montreal. The elderly driver and his wife were both seriously injured. The jury recommended that all cars in Ontario be inspected for safety, either every six months or on a mileage basis.

Again, another coroner's jury recommended in connection with a death in a truck, and I quote:

Steel bulkheads to protect the driver in trucks carrying loads of steel were recommended yesterday by a coroner's jury inquiring into the death of Harold George, 25, of New Toronto. Six 500-pound bulkheads braced to the front of the trailer would prevent accidents which have claimed 17 lives in the past five years, said Bruce Henderson, workmen's compensation board inspector and a member of the transportation safety association.

Mr. Chairman, I bring this to your attention, realizing that work must be done to increase the safety of the cars on our highways. Already, as I have pointed out, many jurisdictions have done this. A brief was presented to the Minister last June 30, by the garage operators association. The brief points out that Texas reports that 15 per cent of its accidents were due to unsafe vehicle conditions before its inspection started. Afterwards this figure dropped to five per cent.

New Jersey included motor vehicle inspection in its official traffic safety programme and in the very first year, 1938, reported a 32 per cent drop in traffic fatalities. Reports from states conducting safety inspection programmes show that up to 55 per cent of all vehicles inspected are rejected as unsafe because one or more parts affecting safe driving conditions require immediate attention.

The state of Pennsylvania reported that all vehicles examined indicated 55 per cent were found to be in need of service attention.

The District of Columbia reported that the average reject was 50 per cent.

Now in the light of this, Mr. Chariman, certainly one would think that this government should be taking immediate steps to institute a stepped up inspection programme. There are just too many cars on our highways which have defects which even the drivers themselves do not realize are there. An inspection every six months by The Department of Transport would show up these defects, many of them, not all but a great many of them. This would send these cars

in to be repaired and in this way would save a great many lives, a great many accidents and a great many injuries.

Now the Minister has said to us this afternoon something about the province of Ontario leading the world, practically, in the whole matter of car safety. He points out, rightly, that last year after, although he did not say this, a great deal of urging he did pass, or this government passed, legislation which empowers him to mandate safety features of automobiles.

I have already said a great deal about this matter in this House and I do not intend to repeat myself this afternoon. But I do want to point this out, that the Minister, despite his assurances this afternoon, has not seen fit to use this power to mandate safety features in the cars in Ontario.

Now he does not tell us why he is waiting, whether he is waiting for the federal government—which also is very, very slow in this field and has so far refused to act—whether he is waiting for the United States to set up its standards and then will say, well we will do that in Ontario too.

He does talk about negotiating with the motor car industry. I do not know what these negotiations mean. We have asked him various questions during the year about this negotiating and we are simply assured that the motor car industry is just as interested as the rest of us in this whole field of safety and they are doing their best.

Now certainly at the present time in the United States there is a great battle going on, and the motor car companies today are engaged in a court battle to fight the mandate laid down by the United States government. Men who know their job say that the departments there are too often buckling under the pressure and are watering down the standards that are being set.

As a matter of fact, one of the safety experts in Washington, Dr. William Stieglitz, who has been quoted in this House before, an engineer hired to consult on vehicle safety standards, resigned from the national traffic safety agency and denounced the standards announced by the government.

Most of the initial motor vehicle safety standards just issued by the agency, he said, are in my judgment totally inadequate. He wrote in his letter of resignation to Dr. William Haddon Jr., agency administrator, that for the most part they merely give an official stamp of safety to what would have been incorporated in the 1968 vehicles—even if federal standards had not been issued—and endorse the lowest level of performance within the industry, world wide, in each area covered.

Now this is the kind of a struggle which is going on in the United States. Leadership is being given, standards are being upped because of the very pressure of public opinion, the government is insisting on some standards, but Stieglitz says that those standards are being watered down to pretty low levels.

Now eventually it may be, Mr. Chairman, that with the increased public pressure, and with time, we may get much safer cars than we have today. I think we will; but in the meantime, people die because of a lack of the safety standards and because of a lack of safety features in our motor cars.

It is very significant, if I can find the clipping—while the automobile standards are being fought in the United States, the Canadian motor industry has announced that it has no objection to the standards that are being talked about by this government. Now this perhaps is very significant. It simply means that this government is going to accept what the Canadian car makers are willing to give and then announce that they are negotiating these particular things.

One of the matters which is of very great concern to the motoring public of Ontario is the fact that in Ontario we do not have to do what United States companies have to do. That is when safety defects are discovered, the automobile companies here do not have to register those safety defects with the Minister. They have to in the United States, and something of the seriousness of this was registered some time ago in a well publicized case, which I want to call to the attention of the Minister once more and put on record, not in its detail, because that has already come to his attention.

It is the case of a gentleman who had a Ford product and that Ford product proved to have a very defective brake system. The booster on the brake was defective, it was not working properly. Mr. Gordon Wells, of Don Mills, came to see me one day and he pointed out that his brakes had failed, one time going across the intersection of Finch and Dufferin. Fortunately there was no other traffic there and he got way with it.

Then again, the brakes failed at the intersection of Don Mills Road and one of the cross streets—Eglinton Avenue it was. Again he was fortunate. The third time the brakes failed, but each time between failures he took the car back to the dealer and the dealer

courteously repaired it and each time a new booster was put on and as he later discovered, a new type of booster was installed.

Now that was generous of the company. He took it up with the Ford Motor Company itself in Oakville and the word that came back from Ford was that this was the first time that they had ever heard of such a brake failure and when he took it to The Department of Transport, I suppose rightly under the present circumstances, he was told that there was nothing they could do unless an accident occurred.

Now Mr. Wells, unable to get redress here, and with word that this was the first time this had ever happened, went further. We looked at the situation and found that there had been four different types of boosters put on that car. Now a company like Ford does not work out four different types of boosters unless there is more than one case involved. We found out from Washington that no record had been given there, in spite of legislation, of any defect of this kind in the Ford product. So finally this matter was taken up with the officials in Washington and a couple of days later action came—and I have a letter from George C. Neale, acting director, motor vehicles safety performance service, dated February 24, 1967, which says—

> Thank you for your letter of February 16, 1967, on behalf of Mr. Gordon S. Wells regarding a defective power brake booster in his 1967 Ford Fairlane GT. On the basis of your letter and on a telephone call from Mr. Wells we contacted the Ford Motor Company and requested they immediately investigate this complaint. As a result of their investigation the Ford Motor Company initiated a recall campaign involving about 217,000 vehicles to inspect and replace as necessary certain power brake booster assemblies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the thing that concerns me really is that because of the failure to act on the part of this Minister and this government, a citizen of this province had to go to a foreign capital to get redress and to get satisfaction in connection with a safety defect on his motor car registered and driven in Ontario. So it seems to me and it seems to a great many people that the time is here when this Minister should mandate that any safety defect—and there have been a great many of them this year—in 1967, during the model year should be registered with him and that certain steps be taken from that point on. Now he may say that the manufacturers inform him of this—it may well be that quietly this is done—I do not know. I hope it is, but at least this thing should be made public so that people who have bought similar cars which may carry defects might know it quickly and might have life itself saved.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are several other items that I would like to mention this afternoon. The hon. member for Grey North has already mentioned some.

There is the matter, for example, of the rear lights of motor cars. I asked the question in the House last year. This has been a matter of some discussion and the Minister is aware of it. I hope, as he said last year, that he is looking into it. There has been some feeling that the red stop light on motor vehicles is just not adequate, that we ought to be thinking in terms of a colour scheme which harmonizes with the stop-go traffic light colour scheme. Last year when this was discussed the Minister indicated that this might be a good idea. I ask him now if some progress has been made. I realize this would have to be a matter of agreement across the country but the Ministers of Transport are meeting regularly and are discussing these problems.

Is any progress being made in changing the rear running light of motor cars to green to correspond to the go signal on our traffic lights along our highways? This would differentiate between the red stop light and the green light, which can be seen much more readily—at least it can be differentiated much more readily from the stop lights which we have today. This seems to me to be the kind of thing which can be worked out if there is a will to work it out. It might take seven, eight, even ten years to get the thing finalized but transitions of this kind are not unknown. It seems to me that with the initiation of this Minister and this department, such a change could well take place.

I have mentioned, and the hon. member for Grey North has also mentioned, the matter of tires and the standards that should be set up there. Again I urge the Minister that more research should be undertaken by this government in the field of tires. I think that the V-1 standards that have been set are an indication of some progress. But the information I have is that this standard was set first of all by the tire manufacturers, and that the Minister himself has accepted their suggestions and has set up in his regulations the kind of standards which the industry itself has agreed to. There are certain deficiencies and difficulties in these standards which I am not going to discuss at this particular time but I think the Minister is aware of them.

The reflectorized licence plates I think, too, are a matter which ought to have serious consideration. I add my voice to that of the member for Grey North and urge again upon the Minister that this matter be seriously considered. I do not think the extra cost would in any way—it is very small—and not in any way would it make up for the added safety after dark on our highways.

I do want to make reference to the matter of motorcycles in our province. As the Minister knows, and as we all know, the motorcycle population on our roads is increasing by leaps and bounds. Perhaps those words are more true than one would hope, because too many people are hitting obstructions and bounding off the motorcycles. During this past year deaths in motorcycle accidents have been very high; the injuries have been very severe because when an accident occurs injuries are almost inevitable. Again, the Minister knows the problem but he has not yet seen the necessity of mandating certain matters in connection with motorcycles which would make for greater safety.

I think particularly safety helmets. The Minister said in this House before that we do not yet have sufficient standards but I point out to him that standards have already been set in other jurisdictions. Some of the provinces of this nation and certainly a great many other jurisdictions have discovered that they can set standards and that they can enforce the wearing of helmets. For the protection of our young people particularly, who are driving motorcycles in this province, the Minister ought to take action immediately to mandate the safety helmet—to mandate that every person riding a motorcycle should wear a helmet. Other things like the crash bars on the side of the motorcycle should also be mandated for the protection of limbs of the drivers and their passengers.

The other matter which disturbs me a very great deal is the way so many of the drivers of motorcycles use those vehicles on the streets. Only last evening I was driving north when a motorcyclist cut in between me and the car next to me with a roar and made his way up and swung in front passing us on the white line. Now there was real danger here of his being squeezed between the two cars; only evasive action by the car next to me made that impossible, but again I urge upon the Minister that he consider seriously an amendment to The Highway Traffic Act which says that motorcycle drivers should use the lanes of the roadway and that only in passing should they get out of those lanes and then should use the other lane to pass so that they are not squeezing in between lines of traffic and endangering themselves and other motorists who are using the road and the highways.

Mr. Chairman, I think those are the remarks I wanted to make this afternoon. As we go on to the detailed estimates I will have other observations to make and some good advice to offer the Minister, advice which I hope he is willing to take in the year ahead.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, in that many of the matters that have been raised by the two Opposition speakers—the member for Grey North and the member for Yorkview—will fall within the item-by-item consideration of the estimates, I think we might deal with them more effectively then, if it would meet the wishes of the two speakers. If they would feel freer then to pursue the questioning, it might better serve their purpose and I would be glad to do it that way.

There are a few general observations I would make in reply to what has been said, and I would start by saying that I do appreciate not only the comments of the two members, but the nature of their observations and the direction of their thinking. It is most helpful to have these two speakers contributing to the debate—if it may be regarded as such—on highway safety, because there is nothing more vital to our modern way of living than an improvement in safety on our highways. To have two such dedicated members making contributions out of a background of experience and interest, is most encouraging.

I would like to say that we could bring in laws ad infinitum regulating traffic with rules of the road, regulating the manufacture and use and licensing of vehicles and regulating the drivers, but that would not give us traffic safety. Laws alone will not do it, whether the concern be of governments federal, provincial or municipal. The only thing that will substantially contribute to a breakthrough in traffic safety is when people of all kinds and classes in all parts of this country, become seized with the importance of highway safety.

I want to again say how much I appreciate the kind of contribution we are receiving from members opposite. This Ministry is not moribund as some might want to represent on a political occasion of this kind, and I do say with some confidence and some degree of satisfaction that we have made tremendous strides in recent years.

The member for Grey North—he is not in his seat—emphasized that we should go out and get "rough" with the manufacturers, that I should be using the iron fist. I think the member for Yorkview is somewhat similarly minded; that we would be doing our job better if we made more noise; if we had a campaign more like that going on before the Senate committee under Senator Ribicoff in Washington, that we might profit by getting a lot of press; that we might be directing people's attention to the unsafe car—and we might be getting more safety equipment on the cars that way.

I have to say to this House, and I say it out of some experience and some feeling, that I do not believe that that is the way to get the best results.

In the first place, I think that there has been altogether too much emphasis in this last year and a half or more, on the vehicle *per se*, as distinct from the driver.

In the second place, I do not believe that the kind of approach that has been used in the United States, in an endeavour to achieve car safety through the medium of mandating these items, has got anything like the successful results that we have by our different approach, and the facts are there to prove it.

Now having said that, I will come back to a reiteration of what I said in my earlier remarks—and I am sorry that the member for Grey North was not here when I said this a few moments ago. When he was speaking about going after the manufacturers to get results, I recalled saying in my introductory remarks that when the general service administration down there had brought forward its proposals on car safety items, and the new federal highway safety agency that was set up under President Johnson's $700 million highway safety bill, started to work on the business, they drew up a list of 23 safety items that were to be mandated by the 1968 model year, which is about September 1.

It was watered down to 20 items, as members know. I think one is on the way out now, and two are the subject of action before the courts. That leaves 17 remaining, but I want to tell you that when they started to mandate these 19 or 20 items for September, and then put them off until January 1, 1968—we already had 16 of the 20 items as standard equipment in Ontario, and they had only eight of them in the United States.

I say to you that to me that is convincing evidence that—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): But that was 16 of 20 of a watered down programme—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Granted, but it is far better than eight—it is twice as many.

Mr. Bryden: It still is not very good; I mean, we know the power of the lobby down there.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: They still do not have as much, and with all their hollering down there and with all their mandating powers, they are not going to be any better off than we are, if as well off.

Mr. Bryden: In other words, we are all badly off.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I am not going to argue that. We all want more highway safety, and no one more than I, and those associated with me. I want to say that I am happy to have surrounding me, a staff of men as dedicated to traffic safety and as well-informed and highly regarded across this continent, as the members of the staff of The Ontario Department of Transport.

The member for Yorkview raised one other point, and that is with regard to recalls. Perhaps I would deal better with that if I leave it until we get into the items, because I want to give him some detailed information on the recall programme that the car manufacturers follow and some rather contradictory evidence to what he has put before the House.

There is one other item I might deal with generally, although we can deal with it later in the estimates as it would come up—perhaps under "vehicle inspection" but not necessarily—and that has to do with the reflectorized licence plates.

This is a very appealing subject and a great many people catch on to it almost automatically. If cars are being bumped into in the dark, and their lighting systems have failed, and reflectorization can be put on, why not?

If it were as simple and as obvious as that, do not think that we would not have been into it long ago—and I want to clear the record that it is not because of the cost that we are concerned with whether we have them or not.

Reflectorization is a matter of importance. We already have a requirement for so much reflectionization on the front and back of vehicles. We increased the areas of reflectorization in amendments to The Highway Traffic Act on the front and back of the car, two years ago.

We have done some considerable study on the need for reflectorization since, on the area, on the place and on the shape.

In the list of items recommended by the general services administration in the United States, there were two items, numbers 108 and 112 dealing with reflectorization. Item 108, as I understand it, has been put into effect, that is for additional reflectorization on vehicles over 80 inches in width.

The passenger vehicle size of vehicle is dealt with, as regards reflectorization, under item 112, and action on that item has been put off because there is negotiation going on between the administration, the new national highway traffic safety agency and the manufacturers. In other words, if we need more reflectorization, we should ascertain how much is needed and where it should go.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister accept a question here? He seems to be qualifying the benefits of this.

This seems to have been proven in over 50 per cent of the American states. If it has been proven there, why is it not adopted here?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, we already have reflectorization front and back, as I said, and it is spelled out—

Mr. Sargent: Where?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In our Act; we require reflectorization—

Mr. Sargent: Why is it not put on the plates where it belongs, not on your Act? Put it on the licence plates.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I differ in that respect with the member, because I do not think that the place in which it should go is, essentially, the licence plates. I treat reflectorization—

Mr. Sargent: That is what we are talking about—licence plates.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I know that, but I am talking about reflectorization. If we need reflectorization, let us put it where it should go.

Someone asked the expert from New York state, Senator Speno, when he was here, speaking on his safety car a year ago, if he thought we should have reflectorized plates, and he said "No". If we need reflectorization, then use it where it is needed.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The reflectorization the Minister is talking about is done by an electrical system, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, no.

Mr. Singer: What reflectorization is compulsory now on private automobiles?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Around the automobile lights—the light rims is where it usually goes, but it is unrelated to the light. It reflectorizes whether the light is on or not. It is reflectorized by the approaching light, the same as a reflectorized plate would be.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister a question here then? I think that he may be on sound ground when he says that the reflectorization may not necessarily go on the licence plates, that it may better go on the extremities of the car, so that people can see the boundaries of the car.

I am not going to quarrel with that. I brought in the licence plate because this seems to be a method by which the whole matter can be brought forceably to his attention and the attention of the House. But he says there is legislation.

How long do we have to wait before we can establish this matter of where the reflectorization shall go, what it shall be, what degree it shall reach? It just seems to me that we are going along year after year, after year, and we are not getting this job done. Meantime, the crashes are taking place on the highways when light systems fail.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I would want to give a date on it, but I would not be surprised if cars, either this year, the new models coming out this year, or the following year, will have much greater reflectorized surfaces than we have now.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister not familiar with the Ontario motor league, and would he not agree with me that that is a pretty responsible body who have the concern of safety on the highways at heart at least as much as the Minister and I do?

I am sure the Minister received, as I did, and perhaps as many other members did, their recent brief, their most recent submission. Very high on the list of priorities in that is the recommendation of that important body, which has thousands of members over the province of Ontario, that there be reflectorized licences. The Minister is back again to the point that has been complained about by many members in this House, but the lead is taken not by the government in this matter, but by the manufacturers. The concern that

we have, Mr. Chairman, is that no lead is offered by this department.

The Minister says that next year or the year after, there is going to be increased reflectorization. It is obvious from that statement, Mr. Chairman, that that increased reflectorization is going to come solely at the behest of the manufacturers. This is Ontario's Minister of Transport, and statistics show and students agree and experts agree and the Ontario motor league recommends that we have reflectorized licences. For goodness sake, why cannot the Minister move?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we are getting a little off–

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if we could simply stick to the Minister's reply and then let us have the questions back and forth during the actual votes? I think that is generally the procedure, to have the three estimate votes and then have the questions during the various votes as they come up. I wonder if you would simply make a reply and we will get into these votes?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I was just trying to deal with a few of the matters that have been made by the two speakers, that I thought perhaps did not particularly fit into any of the items, but on which they would appreciate having some comments before we get into the individual items.

The other matter was, I think, with respect to air fields and air strips across our great north country. I said in my remarks that consideration will be given to landing strips, airports, related matters, with a view to formulating an appropriate policy. And that is where we are at the moment in this matter of looking into the need for air strips in the northern and western parts of Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: Are we going to go on to the votes now?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: Good idea.

On vote 2201.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question relating to a letter he wrote me several months ago regarding the establishment of a permanent Department of Transport office in the municipality of Leamington, to service that immediate area.

I wonder if the Minister has the information with him as to when the moneys and staff and accommodation will be available to establish this new office in Essex county?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think this is a matter which will come up under driver examination centres.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this vote which deals with the general administration of the department, I would like to refer to one matter which to an extent arises out of the remarks made by the Minister a minute or two ago.

He said, during the course of those remarks, that he thought–I will not attempt to quote him, but I think this will be a fair summary of what he said–that in the past year or two far too much emphasis had been placed on the vehicle as a cause of accidents, rather than on the driver.

I would like to say that, in my opinion, the Minister is quite mistaken in this. The propaganda of the automobile companies, of course, has always been to blame the nut behind the wheel, as they have called him, the unfortunate driver who is involved in an accident–it may be because of some lapse on his part, it may be because of mechanical failure in the vehicle. In any case whatever the initial cause of the accident, there is no question at all that vehicle design is a major factor in the severity of injuries resulting from accidents, and as Nader put it before the Senate inquiry–

Mr. Singer: Would not this be vote 2204?

Mr. Bryden: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: You are speaking about policy.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, this is preliminary to a matter which I want to raise which relates to statistics, and I think that comes under general administration. But it is statistics about accidents. I can appreciate your difficulty, sir, and the difficulty of the other members in seeing that my remarks are in order, so I will cut this preliminary right to the very minimum and merely say that Nader made this point very strongly before the Senate committee, that even if the man is a nut, there is no reason why he should be maimed for life, or killed, if it is possible to build vehicles that would make his injuries less severe.

However, the point I am really interested in at this stage, Mr. Chairman, is this: The Minister says that the driver is perhaps the most serious problem in accidents. I have questioned that. I have suggested that the

vehicle may very well be a much larger factor in accidents than the Minister and the industry suggest. The basic point is that we do not really know what the basic causes of accidents are, because our information on the subject is inadequate.

I am aware that statistics are gathered regularly by The Department of Transport and published in quite detailed breakdowns, year by year. I do not wish in any sense to cast any reflections on the people engaged in gathering, collating and publishing those statistics. I think they do useful work and I always appreciate receiving the results of their work in the very clear way in which they present it.

The only trouble, Mr. Chairman, is that they have to rely pretty largely on reports from police officers who investigate accidents at the time. Automobile accidents, I think it can be fairly said, are extremely complex problems and a report by a police officer, by itself, is really not sufficient to get to the bottom of the cause of an accident. The officer, who is trained to conduct certain types of investigations on the spot, is able to note certain facts, but I think it is being more and more realized, that there is a lot more involved in automobile accidents than can be noted by a police officer making a fairly routine, and fairly superficial investigation after the accident has occurred.

As a matter of fact, automobile accidents are now being recognized, I think, as a public health problem, as constituting an epidemic. I think the Minister of Health last year said that he recognized them as a public health problem and he thought that public health administration may have to interest itself in this problem. I am not sure if he said the same thing again this year. If he said it I was not here when he said it, but I remember very clearly that he said it last year. The problem of automobile accidents is really one that must be investigated as a public health problem with all the detailed in-depth-type study that is required in that sort of investigation.

The tragedy, Mr. Chairman, is this. It is not that The Department of Transport at the moment does not produce better figures—it produces the best figures it is able to at the present time—but the great tragedy is that in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto a study was in progress which was designed to deal with this precise public health problem, to conduct in-depth investigations into the causes of automobile accidents or at any rate into the cause of those that are so severe as to lead to deaths. Such an inquiry was in progress in Toronto, ordered by Dr. Shulman before he was fired. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, this has really been scuttled by The Attorney General's Department.

I know the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) and the chief coroner for the province say the study has not been scuttled, but every statement they have made on the subject indicates that they do not understand the nature of the problem at all. They are both estimable gentlemen but they are living in the past. They are trying to deal with jet-age problems by horse-and-buggy methods. Shulman had this set up as a specific, detailed in-depth investigation to be under the direction of one coroner. He was to be totally responsible and that is the only way that an investigation of this type can be meaningful. One person must be—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Is this in my department?

Mr. Bryden: Well, the Minister should be concerned about this. This is a matter of accumulating information about the causes of accidents. I am suggesting that the Minister's statistics are not adequate, that they do not give us sufficient information about the causes of accidents. I am not blaming him for that. He is producing the best statistics he is able to produce at the moment. But I am suggesting that he should be vitally concerned with any studies and investigations that can improve his statistics.

I would have thought the Minister of Transport would have been vitally concerned about the inquiry that Dr. Shulman had directed Dr. Porter to undertake. I would have thought that the Minister would have made strong representations to have that inquiry continue in the form in which it was laid down, which is the only form that will produce meaningful results.

In fact, I notice that in this vote the Minister has an item described as item 6, fees and expenses for special studies and research, for which he is asking a total of $410,000. I recognize that this is special research in a great many fields, not merely relating to automobile safety, but I am suggesting that here was a study that was in process at no cost to the department which could have given the Minister most useful information. And now we have had the thing really reduced to a nullity. Dr. Cotnam has now tried to argue that we will have the good old horse and buggy system of every coroner doing a little bit of everything, when

we know that here is a specialized problem that can be dealt with adequately only by a man who is specializing in the field.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the member for Woodbine is determined to circumvent the Chairman's ruling.

Mr. Bryden: The Chairman has made no ruling.

Mr. White: I think, sir, that you should bring him to order because his comments do not relate to the vote before us.

Mr. Bryden: They certainly do. If the hon. member for London South would pay attention to the debates he would be well aware that this relates directly to the vote; it relates to the whole question of getting information about—

Mr. White: The member's ingenuity is not in question.

Mr. Bryden: Nor should there be any question about me being in order. This is right under this vote, a vote which covers the gathering of information relating to the causes of accidents as well as others things. And I am just saying to the Minister that there was a study in progress that could have given him most useful information and it was scuttled before his very eyes. I believe he should have made some strong representations about it. Since he apparently made no representations at all, I am now taking it upon myself to protest in the strongest possible terms that this study should have been altered to the point where—

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this should come under the Attorney General's votes.

Mr. Bryden: It should not.

Mr. White: This hon. member is out of order.

Mr. Bryden: The unfortunate thing is that it came under The Attorney General's Department; this is the sort of thing that this department should have been doing.

Mr. White: The member is completely out of order.

Mr. Bryden: They have not been doing it and there was one man in The Attorney General's Department who undertook to do it because nobody else was doing it. But of course he got the axe because anybody who really wants to do a job is *persona non grata* with this government. That is the trouble; he was a man who wanted to do a job, so we have no studies of any kind proceeding in this field and yet it is probably the most vital field that the department should be concerned with.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the collection of accident statistics—I use the word that appears on the front of that report though I do not agree with it—is being done in the best way with the facilities we have, relying on the sources of information we have. But I have to disagree with the member, sir, when he asserts that it is not the driver, that it is the vehicle that causes the collisions.

I think it was a year ago, there were 235,000 vehicles involved in motor vehicle collisions and I prefer to use the word "collisions". I think "accidents" is an invitation to irresponsibility, that the word "accident" suggests it was an unavoidable and inevitable collision. And we know that is not the fact, that most automobile collisions are caused, and they are caused by the carelessness and recklessness of the driver, by the disregard of the driver for the rights of others.

According to the police reports on those accidents in 94.1 per cent of the cases the vehicle was in apparently good condition and in 3.1 per cent of the cases the condition of the vehicle was not reported. That leaves a figure of 2.5 per cent only where the vehicle was found to possess some fault or defect that could have been, but was not necessarily responsible for the collision.

I want to keep that in context, and let us realize that most accidents are caused by the driver. Now, the member has made—

Mr. Bryden: According to the Minister's statistics, that is all.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is right, relying on what statistics we have and I will agree with the member that there is a desirability for having better statistics collected in these traffic collisions. Indeed, I have made this representation to the authorities in Ottawa, who have been trying to involve themselves in some way in traffic safety and perhaps getting mixed up in what is purely within the provincial jurisdiction. And I have suggested that one of the areas in which the federal authorities might very well interest themselves would be in the matter of research on traffic collisions and on injuries.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, just in this connection, I wonder what the Minister's

comment would be on the two studies that I have brought before him this afternoon. Certainly his statistics show one thing and his statistics are based on the policeman who looks at the car or casual witnesses then and later on, but in too many cases there is no "in depth" study of what actually took place. The car is not torn down; we are not sure what causes might have contributed to that accident.

Where studies have taken place—such as those by Dr. Mosley and his group—where they took the car, tore it down piece by piece, examined it carefully, looked at it with a microscope if necessary, their verdict is that well over half the accidents are caused by defects in the motor vehicle, or the occupants wished for suicide or something of this kind. Certainly, a suicidal wish and a suicidal determination is the nut behind the wheel, I suppose.

But by and large, when you have studies in depth of this kind we have a verdict that the mechanical failure is there and that there is very great need for not only closer supervision of new cars but very close and regular supervision and inspection of the cars on the highway. Does the Minister dismiss studies of this kind as inconsequential?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think particularly the Mosley report that the member refers to was too limited in its reach, and further than that the results that came out of the Mosley report, I think, are at such variance with the findings of other studies that they are not acceptable to most authorities. It is worth looking into and worth following with interest but as I say it was too limited and it is too far out to be acceptable to most authorities.

Mr. Young: Is the Minister not concerned to do some real in-depth studies in this province in the same way?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have been interested in the work that is being proposed and we hope it will be assisted by the federal government. That is being advanced by the TIRF organization in which I was interested from its beginning, and we will follow its work with hope and interest for I think that there is some likelihood of it really getting off the ground now that the federal government and the national research council are showing an interest in this field.

Mr. Young: Well, the national research council is doing something.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I could readily understand that it might be difficult to study all automobile accidents, but I think that the Minister could undertake a study of accidents in which death is involved. Now here this afternoon we have heard a lot of comment concerning the fact that the automobile was to blame in the majority of these accidents. Well the state of Michigan did conduct—I should not say the state itself, but the American automobile association in the state of Michigan—did conduct studies on 20 per cent of 2,296 traffic accidents. That meant there would have been about 450 traffic accidents in which fatalities were involved.

The results from the studies there showed that some basic law violation by drivers was the primary cause in 89 per cent of the fatal accidents. Pedestrians were blamed in an additional 8.5 per cent, cyclists in 1.9 per cent. This covers nearly 99.5 per cent of the traffic fatalities examined by auto club investigators. Only eight automobile defects were found, none of these defects could have caused the accidents.

Now Mr. Chairman, be this so, I think it is incumbent upon your department to conduct similar studies so that once and for all we could come along and assess blame to the individual or the vehicle. I think laying blame on the vehicle by some, and others saying it is the driver is not good enough. I think we should finalize this so that we would know whether it is the vehicle or the driver. From Michigan's studies you would have to conclude that it was the driver. From the studies that the hon. member mentions it is the vehicle. There is nothing conclusive here.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman this is obviously a very involved subject. It is not one that relates to our department alone but in which I can assure you our department is vitally interested. It involves health, it involves law enforcement because a great deal of the correction would obviously be done by the law enforcement officers in conjunction with health and hospitals and doctors. This is the kind of study that TIRF has been interested in doing. In fact they have made some presentations to The Attorney General's Department as to how they could cooperate with the police officers in making much better reports—Reports in depth of the kind I think both members are referring to on traffic accidents. It would be an extension of the ACIR study from Cornell.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to you that in the ensuing year you study traffic fatalities.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to call upon His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and ask him to give Royal assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has at its present sittings thereof passed certain bills to which, in the name and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Assistant Clerk of the House: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 60, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Bill 61, An Act respecting The Whirlpool Rapids Bridge Act.

Bill 62, An Act respecting The Lewiston-Queenston Bridge Act.

Bill 63, An Act to amend The Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964.

Bill 64, An Act to amend The Energy Act, 1964.

Bill 68, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

Bill 69, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Bill 70, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Bill 72, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Bill 75, An Act to amend The Human Tissue Act, 1962-1963.

Bill 80, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Bill 81, An Act respecting the township of Cornwall.

Bill 97, An Act to amend The Ontario Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, 1967.

To these Acts the Royal assent was announced by the Clerk of the legislative assembly in the following words:

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 25, by Mr. Worton.

RESOLUTION: That, in view of the present grave housing shortage in Ontario, the government should establish a fund for the provision of inexpensive second mortgages, similar to the successful fund established for this purpose to meet the housing shortage in Ontario in 1948, and that this fund be administered by the present Ontario housing corporation, in order to accelerate house construction in Ontario and make it easier for Ontario citizens to own their own houses.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): I move, seconded by Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls), Resolution No. 25 standing in my name, which has just been read.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all very conscious of the present grave housing shortage in Ontario, a shortage which affects all parts of our province. I know that we are all concerned about this and I appreciate the motives of concern which have led the government to introduce its Home Ownership Made Easy programme. But I also know that many of us feel, and many of us have expressed this view, that the programme is not necessarily going to be sufficient or adequate to deal with the housing problem. It may not operate quickly or effectively enough to counteract the urgent and pressing shortage of home accommodation.

The government should offer prospective home buyers inexpensive second mortgages and this move would tend to lower down payments.

Mr. Speaker, we believe on this side of the House, that all citizens of Ontario should be able to look forward to owning their own home. The provincial government, in coop-

eration with the federal government should make it easier for people to buy their own home. This can be done by using government funds at lower down payments and lower interest rates. Monthly mortgage payments could be lowered by spreading them over a longer term in cases of need.

We believe that in a province as wealthy as Ontario, that a real home owning democracy can be established. Of course, the grave housing shortage is not a completely new phenonenon.

Mr. Speaker, there have been several occasions in our history when similar shortages have existed. I think it would be useful to look back at some of the measures that have been implemented in the past to deal with this type of shortage.

If we go back, for instance, to 1948 when there was also a lack of housing, we find that some ideas were put forward and put into practice which were extremely useful. One of these was the establishment of an Ontario housing development operation. In 1948 this corporation, which should not be confused with the present Ontario housing corporation, accepted applications for approximately 3 years. If you refer back to the introduction of that operation, you will see that the government of the day and I want to give full credit—this operation was brought into effect by a Conservative government—and if you look back, you will see that the then Minister of planning and development, Mr. Porter, brought his proposal into effect to encourage and assist effectively, the building of housing accommodation. This was the problem then and it is still the problem now.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that we need to develop a new market in home ownership, and one of the reasons why home building has fallen off is on account of the high down payment that is required to build. That was also the problem in 1948.

The Housing Development Act which was introduced in the Legislature in April of 1948, had, as one of its major aims, the reduction of down payments on houses, and it accomplished this by making available second mortgage loans to first occupants of newly built, single family houses.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that a similar approach would be useful today and the government should establish a similar fund to meet the same kind of need which we have today. During this period of operation, housing corporation limited, which was set up to administer this programme, made loans in the amount of $17 million.

The maximum loan at that time was $1,250 with an interest rate of 3.5 per cent and the terms were for 20 years. Approximately 15,000 loans were made.

No doubt, different kinds of limits would have to be established today to take into account the higher costs of home construction, but the principle which was made effective in the scheme is still valid today—and that is, by aiding with second mortgages, we can do a great deal to cut down the heavy burden of high down payments required for prospective home purchasers.

A prospective buyer should be able to buy a standard house for a down payment of $700—or even less in a case of need.

In the United States, it is possible to acquire a house for $17,500 with a down payment of $700, under the federal housing administration, and it is suggested that our financing, in connection with home ownership, should be expanded and brought into line with United States regulations.

Mr. Speaker, some 3,000 families in the city of Toronto—and I might say that in my own area, there are some 200 families—are waiting for public housing, but the Toronto housing authority has obtained only 56 units geared to income housing.

The Ontario housing corporation, although it has a good record of public housing in the suburbs, has provided only 47 units in the city of Toronto. It is obvious that urban renewal should be increased.

Housing is a necessity and family life is subject to disintegration when people are forced to live in miserable and unattractive surroundings.

It is for these reasons that I have put forward this resolution in my name. I believe that it would be a relatively simple administrative operation to establish a fund to aid with inexpensive second mortgages. The history of the previous housing corporation limited is one of great success. There were almost no bad debts incurred under the programme.

When we have had a past example of successful activity in this difficult and crucial field, in providing more homes for our citizens, surely it makes good sense to be guided by that success in providing a similar programme for our present needs.

Mr. Speaker, these needs are urgent. Immediate action along the lines I have suggested would not be a full solution to the shortage, but it would be a useful step.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. G. R. Carton (Armourdale): Mr. Speaker, I concur heartily in the reasons advanced by the hon. member for Wellington South in bringing this resolution forward, and I am happy to play a small part in this debate.

The problem confronting the government, insofar as mortgage lending is concerned, cannot be understood without first briefly examining the historical background of mortgage funds in this province. A considerable number of loans are made by private investors from their own funds, while major investments emanate from the pooled savings of the populace at large.

In addition, it is true that, in Canada, we have the life insurance companies, banks, the trust and loan companies, and also the trustees of pension funds and estates. Under the joint loan arrangements in force during the period 1935 to 1954, only a segment of these sources could participate.

The Bank Act did not permit banks to invest in mortgage loans while the pension funds, and other estate funds, were precluded from operating, since they were unable to meet certain statutory requirements prescribed for lending institutions.

Neither of these groups could purchase mortgage loans made under any of the national housing Acts.

In 1954, the new National Housing Act was passed enabling chartered banks to become NHA mortgage lenders. A provision was made to allow such mortgages to be held by any person or company, provided that the insured mortgages were continuously administered and serviced by an approved lender under the Act, and this opened the national housing mortgage door to pension funds and to holders of other trustee funds, as well as to individuals.

The banks at that time, sir, were not too pleased at the prospect of becoming mortgage lenders, as shown by the minutes and evidence of the standing committee on banking and commerce, for the period February 2 to March 2, 1954.

During the committee discussions on Bill 102, the banks indicated an unwillingness to enter the mortgage field. Bill 102, you will recall, proposed the complete abandonment of the joint loan system previously used, under which the government directly, or through CMHC, had contributed upwards to one-quarter of the joint loan mortgage loan funds.

Under the new National Housing Act of 1954, a system of insured mortgage loans was inaugurated to replace the previous joint loan technique, wherein the full amount of a loan would be provided by an approved lender.

The lenders could make large ratio loans which would be insured against loss by the insurance fund, and the borrower would have to pay an additional fee of two per cent of the loan if the loans were advanced in progress advances, and 0.25 per cent less, if the borrower required the full fund at completion and this is the procedure which is now being used.

In 1948, Mr. Speaker, the province of Ontario entered the second mortgage field briefly, through the Ontario housing corporation. While the province's experience in this field was not an unpleasant one, caution must be taken to realize that the circumstances of today are completely different from the 1940's.

We cannot plunge the province into the second mortgage field without first envisaging the problems that would confront it, and its entry into the area of secondary financing.

The problem is one of enabling the purchaser to meet the required cash down payment to purchase a new home. It is suggested that this be done by a low interest, second mortgage over and above the CMHC loan, provided that funds are available.

What are some of the problems, Mr. Speaker, that immediately come to mind? Should the province make the loan itself or should the loan emanate from a private source with a guarantee of repayment by the province of Ontario to the individual making such loans? What percentage, over and above the first mortgage loan, should be loaned by the province to the borrower? What should the payment period be in order to enable the borrower to repay this loan without serious financial hardship to himself? One must consider the ratio of lending to income.

Should we set a maximum amount to be loaned in dollar figures, or should we base the loan amount on a percentage of the total sale price of the house?

That is, we have a range today of $18,000 to $30,000, Mr. Speaker, which is a spread of $12,000, whereas back in the 1940's we had a spread of $2,500, being from $12,000 to $14,500.

How will we arrive at a proper and effective interest rate for the secondary financing, sufficient to draw private lenders into the

second mortgage lending field? Should the province enter the secondary lending field insofar as older homes are concerned?

Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the problems that crop up. There is no question that if the province enters the secondary mortgage field at this time, we will be introducing the highest loan-to-value ratio in Canadian mortgage lending history.

It is imporant to note, Mr. Speaker, that we must be aware of the possibility of a resulting increase—continued spiralling increase, sir—in housing values, due to more readily available finances. This is an inherent danger if we enter the secondary financing field, no matter what method we use.

I think it is fair to say that our housing shortage cannot be overcome unless some form of secondary financing is introduced, to enable the purchaser to buy new homes, and also to give the builder a proper incentive to accelerate his ability to build them.

Yet every attempt must be made to vest the mortgage lending business in the hands of private enterprise, in order to obtain a constant flow of funds from those sources which might leave the field, if the government takes over financing of homes in its entirety.

In other words, we must not, Mr. Speaker, permit the government to take over those segments of mortgage lending where conventional lending might prove to be adequate.

For the purposes of preparation of this debate, sir, I discussed this problem with a number of knowledgeable people and have come up with a rather different approach than the hon. member for Wellington South.

One suggestion, sir, that I would like to advance is the possibility of pegging the provincial interest lending rates of secondary loans for new housing at one per cent above the then current CMHC rate of interest.

The term would be three to five years, bearing in mind, on this term, that the methods of raising money usually involve a three to five year term. The province of Ontario could then insure these loans so as to attract the private lender to enter the field of secondary financing, for as a matter of incentive, he would be receiving an effective interest rate of one per cent more than the usual interest rate charged.

This would eliminate the loan sharks. At the same time I would point out that the difference in payment on $1,000 amortized over 25 years, between seven per cent and eight per cent, is 63 cents per month. As a further corollary, sir, the builders would be more inclined to take back second mortgages provided that the total mortgage debt did not exceed the percentage of the total amount approved. They could then dispose of these mortgages through sale for a slightly reduced price, or more than likely, at face value, since the loans would be insured by the province of Ontario.

Presently in most cases, sir, builders do take back second mortgage loans and in many cases they sell them at a considerable discount. This results in the builder increasing the sale price originally to take into consideration the fact that he is going to lose for the discounting of the second mortgage.

What sources of funds would be available, sir, if the province of Ontario insured these loans as I suggest? First of all the banks. It may or may not require an amendment to The Bank Act, sir, because I am not aware of the exact wording of the present changes. But certainly, if the government insured a portion of the loan—say 85 or 90 per cent—the banks would be interested. They would screen the borrower. They would be earning a higher interest rate and even personal loans could be secured by second mortgages as collateral.

Credit unions, sir, would be interested in government-insured secondary mortgages for its employees. These loans would provide a profitable outlet for their cash assets and at the same time help the employees who would be screened properly by their own people.

Pension funds, sir, if the government could guarantee loans made by this source 100 per cent, would provide an additional source of funds.

Loan corporations and savings funds. Provincially incorporated companies would be permitted to invest in secondary financing guaranteed by the province and they could be permitted to sell participation to mortgage investors.

Another thing, sir; joint loans could be made by the province of Ontario in conjunction with the builders, 50-50 on second mortgages taken back by the builders up to a stipulated amount.

In summary, sir, I do not believe that the province is in a position to invest large sums of money—and indeed they would be large amounts—out of public funds. There are the hazards of collecting. The required amounts of principal are now too high, as I point out, sir. I could go to the 1940's when we loaned —I believe the maximum was $1,250. Today we would require second mortgages of

$3,000, $4,000, $5,000 and $6,000. The interest rate, sir, would have to be reasonably high to offset the risk and pay for the large costs of administrative personnel. It is as I said at the outset, a completely different picture, sir, than it was 20 years ago.

Second mortgage loans participation at the first level of government today are financially impracticable and mechanically almost impossible. Certainly if this is true, sir, in the area of new homes, it is *a fortiori* so in the area of older homes. The older home field should be left entirely to the conventional and private lenders. Government's purpose, sir, is to build thousands upon thousands of new homes which will then release the older homes for marketing. The government would, in my opinion, do much better in helping ease the problem if it concentrated on the land developing area. A Crown corporation could be set up solely for the purpose of buying all land, subdividing and selling at cost, thereby reducing the end price.

Land would be sold only to those builders agreeing to sell at a preset profit, not unlike sir, the limited dividend arrangement through CMHC. The provincial government could work in conjunction with the federal government and the municipal governments, obtaining money from the former and land from the latter. There would have to be built-in safeguards, sir, such as precluding resale of lots by builders, and so on, but these could be formulated.

In brief, this system would aid the purchaser of homes, which is what we are trying to do, by attacking the very problem at its nerve centre, land. This would be accomplished, sir, by municipal assistance in the purchase of raw land, by the province doing its own subdividing, which could be done expeditiously, and by the province selling at cost, or cost plus five per cent, and by using and utilizing any profits to purchase and subdivide more lands.

In closing, sir, I again commend the hon. member for Wellington South for bringing forth this resolution and allowing this important matter to be debated. I trust that some additional facts advanced on this subject today may be of some value to those who are charged with the responsibility in this area.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been advanced as a major item in a proposed solution to what is quite properly described in the resolution as the grave housing shortage in Ontario.

In my opinion, the resolution as presented to us demonstrates that the Liberal Party is as little attuned as the Tory government to the real nature and severity of the housing crisis. It would not be true to say that a second mortgage plan as proposed here would be of no use at all. It would not be true either to say that the land rental, and in some cases land sale scheme, and the condominium plan, and other little items which the government has proposed are of no use at all.

It is however, true to say that such measures taken individually or together are of only very limited use. They merely nibble at the fringes of the problem instead of attacking the problem at its heart. That is my objection to the resolution. If we were to vote, I would vote for it, because every little bit helps, but the point is that this measure is really very much of a fringe measure. It will have only a very limited use.

It actually is based, Mr. Speaker, on a full acceptance of the mystique of home ownership. In fact that mystique shines through almost every word of the resolution. It is based on a continued acceptance of the fallacy that there is some special virtue in a piece of paper on file in a bank vault or in some other place of safety, which says that John Citizen owns this piece of property. In actual fact he may only own a very little bit of it. Most of it, in fact, may be owned by the mortgage holders. But this piece of paper says that he owns it. We are led to believe, or have been led to believe in North America at any rate, down through the years, that there is some special virtue in that piece of paper.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that there is no virtue at all in pieces of paper. What is required is not a piece of paper in everybody's safety deposit box; but housing units, whether they are individual or "semis", as the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) calls them, or multiples—homes where people can live, homes suitable for families to live in and to grow and develop in, homes suitable for senior citizens. That is what we require, not pieces of paper. We need policies that will ensure that people will have homes to live in of the nature I have described. Actually that will mean, as I will try to show in a moment, that a great many people will never have home ownership in the technical sense in which it is described —having a piece of paper in a bank safety deposit box.

Actually this mystique of home ownership has for 30 years diverted governments from tackling the real problem, which is to provide

homes, not to provide pieces of paper. Nothing illustrates that point better than the 30 years approximately of experience with The National Housing Act, Mr. Speaker, in which the whole thrust has always been on so-called home ownership, on having a piece of paper in the bank vault. The thrust has always been towards making mortgage money available and this is essentially what is proposed in the resolution, that it should be made a little more available than is now possible under national housing. But that has always been the focal point of The National Housing Act. Other programmes for a good many years have been possible under that Act, but the major programme has always been the provision of mortgage money on terms somewhat more lenient than one would encounter in the private market.

What has happened? Well, I will quote one sentence from Mr. Nicholson, the Minister who has been in charge for a number of years, as to the end result of that emphasis, the emphasis on making mortgage money available.

Mr. Nicholson said in the House of Commons on May 28, 1964:

> Ninety per cent of the entire housing output associated with The National Housing Act has been provided to the middle-income and upper-income brackets.

Now, there is the man who has been in charge of the administration for a good many years and he ought to know what he is talking about. In any case it is self-evident, Mr. Speaker, as many people have said on many occasions; NHA as it has been administered, in the provision of mortgage money which has been the main thrust of NHA and which is envisaged as the main thrust of a housing programme in Ontario in this resolution, has been a form of socialism for the rich and private enterprise for the poor.

Only people of incomes of $8,000 or $10,000 a year or better can afford to buy homes. I would say $8,000 would probably be the provincial average but the prices now being charged in the Toronto area are $30,000, $35,000, $40,000. You have to set the minimum at about $10,000 in Toronto, no matter how favourable the mortgage terms are. Only the people with from $8,000 or $10,000 and higher incomes can afford to buy homes, even if the land were available.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It costs an average of $30,000.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): That is nonsense!

Mr. Bryden: It is not nonsense!

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, it is 50 per cent too high that is all, it is that much nonsense.

Mr. Bryden: I am taking the situation as it is now, not as it has been over the last 15 or 20 years, but it does not really make much difference because though it is true that incomes are now higher than they were a number of years ago; but so is the price of houses. So the situation is still the same as Mr. Nicholson said it has always been, about 90 per cent is for the benefit of what he calls the middle income and upper income classes.

Well I say he is exaggerating when he includes very many of the middle income classes, because if you take, say, a figure of $8,000 or better, you have less than 20 per cent of the entire population. Let us cut it to $6,000, let us accept at least in part the point of the hon. member for Russell and say $6,000.

You cannot afford to buy if you have less than $6,000. The people making $6,000 or more are still less than half the total population. So the majority of the population is excluded from the housing programme into which the public has put its main effort in the past number of years.

The resolution proposed by the hon. member for Wellington South would increase the charmed circle a little bit, but it would still leave the majority of the population excluded. In my opinion it is time that we started to do something about the excluded majority. In fact my submission, Mr. Speaker, has been in the past and continues to be that the role of government is to deal with the excluded group, the people in the upper income groups can manage for themselves in the housing field. Admittedly, right now because of the overall acute shortage, even they are having difficulty; but if we had a proper public housing programme so as to relieve the pressure, then I think that the private market could quite readily take care of these people. And I would have no objection to continuance and expansion of programmes to make mortgage money more readily available. That is fine, but let us bear in mind that those are programmes for the upper half of the income scale, or somewhat less than the upper half of the income scale. Where we have to hit into the problem is for those groups, who just

cannot benefit from this type of programme at all, in any meaningful way. In fact, one of the difficulties about making mortgage money easier to obtain is that some of the people who cannot really afford to buy because their incomes are not high enough, but who are faced with the desperate housing shortage, are encouraged to get in over their heads. They get in too deep and ultimately they lose their homes, they cannot carry the mortgages over the long period when it is necessary to carry them, so that sometimes for those people mortgage programmes make the problem more acute.

Of course NHA, recognizing that propensity in the situation we have sets a minimum, below a certain minimum you cannot get a mortgage through NHA, and I presume we would have to set a minimum even on a second mortgage programme. Maybe it would be a little lower, I am not sure, because, you see, as soon as you get the second mortgage, then there are all the additional carrying charges as well.

But at any rate, there would still be a minimum. The people below the minimum cannot be taken care of and I say that is a complete abdication of government, the people below the minimum are those about whom government should be concerned. Our basic problem in this area, Mr. Speaker, is quite easily identified. Unfortunately it is far from easily solved, but it is quite easily identified. The basic problem is that there simply is not enough housing construction, anything like enough. And the shortage is most acute in respect to the lower and middle income groups.

That is where we are failing to build, for people who need it most, the people in the lower half or somewhat more than half of the income scale.

And if we are going to solve the housing crisis, even over a long period of time, we have to hit the real problem, and that is it. I am not suggesting that the problem will be easily solved but obviously this is what we have to do, and furthermore we have to start facing facts.

There is no use talking about constructing a few geared-to-income housing units, a thousand or two thousand or three thousand a year, and say that we are dealing with the problem. Let us face the problem as it really is. I am going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what we should be doing is setting an objective, which will admittedly not be achieved immediately, of 20,000 low-rental geared-to-income units per year between now and 1980. That figure is not taken out of a hat, Mr. Speaker, it is derived from the publication *Good Housing for Canadians* which was published a few years ago by the Ontario association of housing authorities.

I will not go into the statistical details of how I arrived at the 20,000 from their figures —there is not time now, but I will say that 20,000 is, if anything, understating the case on the basis of the analysis contained in *Good Housing for Canadians*. So this is what we have to face up to, so why play with the problem any longer? I was amazed, I could hardly believe my ears when I heard the hon. member for Wellington South, who is a very intelligent man, say that the government has done quite a good job in constructing geared-to-income rental housing in the suburbs. He said they had failed in the city of Toronto but had done quite a good job in the suburbs. Well let us see how good a job they have done.

The Ontario housing corporation has been in existence for two years. In that two years it has constructed—and I am not sure they are all completed, but at least it has started—4,500 units roughly for low income families and senior citizens. In two years, that is an average of about 2,200 a year, or about 10 per cent of what is required in the province as a whole. If that is a good job then I would hate to see a poor job. I know that they have come forward with a great variety of statistics suggesting they are going to do better in the future but even putting the best interpretation on their statistics—and they are hard to interpret—they will only be constructing perhaps 4,000 to 5,000 a year when we need 20,000 a year.

Now this is where we have to head in. It is not easy I admit, but we have to face up to the problem, otherwise the housing crisis will get worse and worse.

I would say that any programme to deal with this must be a wide ranging integrated programme in which the problem is attacked on many fronts, and when one says that one has to add that it is impossible to state even the outlines of a programme in terms of points because they are interrelated.

Nevertheless to conclude, Mr. Speaker, just to give some quick suggestion of what I think should be the items to be borne in mind in a proper housing programme, I am going to list a few points, as major points that ought to be dealt with.

First, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any escaping the fact at all, that, if we are going to get the kind of action we require, we need a Minister who devotes his full time

to dealing with the housing programme, plus the programme of community planning and urban redevelopment.

You cannot separate those two things but there should be a Minister who devotes his entire energy to this programme. This is the only way we are ever going to get off the ground. We have not got off the ground yet in solving the problem.

Second, the major stress, in fact almost the entire stress, has to be on construction of geared-to-income rental units by the public authority, under the direction and inspiration of an energetic Minister who devotes his whole time to it.

Third, we have to give a much greater stress to the urban renewal than we have. This is one of the areas where we can use land that is now badly used for substandard housing or substandard commercial units and get a much greater density with better units on it.

This has to be part of the programme, but at the same time we have to bear in mind all the psychological factors involved and the sociological factors—we should not make the mistakes that have been made in the past in developing urban development programmes.

Fourth, we have to put major emphasis on developing imaginative new types of design which will make efficient use of land. It is sheer romanticism to suggest that in any of the great urban areas of the province, it is possible for all, or even most of the people, to have their own little houses on their own little plots of land. We have to develop more efficient use of land.

Fifth, we have to put major stress on land assembly. I do not have time to talk about the poor effort the government has made in that field, as indicated by an answer tabled in the House today. We have to do something about land assembly on a major scale, and in connection with that, we have to curb land speculation through capital gains taxes and other devices that will take a lot of the joy out of land speculation.

Sixth, we have to develop an idea that the Minister of Economics and Development has talked about, and that is the development of satellite communities. But let us bear in mind, that this a five- or ten-year project before we get any satellite communities.

However, we have to think in the long term as well as the short term, and I have no doubt at all that in a province like Ontario, where we are developing major concentrations of population, a satellite community programme is part of the answer.

Then seventh—and I will rate it no higher than seventh—we could have what I would call the supplementary programmes—the first and second mortgages guaranteed by governments, land rental, condominium housing, and that sort of thing.

Fringe measures but that should be very low in priority. They should not even be reduced but what should happen, is that the other items that I have talked about, should be greatly increased.

Eight, we should start recognizing the fact that pre-fabricated housing has an important role to play in solving the housing problem in some parts of the province. Not in a city like Toronto where the individual unit is becoming passé, but we also have a major housing problem in rural areas of worn out, inadequate units, and land is not a problem there.

The problem is to get the house. The cheapest way to get the house is to buy pre-fabricated housing—but NHA loans are not available for pre-fabricated housing. It is absolutely ridiculous that that should be so but it is.

Good three of four bedroom pre-fabricated houses are on the market right now for $14,000 or $15,000. If the NHA would get up-to-date, and make loans available for those pre-fab houses, it would help greatly to cope with the housing problem in rural areas.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would say that we should be taking positive steps to conserve the existing housing stock. I have no time to indicate some of the steps that I think should be taken, but one thing I would like to say, sir, is that, at least, we should stop tearing down existing houses, except in cases of real, extreme, public necessity.

I am all in favour of parks, but it is absolutely ridiculous that in an area like Toronto anybody should be talking about tearing down several hundred good houses in order to make park space. We just cannot do that for the present.

We have to hold onto the houses we have. Indiscriminate tearing down must stop. There are some cases where it is inescapable but those should be the only cases where it is even contemplated. Measures of this kind, Mr. Speaker, would, in my opinion, produce a real solution to the housing programme. A second mortgage plan would at best have only a very minor effect in solving this crisis.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, the seven, or eight, or nine point programme

that we have just heard, is without a doubt, good, and it has its place, but as I understand it, we are discussing here, this evening, a resolution pertaining to second mortgages.

I could cover the waterfront with many instances and tell you of the things that have happened and could happen. For instance, sir, the little village that I come from, where the village council sold lots to the residents—the returned soldiers of that day of the second world war—where they sold the lots to young men, young families, for half of their assessed value.

I realize it might be contrary to some law to do that, but they sold lots for as little as $62.50—a 60-foot lot by 150—and they sold the better ones for $100 a lot. That was about 1948.

We were thinking of the man who was carrying the lunch pail who ought to have a home and build houses on those little lots—substantial homes to maintain a family well—and I suppose, now, their mortgage payments are $40, $50, or $60 a month. This is good. I liked the attitude of the Conservative member who spoke so well—talked about the pitfalls in this particular resolution—what ought to be done and how we ought to approach the problem.

The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that this government has the machinery set up to go into the second mortgage business. We, through our cost of consumers credit committee, that I was fortunate enough to sit on, found, in many instances, where the second mortgage market—through private enterprise to people who were in that field—we found that in one instance they paid as much as 87.5 per cent mortgage for a house right here in the city of Toronto.

We found, too, that 15 per cent, 18 per cent and 32 per cent was not too much to pay for a second mortgage. All this resolution is asking this government to do is to re-implement a method that worked adequately at that time for the people who applied for that very thing.

Some hon. members: Hear, Hear!

Mr. Bukator: They applied for second mortgage money through the admission of the government member who spoke on this very resolution. They did not have any difficulty in collecting the money; the thing worked, and worked well.

I realize that we ought not to interfere with private enterprise, but where private enterprise is going to tack on even one per cent over the mortgage that I recently got on an establishment of mine—maybe my credit is not too good—where I had to pay nine per cent, and now an extra one per cent for a second mortgage, which makes it 10 per cent and pay it over a period of three to five years.

This, with the payment of a home of $13,000 to $14,000 which you must pay today for a three-bedroom bungalow in the area that I come from, just puts this house out of the reach of the man who is recently married and is bringing up a family, and is trying to build himself a home and a place in the community.

To my mind, and to the minds of my colleagues, I find that the second mortgage money is in the right place. The government has the credit and they ought to give this money to the purchaser of a home on a long-term basis, whereby it may take them 30 or 40 years to pay it off.

I do not care how many years it takes, except with a low rate of interest, with an open clause in that mortgage that if he is fortunate enough to acquire some money by his ingenuity and by his manner of administering his own affairs, then he can pay that second mortgage off without notice or bonus.

Now this is common sense and good business tactics. I see no reason why one segment of our population cannot get a concession when there is an opportunity to help them. I mentioned this in the House once before, and I say it again, that we have had open homes that could be purchased for approximately $130 a month—that is interest, principal and taxes.

The young couples who went into those homes and looked them over, said, "This is what one day I would like to own; this is the home for me and my family. How much of a down payment must I have?" Then they are told that they must have anywhere from $3,500 to $4,000. It all depends on the little extras in that house. Many of them have said, "I have $1,000, I have $1,500, I have $2,000, I could buy this house if I could only get my hands on an additional $2,000 or $2,500."

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the members who are listening, that this is where this government comes into this field. They have nothing more to do than to say, "The doors are open to our banks; come in and borrow your $2,500 and buy your home." I know of many homes today that are sitting vacant, ready to be moved

into, but the down payment is so great that they cannot do it.

I thought the other day that the Minister of Economics and Development with his HOME programme, might consider purchasing those lots under those homes that are now mortgaged and letting them rent the lot until they can afford to pay for it; or better yet, follow up on the resolution of my colleague, which makes sense—go into the second mortgage business for the people who would like to get into that field and who could do it with a minimum amount of money.

They can meet their payments. They can make a position for themselves and for their families in their own municipalities and they would have something that they could be proud of. But they just do not have that little extra that you people on the other side of the House are capable of providing for them by saying, "Yes, we will open the doors to you again". We did it before and it worked and we hope—not hope—I have reason to believe that the government, Mr. Speaker, is intelligent enough to see the reasoning of this resolution and follow it through.

This must be done. These people should be helped when they are trying to make a place in their communities for which they should be commended.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to get into the discussion on the mortgage loan problem, although I fully realize that it is an important factor, but rather to speak to the housing problem generally, except to say that heavy mortgage commitments impose a burden on the home owner which he is reluctant to assume. And if we go into the second area of a second mortgage, I am well reminded that in 1954 the federal government central mortgage and housing corporation introduced legislation that would permit not only the salary of the man of the house, but also that of his wife where she was working. And I had many instances where a young couple, fully hoped that they could cope with such a problem and no sooner were they fully installed in a house than the inevitable baby was on the way and the wife's salary was no longer a factor.

So I am very reluctant to look at anything in the second mortgage field, unless it is definitely related to the income of the man who is responsible for keeping the home together. But I do feel that under the HOME programme and particularly under the Ontario housing corporation, such a programme would help solve the financial burden.

The city of Hamilton last night turned over to the Ontario housing corporation the Cotton Mills site, which is in the urban renewal area and was the scheme for public housing. They have now turned it over and Ontario housing will start to build some 80 homes, public housing. Also, the city has an agreement with Ontario housing to build 485 senior citizens' residences on Jackson and Hess Streets. This is a step in the right direction and I am very happy to see the city taking part in such an extensive programme.

One of the main problems in housing is the shortage of serviced land. On the mountain in the city of Hamilton, there is a very large acreage of unserviced land and I notice that Mr. Charles Campbell, past president of the national housing association, said last night, and I quote from the Hamilton *Spectator*:

> that he did not consider that there was a shortage of housing in Hamilton but there was a shortage of serviced land and to service the acreage on the mountain would cost some $15 million for a trunk sewer to go right across the mountain.

I feel that this is one of the heavy penalties and burdens on the municipality to provide the services and I think that most cities could take much more advantage of the HOME programme if they had some assistance in the serviced land.

I think some arrangements could be made, possibly, as we had to do during the hospital bed crisis in the city of Toronto, when the department came forward with a loan of three per cent. Perhaps this is the area to which we should give attention, that would enable the home owner and the city to participate in a programme if the loan was reduced to three per cent. This was most effective when it was done for the bed shortage. I know that there are many people, very, very anxious to own their own homes, that have not the necessary income to make the down payment.

A low down payment is a very serious problem but with today's high wage scale, I think that perhaps some modification in some way of a small second mortgage might be the solution, but I do not know how you are going to perform this until the cities have more serviced land, and this is the area that is the most expensive. In our travels the committee on aging looked at all sorts of housing and I was very impressed with some

that I saw, such as the condominium. It is very essential and I have people calling me to say, "We understand and appreciate your great concern for the people in the low income groups. But we on the fixed incomes, are in a very similar situation".

This year, in the city of Hamilton, they are now allowing up to $100 a year reduction in the education tax to pensioners who qualify. Perhaps, in this area of the fixed income something should be done in building low-rental apartments that can be built for this group of people who are not necessarily needing heavily subsidized housing, such as the pensioner only on the inadequate $105 under the Canada assistance plan. Housing is one of our stickiest problems at the moment and I would suggest very humbly that serious consideration be given to some way of assisting the municipalities in the field of servicing the vacant land. I know that, in Hamilton, my own city, we do have this need and with a high tax rate which is inevitable due to the increasing pressures on municipalities and on the province and on the federal government for more assistance in every field, we must have homes for these people and I feel that something concrete has to be done to reduce the heavy charges that people are now liable to.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to stay within the four walls of the resolution.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): That will be a change.

Mr. Singer: Yes it will be. It will be and I was just about to write a note to my friend from London South, the official keeper of order around here, suggesting that he perhaps had a task with the last two speakers. The resolution, if my friend, my well informed friend from London South will note it, deals with the advisability of having the government get into the second mortgage field. It does not deal with the whole broad housing programme and the last speaker, at least, started off her remarks by saying "I am not going to talk about second mortgages, I am going to talk about the housing programme". The member for Woodbine discarded this as well and got off into a general housing programme.

We have had opportunities to debate that and we, in this party, have a good programme for developing housing. We have expressed our lack of confidence in the HOME programme on several occasions, and we shall continue to do so.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, is this in order?

Mr. Singer: Well, I am glad the hon. member asked me but I thought, Mr. Speaker, because he was not doing the job that he charges himself with, all afternoon I would draw it to his attention so that hopefully he would be more alert. Now maybe he would not.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Now we will return to the second mortgage field.

Mr. Singer: Yes, let me now do that, sir. Dealing with the remarks of the only member who was in order, my hon. friend from Armourdale, I was interested—oh no, on the other side of the House—my friend from Wellington South, of course, and my friend from Niagara were in order—the only member on the other side of the House who was in order, the member for Armourdale. I was interested to hear the typical Tory approach to this problem. He throws his hands up in horror and says "Let us not compete with private industry. It would be terrible." And then he sets up a whole list of all the difficulties we are going to encounter. We are going to have to have people examine the people who want to get mortgages; there might be some loss of money. We are going to have to inquire about incomes; there is bookkeeping to do. All sorts of things. So he says, "Let us keep it in private industry, let us guarantee the mortgages that the present lending institutions offer and let them charge one per cent over and above the present rates."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this defeats the whole purpose of my colleague's resolution and, had this thinking been in vogue at the time the government was in the second mortgage field, it would have defeated the whole advantage that was to be obtained. Let us face the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we need a greater housing supply and one—and I emphasize one —of the methods by which this can be brought about is to get the government back into the subsidized second mortgage field. That was the purpose for which my colleague from Wellington South brought forward this resolution and the purpose for which he gave the statistics on the success of it.

Let us look at the success of this scheme limited only to three years. It serviced some 14,000 people—a very substantial service. It enabled, Mr. Speaker, some 14,000 people to buy homes. It provided second mortgages at the rate of 3.5 per cent per annum. Not guaranteed by the government but loaned by the government because no one is going

to give money on second mortgages at 3½ per cent or the equivalent of that figure today, except government.

Now, is it worthwhile? Certainly it is worthwhile, because the government lost not a penny. My colleague, the member for Wellington South, says $250 in an investment of $16 million. So what then is the government afraid of? Why should it not get back into this field as one of the methods which would be successful in providing more homes? One of the methods that has proved eminently successful and one of the methods that could be used again. The reason, Mr. Speaker, we did not indulge in another housing debate is that apparently our suggestions have fallen on completely barren land, there has been no reaction at all; the Minister has given us his so-called HOME programme, but he has really missed the importance of providing homes now.

This is something that the government has done before. It has been successful, and it has done it at no great sacrifice to the people of Ontario of anything really, except that it ties up its money, or a small amount of its money for a limited period of time at a reduced rate of interest. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the ways in which the government can and must supply the social need for housing. Let us not look at housing any longer as a business, let us not look at it as the hon. member for Armourdale does, as something into which we can only get at as a business, where there has to be a profit. If there is any business of the Ontario government being in housing it is to provide for this social need, and in order to provide for this social need, surely we must get the government into the act in a meaningful way.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what more meaningful way could there be than to bring the provincial government back into the second mortgage field?

I am sorry this debate has gone on, and other debates on these resolutions have gone on, and we have not been able to bring in a Minister of the Crown, either the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), or the Minister of Economics and Development or someone, who would say why they cannot get back into the second mortgage field.

Because this would be a most important contribution that the government could make, that the government could make immediately. They have all of the mechanics set up. They have used them before, they are still collecting money, they will continue to collect money until 1970 under the old scheme which has cost them really nothing, except the small subsidy on interest. Why then can we not do it again?

I do not discard what the hon. member for Hamilton Centre had to say as an important adjunct to the housing plan; I do not discard the eight or ten points the hon. member for Woodbine had; but I have very little faith that the government is going to embark on any one of these programmes because the HOME programme, to my mind, is meaningless.

Here is something, however, in which there has been abundant experience, good government experience and for the loan of $16 million of Ontario's money, some 14,000 people were assisted in buying their homes. Why then can it not be done today?

I do not get carried away by the histrionics either, of the member for Woodbine, who says the average price in Metropolitan Toronto is $30,000 to $40,000.

When he gets off into high flight into one of his arguments, it is nothing for him to add 50 per cent to averages. Well, the fact is that, though the averages are high, they are about $20,000—his zeal for the subject got him into great exaggeration.

But the fact is that the government could, with a small amount of loans to a lot of people—let them fix 20,000 as a goal—and they could do this immediately, let them fix as a goal, loans, say up to $4,000 to 20,000 people. What would we be talking about—$8 million.

For an investment like that, in this year at election time, the government could endear itself to a lot of people. We hate to bring forward these suggestions, Mr. Speaker, it is going to help the government in its election plans, but here is one that is so obvious, it is surprising to me, that it has not occurred to the members opposite, that they should adopt it.

For an investment of $8 million, which they are going to get back, and they are going to get back completely, and the subsidy will be a couple of interest points only, we could produce another 20,000 homeowners before the end of the year in the province of Ontario. Why then will not the government buy it?

Let me emphasize the point, Mr. Speaker, we did not bring this resolution forward—my colleague for Wellington South did not bring this resolution forward—to be the be all and the end all in the housing programme, we brought this forward as a realizable immediate step that the government could and should

take to quickly allow people to buy homes and, again, I must discard very violently and very vehemently, the argument put forward by the member for Woodbine that this nonsense about owning homes means nothing in our society. I think it means a great deal and I think that we have to strive to allow people to own their own homes so that they believe they have a real stake in the community. If they do have a real stake in the community, a meaningful stake such as home ownership, then they will be in a position to stay and become an integral part of that community; to make that community a better place in which to live.

For all those reasons, Mr. Speaker, it would be my very strong feeling that all members of the House should support this resolution. Our rules presently will not allow a vote on it, but hopefully our remarks have not fallen on deaf ears this afternoon. And hopefully, within a very short time—and it would take almost a minimum amount of consideration if the government was anxious to do it; they could do it in a matter of days. They could get into the second mortgage field in the way they have done before and they could make available 20,000 homes to another 20,000 people just like that, and they would be doing a good service to the people of Ontario who really need homes.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, tomorrow we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Transport, and following Transport will be The Department of Labour. Following The Department of Labour, I think we had better get ready for The Department of Reform Institutions. So you have three ahead of you, and we will get back into the estimates of The Department of Health next week. On Friday morning, apparently there will be some Budget debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

(*See page* 2660)

Answers to questions were tabled as follows:

2. *Mr. Sargent*—Enquiry of the Ministry—In view of the recent statement that the department has land set aside for the HOME programme that the builders do not know about, would the Minister inform the House: (*a*) where this land is situated; (*b*) how much land is available; (*c*) what did it cost; (*d*) from whom was it purchased?

Answer by the Minister of Economics and Development.

VACANT LAND HELD BY FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL PARTNERSHIP

(*a*) *Municipality*	*Title held by*	(*b*) *Approximate acreage*	*Year of purchase*	(*c*) *Original cost*	(*d*) *Original owner*
				$	
Brantford	CMHC	22	1955	27,125	Seneca Park Limited (P. Abeles)
Sandwich East (Windsor)	CMHC	229	1958	345,768	Slutsky, Ivan
St. Thomas	CMHC	50	1958	50,000	Thompson, G. M. & J. M. Young, Vern S. (Estate)
Trenton	CMHC	5	1959/60	4,500	Brinklow, Walter A.
	CMHC	12	1959/60	9,500	Donaldson, W. L. & L. B.
	CMHC	3	1959/60	13,000	Reid, John R.
	CMHC	16	1959/60	15,200	Burrows, Elwood G.
	CMHC	4	1959/60	3,800	Vandervlied, John & Alida
		40		36,000	
Peterborough	CMHC	140	1952/54	10,476	Micklejohn, R. S. & M. E.
	CMHC	102	1952/54	41,250	Brown, Jonathan & Robert
	CMHC	100	1952/54	35,000	Hetherington, Isaac
		342		86,726	
Arnprior	OHC	18	1965	63,700	Newill Realty Ltd.
Renfrew	CMHC	32	1967	56,210	Barnet, Thomas F.
Windsor	Trustee	77	1966	187,572	Tabachnick, Morris
London	CMHC	95	1950	35,000	Felner, Frank
Hamilton	CMHC	55		55,000	Helland, G. M.
	CMHC	95		57,000	Fairwell, Marvin R.
	CMHC	104		62,400	Ontario Hospital
	CMHC	66		66,000	Comarmicka, H. & A.
	CMHC	21		13,650	McDonnell, T. A., A. R., I. H. and C. I.
	CMHC	22		12,100	Stewart, C. & E.
	CMHC	85		51,000	Comley, E. H. & A. E.
	CMHC	47		47,000	Comley, E. H. & A. E.
Hamilton	CMHC	15		15,000	Marischuk, Peter
	CMHC	27		27,000	Quinn, Emma
	CMHC	32		38,400	Beisclag, I. & M.
	CMHC	29		29,000	Sondrigger, F. & F.
	CMHC	95		114,000	Janus, A. & M.
	CMHC	45		45,000	Petanowich, G. & C.
		741		632,550	
Cobourg	CMHC	15	1953/4	4,500	Tinney, George E.
	CMHC	88	1953/4	30,000	Robertson, R. J. & G. A.
	CMHC	97	1953/4	29,100	Hie, Clifford and Edith
	CMHC	14	1953/4	8,000	Wilkins, Dr. Warren W.
		214		71,600	

(a) Municipality	Title held by	(b) Approximate acreage	Year of purchase	(c) Original cost	(d) Original owner
				$	
Port Hope	CMHC	50		22,500	Bennett, Frank
Nepean Township	CMHC	614	1959	1,600,000	The Borden Company Ltd.
Atikokan	CMHC	1,300	1951	182,500	Hennepin Mining Company
Brockville	CMHC	45		7,425	Stanford, E. K. & E. G.
	CMHC	45		7,490	Row, W. H.
		90		14,915	
Kingston Township	CMHC	200	1954	107,500	Knox, H. F. & M. E.
Metro Toronto					
Thistletown	CMHC	97		142,500	McMullen, Mary E.
	CMHC	109		177,250	Torrance, John C.
		206		319,750	
Jane/Steeles	CMHC	95	1954	141,512	Norobsche Holdings Ltd. (A. Dignan)
Malvern	CMHC	2	1958	25,625	Aiton, Estate of Ronald McDonald
	CMHC	2	1954	12,250	Bray, T. & B. P. E.
	CMHC	51	1958	92,500	Brooks, John
	CMHC	97	1959	101,400	Brown, Frank
	CMHC	109	1957		D. R. Little
	CMHC	49	1957		Fraser, Alfred H.
	CMHC	104	1957		Hutchinson G. & Little W.
	CMHC	27	1957		Jones, Herbert & Sylvia
	CMHC	100	1957		Lawrie, John S.
	CMHC	102	1957	950,000	B. Little
	CMHC	30	1957		Moore, Gertrude A.
	CMHC	57	1957		J. Scott
	CMHC	48	1957		M. & J. Scott
	CMHC	93	1957		Stirling, James A.
	CMHC	1	1958	10,920	Clancy, Isabella
	CMHC	96	1955	90,000	Cosentino, Eleanor
	CMHC	50	1957	64,500	Fleming, Hilliard
	CMHC	100	1953	150,623	Haliasinsky, Estate of John
	CMHC	5	1954	25,000	Hawke, P. B. & R. E.
	CMHC	67	1959	88,485	Department of Highways
	CMHC	10	1954	25,000	Ivanenko, N.
	CMHC	5	1958	9,700	Lato, John
	CMHC	1	1953	15,000	Lynton, R. G. & A.
	CMHC	1	1958	13,200	Malvern Orange Lodge
	CMHC	1	1958	18,000	McConnan, D. J. & F.
	CMHC	5	1954	18,000	McVey, Margaret and Frank
	CMHC	99	1954	93,195	Miller, Estate of W. & M.
	CMHC	1	1957	11,025	Prentice, Winifred
	CMHC	2	1957	12,200	Rowntree, John
	CMHC	2	1957	10,000	Ross, Sarah Jane
	CMHC	7	1957	5,175	A. & G. Scott
	CMHC	199	1953	85,000	Staines, F. M.
	CMHC	3	1954	25,500	Tornbeck, Catherine A.
	CMHC	3	1958	4,440	Tomlinson, W. & E. G.
	CMHC	28	1957	86,000	Walton, Arthur M.
	CMHC	20	1954	32,000	Yacuk, William and Sophia
		1,577		2,074,738	
GRAND TOTAL		5,942		6,055,666	

7. *Mr. Worton*—Enquiry of the Ministry—1. What was the cost of purchasing, maintaining and operating the automobiles used by members of the provincial Cabinet for the fiscal year 1965-1966? 2. (*a*) How many vehicles were used by members of the Cabinet, (*b*) what was the make of these cars and (*c*) were they chauffeur-driven? 3. Is a record kept of the public and private use of these cars as suggested by the recent provincial auditor's report? 4. (*a*) Were any amounts repaid the Treasury by any persons for the use of these cars and (*b*), if so, what were the amounts, when were they paid and by whom?

Answer by the Prime Minister:

1. 21 departments $64,175.39.

2. (a) 19 Cabinet Ministers.

2. (b) 1 Rambler; 1 Mercury; 3 Oldsmobiles; 7 Buicks; 7 Chryslers.

2. (c) Yes.

3. Not in all departments.

4. (a) Yes—when used for personal reasons.

4. (b)

Prime Minister Hon. J. P. Robarts	$ 245.00	(during 1965/66 fiscal year)
Hon. W. A. Stewart	200.00	
Hon. H. L Rowntree	185.00	
Hon. John Yaremko	35.00	
Hon. J. A. C. Auld	207.00	
Hon. Allan Grossman	50.00	
Hon. James N. Allan	200.00	
	$1,120.00	

18. *Mr. Spence*—Enquiry of the Ministry—(*a*) What is the total cost, including funds spent on equipment and construction, of the government's programme to improve duck hunting in the bays and marshes around Rondeau Park? (*b*) What has been the total revenue to the government, over the same period, from duck hunting in that area?

Answer by the Minister of Lands and Forests:

(a) The total cost of the duck management area at Rondeau Park is as follows:

(1) *Capital expenditures*—1964—To improve access and build blinds			$10,777.35
(2) *Operating*—1964—Salaries		$1,405.54	
Maintenance		807.30	2,212.84
1965—Salaries		1,674.32	
Maintenance		1,831.90	3,506.22
1966—Salaries		2,775.20	
Maintenance		3,221.40	5,996.60

(b) Revenue—1964	2,044.00
1965	2,868.00
1966	3,084.00

No. 78

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 27, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 27, 1967

Introducing Hon. James Harding, Minister of Public Welfare for Nova Scotia, Mr. Yaremko 2697

Presenting report, Mr. Welch 2697

First report, standing committee on health, Mr. Ewen 2697

Questions to Mr. Wishart re sales and purchases of slum-area properties, Mr. Renwick 2697

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Canadian association of police chiefs, Mr. Renwick 2697

Questions to Mr. Wishart re violations of Metro's air pollution law, Mr. Young 2698

Question to Mr. Wardrope re assessability of mining properties, Mr. MacDonald 2698

Estimates, Department of Transport, Mr. Haskett, continued 2699

Recess, 6 o'clock 2734

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 1967

The House met at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Our Lady of Fatima separate school, Scarborough; and in the west gallery, eastern high school of commerce, Toronto.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce a guest to the members of the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario. Under the press gallery at my left is the hon. James Harding, the Minister of Public Welfare for the province of Nova Scotia.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I voice the feelings of all the members of the assembly of the very high and warm regard we have of our fellow Canadian from the coast.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the annual report of the Ontario water resources commission for 1966.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Mr. D. W. Ewen, from the standing committee on health, presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill 76, The Pesticides Act, 1967.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill 71, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question for the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

In view of the housing situation of the Blais family, of Shuter Street, Trefan Court, as reported in the press yesterday, will the Attorney General now hold the inquiry requested by the city of Toronto through Mr. Callow, the city solicitor, into the financial transactions surrounding the purchases and sales by certain slum landlords of house properties?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): The answer, Mr. Speaker, is, no.

Mr. Renwick: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General will permit a supplementary question? Will the Attorney General not give consideration to the deterioration which is continuing in the city of Toronto by the activities of such landlords?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this matter was brought to our attention by way of request by the city of Toronto some weeks ago, some months ago actually. We considered it and I replied to the officials of the city pointing out that they had powers under which this matter might be quite fully investigated. For them simply to come forward and ask for a province-wide inquiry or an inquiry under the provincial government's authority is, I think, unnecessary. There are a great many things the city of Toronto could do in this area without calling upon the provincial government to make an inquiry.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

Will the Minister make a positive statement of principle rebutting those recommendations of the Canadian association of police chiefs which infringe the fundamental principles of our civil liberties in this Legislature, and by submission to the Canadian committee on corrections?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at the outset, and I want to make this clear, that I do not feel called upon on every occasion when persons express views

—even though they may touch on their attitudes towards the administration of law or justice—I do not just for that reason feel called upon to make statements to this House.

However, I have publicly expressed my views to the press, so I would offer an answer to the hon. member as follows: I have already stated publicly that I do not support any recommendation that would provide for the searching of premises without a warrant, detaining of persons where no offence appears to have been committed or the introduction of further methods of corporal punishment. I have also made my views known on several occasions that electronic and other listening devices should be prohibited, except to police officers acting under the authority of a judicial warrant.

To the latter part of the question I would say that I have already met with Mr. Justice Ouimet and his committee on corrections and my views on the subject of his study have been made known to him.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister permit a supplementary question?

Will the Minister consider taking any steps to educate the police chiefs in the province of Ontario in the basic civil liberties which are involved in these proposals?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): You might tell that to the NDP critic out in British Columbia too. He believes in corporal punishment.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the views expressed yesterday were not presented to me in a brief. I have not seen the brief. I have read about it in the newspaper reports. It was an association, I understand, of police officials from all across the country.

Insofar as Ontario is concerned, I think perhaps the expression of my views here and in the press may have some influence on the attitudes of police chiefs and other police officers, and I would add that we do meet frequently with our police people in various groups and on various occasions and attempt through our Crown attorneys, through our own efforts, through meetings with them and through discussions, to inculcate the principles of justice which are to be followed by all police forces.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Not very successfully.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Let me just say that the mere expression of these views of police officers, which they would like to see incorporated in legislation, does not of course change our law and our laws are administered as they stand. Without a change in the legislation, the attitude of the police chief is worthless; really, it has no value in the administration of justice.

Mr. S. Lewis: I like that word—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Attorney General.

In the light of Magistrate Tupper Bigelow's action in dismissing five cases of violation against Metro's air pollution law earlier this week, does the Minister plan any action?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the prosecutions were undertaken on the information of the Metropolitan Toronto officials and I would feel that their representative will probably take some action, such as to them may seem appropriate, and I do not propose to intervene at this time.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would permit a supplementary question? Have you any information as to whether these charges will be relaid?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, they did not arise with my department and I have no knowledge of them other than what I, again, read in the press.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day—on April 26, the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald)—in reference to my answer to his question regarding the assessability of mining properties—asked a further question after stating that he understood certain things.

His question was as follows: How does the Minister explain the fact that there is a partial assessment for limited purposes if the Act does not permit it?

In 1956 The Department of Municipal Affairs made the home for the aged equalization report which apportioned the operating costs of this home to the municipalities concerned. The report added an estimated assessment, in lieu of the assessment deemed missing from the municipal rolls of the township of Falconbridge and the towns of Copper Cliff and the town of Frood Mines.

These municipalities, which were company towns, appealed the matter to the Ontario municipal board and then to the Ontario court of appeal which both ruled that this action was proper, and presumably, since only in these cases company towns were involved,

the companies are bearing the cost of the home for the aged assessment rather than see the municipalities go into the red.

In about 1958 the township of Waters added the iron ore recovery plant situated in that township to the municipal roll. This action was appealed to the Supreme Court of Ontario which ruled that the plant was not assessable. The International Nickel Company, by gentlemen's agreement, does pay estimated taxes to the town of Coniston on the smelter located there.

So it can be seen that there is no real assessment made at any of these locations.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 10th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT
(Continued)

On vote 2201:

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, in connection with vote 2201, item 6 indicates that $410,000 is to be spent—fees and expenses for special studies and research—I wonder if the Minister would outline what special studies and research are going on at the present time?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Chairman, as the members know well, the chief study being undertaken by the department as covered by this item is the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study that we now see growing toward its conclusion. In addition to that, I think that the member for Yorkview would be particularly interested in a study we now have under way respecting the driving records of those who have graduated from driver training courses in the high schools and young drivers who have not had the benefit of that training. It is a little early yet to give any facts or figures from that, but they are being run through our computing machines now and this will be an on-going study. I will be happy to keep the House informed of the developments that come out of this very critical study.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct a report that was in today's Toronto *Daily Star* wherein I was quoted as saying that the amount to be spent on highway safety was to be eleven cents per person. If *Hansard* is checked properly, I think I said that the increase was $75,000 this year, which would be an increase of eleven cents per person in Ontario. However, on this vote, I think it has a lot to do with the Act that was passed last week —Bill 72—where we are amending section 49 of The Highway Traffic Act; and I think that this part of the Act is where we are calling upon the automobile dealers to put safe cars on the highways. Now I think the only way that we can promote auto safety, where it involves a mechanical condition of an automobile, is an annual vehicle inspection.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this would seem to come more appropriately under 2204—if the member agreed —under vehicle inspection.

Mr. Sargent: All right, sir, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale please.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he would please tell us what services were rendered by H. G. Acres and Company Limited in the amount of $47,000; Bonnycastle Travel Agency in the amount of $10,800; DeLeuw, Cather and Company for $30,000; F. H. Finnis for $9,000; Department of Highways, $7,000; Ed. Ingraham, $11,000; and Traffic Research Corporation Ltd. in the amount of $283,000.

Would he please tell us specifically the services that were rendered by these firms or individuals for the amounts received by them?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of detailed information in replying to the hon. member's questions. I think that he has taken these figures out of the annual accounts?

Mr. Ben: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will put those in order for him. I think that his question deals largely with accounts that were paid to consulting firms in connection with the MTARTS study. For instance, he spoke of DeLeuw, Cather—would you repeat those please?

Mr. Ben: H. G. Acres received $47,591.98; Traffic Research Corporation, for instance, received $283,000. Would the Minister please inform this House specifically what services were rendered, what research was carried out, and what was the result of this research?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, I will get the member the information on these accounts. Traffic Research Corporation, I think now goes under the name of Kates, Peat, Marwick and Company, and those contracts were all in connection with work being done on the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study. I will give the member the individual contracts and what they were related to.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, surely the Minister ought to be able to tell me or tell this House now for what purpose these sums were expended. The department has paid these sums so he should certainly be aware of the purpose of these expenditures.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, but to identify the exact purpose of each of the several contracts that went into these payments, were made in the year before, the one that has just closed, and it would require that I pull them out of my past records and not rely on the ones I have in front of me. But I shall give him the items and tell him what each of these accounts covered.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago, I brought before the House, the new concept of transportation which is being looked into very carefully, particularly south of the border and in some European countries, of the urbmobile electric powered car which can duplicate as rapid transit.

I understand that last week in Pittsburgh two member of the department, Mr. Oliver and Mr. Cowley, were at the convention and looked in on the car which was mentioned in the House.

I wonder whether the Minister is giving serious consideration as to how far this new concept of the electric car, duplicating as mass transit might have and what impact it might have on our future transport needs. Is he looking forward to a policy which might fit this concept into the general transport system?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the department is very interested in the matter that has been raised by the member for Yorkview, as is evidenced by the fact that we had a couple of our officials there, keeping very closely in touch with what is evolving in the field of motor vehicle transportation, especially the transition that seems to be going on now from internal combustion to electrically-powered vehicles.

The electrically-powered automobile is not new, it is an old concept and I can remember in my very young days travelling in an electric car. Of course, they were superseded entirely and for a while there was a threat from the steam car but they were superseded by the internal combustion engine.

There is some very real serious attention being paid to the electric-powered unit, because of the development that has occurred in batteries *per se*—and I think that is a very, very hopeful development.

I may say that the contrast between the types of batteries being developed, both in the different countries, as well as between different manufacturers in this country, is a very intriguing one.

There is likely to be a real race starting in battery development, it may be going on now under cover, but I think we will be learning of it increasingly in the coming months.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, what the Minister has said is true, but how much serious consideration is given as to the revolution that this might create in the whole transport pattern? Is it possible that electric-powered cars, with the guideways, might take the place of rapid transit as we know it now? Might it take the place of extra lanes on our highways?

This is perhaps within the purview of the Minister of Highways, but certainly the Minister of Transport has this all within his ambit and certainly he should be thinking some distance ahead. I presume his department is, because of their interest in the field, and I wonder if he has any kind of advice to offer at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the member's question rather anticipates our thinking in this because we cannot go faster than we see these machines developing.

One of the most fascinating proposals, of course, is that when we get these vehicles, and in the days ahead when we build the roads to accommodate them, the road will be, perhaps, provided with a recessed, electrified cable. This cable will serve to guide a vehicle with some sort of an electric pick-up on, you might say, the pitman arm of the steering mechanism, so that as the road curves, the vehicle will follow the centre line of the road exactly. It would only require that the driver should become awake again when he reaches a switching point at an intersection.

This is intriguing, and I say to the House, sir, that we are following these developments with very keen interest, but I am not prepared to say that we are taking any positive steps

to adapt ourselves to them in advance of knowing what we are going to have to adapt to.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, maybe we should ask the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer), who is charged with looking after Hydro, to give us his opinion on it.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, coming back to the gasoline-powered engine then, what the Minister says is true, that many of us remember, years ago, the old electric-powered—

Mr. Ben: Just guys like you.

Mr. Young: Yes, the member for Bracondale, with his dark hair does not quite remember this—but the electric-powered milk delivery vans and automobiles and all this.

Mr. Bukator (Niagara Falls): We have them now, they are back again.

Mr. Young: That is right. But for many years, because of the adequacy of the gasoline engine and the lack of comprehension as to how it was polluting our atmosphere, the pressure for developing batteries was minimized and so we went ahead with the internal combustion engine.

But since we will still have that engine with us for some years yet, I wonder if the Minister would tell us just what the new safety standards which he has agreed with the industry, amount to? Could he outline what those standards are for the edification of the House?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, this might better come under automobile safety or vehicle administration. But I would like to say to the member for Yorkview, that other than that we are pursuing diligently with the industry, the items of safety that we will want on next year's cars and the year ahead. I would not feel, I would want to disclose to the House, at this time, what we are discussing with them, in advance of coming to some further conclusions, either by breach of understanding with them, or by way of forecasting what we may or may not get.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the Minister, is he making any recommendation to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) concerning a rebate of fuel taxes to the municipality, or privately operated transportation systems, so that municipalities can have the same type of advantage in mass transit, be it by way of a highway, that Toronto today enjoys with its subway?

I know my own municipality, the city of Windsor, has pressed for relief for its transportation system and, were relief given in the way of fuel tax rebates, we could have a better transportation system in the community. We would eliminate some of the air pollution problems, because fewer people would be using their cars. All in all, it would be a real asset to not only my own community, but many other communities throughout the province of Ontario.

I would like to ask the Minister if he is recommending this to the Provincial Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I just might make this observation to the member for Windsor-Walkerville about his specific question. Yes, I have had conversations, you can be very sure, with my colleague, the Provincial Treasurer, on this matter.

It is a very real one to me, coming from Ottawa where our situation is not greatly different from that in Windsor, except it is bigger. We have a very splendid public transit system. It went into motor operated buses instead of electrically-operated street cars and probably did it in the full knowledge that we would have to pay both vehicle taxes and fuel tax.

This is a great burden that those municipal systems are having to meet, that is saved by those that have either the electric cars or that operate underground, in the case of the subway, which is also an electric operation.

There is certainly a great advantage in electric transport, in that, as the member for Yorkview has said, there is not the exhaust problem. But in addition, the use of public transit is a much more economical use of transportation facilities insofar as roads and parking are concerned and it is from that standpoint that I think we have the most useful approach to this difficult and complex subject.

I have lived with it for a while and I am looking forward to some solution to it. And I point out to the members of the House that there was some amelioration offered in the Budget recently brought down by the hon. Provincial Treasurer in the increased amount of grant for road subsidy, and also the increase of the unconditional grant by $1.50 per capita. Those were included under transportation where, if you will remember, that was the way it was listed in the Budget. And it was my hope that our own city council might have found its way open to providing

some amelioration to the conditions under which the Ottawa transportation system is operating.

But I have the matter on my mind and my conscience and I assure the member for Windsor-Walkerville it is being pursued.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, he simply mentioned the unconditional grant increase. That has helped, but do you not see that were he to come along and rebate the fuel tax to municipally operated transportation systems, the grant would be much better, much greater? You could have better transportation in the community. You would have fewer vehicles—or fewer individuals driving their own cars and cluttering up the downtown areas of the municipality. All in all, it would be much better and a much more improved system of transportation were you simply to rebate the fuel tax to the various systems throughout the province of Ontario.

I think this should be given real serious consideration. And given more than consideration. I think this is one place where you can really assist a community. The money that you would save on road construction alone, on highway construction, would more than be offset by the fuel tax rebate.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I thank the member for Windsor-Walkerville for his comments.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I was just going to follow up on the remarks that my friend from Windsor-Walkerville made. I have talked several times in this House about this problem and I think the Minister could go a bit further than the remission of the fuel taxes. I think it would be his job as Minister of Transport to make a recommendation of direct subsidy for public transit, not only in Ottawa, but throughout the province, and I do not think you need to hire several consultants, like my friend from Bracondale mentioned a while ago.

I do not think you need to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars for consultants. You should know that the problem exists throughout the province of Ontario, particularly in the large centres, Ottawa, Windsor, Hamilton; of course, in Toronto I think we have partly solved the problem. The Minister, being responsible for the transport systems in this province, should make direct recommendations to the Cabinet for the elimination of fuel taxes and for other subsidies.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get back to the matter we were discussing a moment ago. The Minister in his disarming way gave us an answer about his negotiations with the motor car companies, and before I could find his comments yesterday, which I jotted down, someone else had come in on the debate.

But as I heard the Minister yesterday, if I am correct, he said that we now have 16 of the 20 suggested new standards of safety—the 20 were the ones—

Mr. Chairman: Does that not come under 2203?

Mr. Young: Well, if you want us to come back to it at that point all right, but—

Mr. Chairman: I think it might be better if the member would keep them in sequence, if you will plan.

Mr. Young: All right, I will come back to it then.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: May I say this in anticipation of the hon. member's question—I take it he wants me to list the items—just so we can get them ready.

Mr. Young: Yes, the Minister said yesterday we had 16 of the 20 and those 16 I would like listed, because a moment ago he said he was still negotiating and I could not quite harmonize what he said yesterday with what he said today. So when we come to the vote perhaps he will have the answer.

Mr. Chairman: Is 2201 carried?

The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, my attention was brought to the DeLeuw, Cather report in the amount of $30,000. I have a functional planning report—proposed roadway in the city of Niagara Falls—compiled for the city of Niagara Falls and The Department of Highways. I would like to ask a question of the Minister. Is he paying the bill for the DeLeuw, Cather report that I have before me, and where does the overlapping come into existence; are we talking about that particular functional report?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, no, Mr. Chairman, the DeLeuw, Cather report that I think was in the question from the hon. member for Bracondale, related to a piece of work that was done by this firm just in connection with the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study. It has nothing to do with the study from Niagara Falls. That would be with The Department of Highways.

Mr. Bukator: The point I was trying to make was—do I discuss this matter with The Department of Highways or with this department—because it has to do with transportation and all of the roads leading in and out of that city and across the border; and then again maybe the Provincial Treasurer paid the bill. Maybe I will have an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to speak on this bill three times. I would like very much to do that. But this is not the report I make reference to.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on item 6—research—has the Minister undertaken any research studies concerning cost-free city transit? I happen to have read at some time or other where a Mr. G. Warren Hayden, a past president of the Toronto real estate board, urged that urban public transit should be free and financed by the three levels of government. Has the Minister undertaken any studies to see the impact of such a suggestion?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, Mr. Chairman, we have not as yet.

Mr. Newman: May I suggest to the Minister that he undertake a study like that in some small community to see if such a thing is practical. I would say some rural or a smaller urban municipality that has difficulty with its transit system now and a municipality wherein much money would not be involved.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think we had better get this in here, because I do not see anything in the vote coming on that would cover anything regarding dump truck operators. Some ten years ago, after an exhaustive study of the dump truck industry following a violent strike by such operators, Mr. Justice Roach reported upon the pitiful conditions existing in this industry; and he made suggestions as to how conditions might be improved.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Is this the coming vote, 2202, the highway transport board?

Mr. Sargent: I think I could get to this under research, could I not, under studies—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Oh excuse me.

Mr. Sargent: Okay. There is only one thing I want to get across here. Following the report of Mr. Justice Roach on his recommendations, few—if any—of his recommendations had been brought into effect. The conditions of the industry as he described them continue to exist and are possibly more exaggerated even today, and I think that the Minister should reveal to the House what is going on in this department.

Mr. Chairman: I think under the next vote. It would be more properly introduced at that time.

Mr. Sargent: Well now, do I have to do this all over again?

Mr. Chairman: Yes. Go through with the sequence plan.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I will deal with it under 2202.

Mr. Sargent: Well, under this vote yesterday we were talking about luminous plates. Do you want to pursue that here now, or what?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It really should be under 2204.

Mr. Sargent: Okay.

Vote 2201 agreed to.

On vote 2202:

Mr. Chairman: Would the Minister answer the question now under 2202?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes. The member for Grey North was speaking of the pitiable condition of the dump truck operators, and I think in this he had reference to what we call class F operators. I may say that it is a very competitive area and there is a sensitive balance. There are those who think it would be in the interests of economy to grant a great many F licences; to make them very free in their distribution, to give F licences to anyone who wants them.

Undoubtedly there was a practice where some F licences were being granted for very, very limited or restricted territories, and when an applicant for such a licence came forward he got the licence by showing public necessity and convenience would be served in a specific area. He was supported by the immediate contractor who wanted to employ him and, when that job ran out, the licence was of such limited territory that he was not able to fulfil another job.

Now this is the one side of it, so we decided to open out the licences to cover larger territories in the hope of helping this group of truckers who operate, some of them, on a shoe string—a one-truck or a one-man job. We have found ourselves in the position of having to decide whether you want to have a

great many people competing and cutting throats on prices in this area, or whether you want to restrict it so that a man will have enough business and be able to quote a price that is fair and reasonable for the job he is doing; and thus enabled to make not only a decent living out of his work, but also to maintain his equipment in safe condition. I must say that you have to try to balance these factors.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, with the other types of transportation do you not have rate schedules?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We do not have rate setting here, we have rate filing.

Mr. Worton: Rate filings. All right. Well is it not applicable to the dump truck operators too?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This only applies in the case of the larger operators and does not apply to the individual who operates one, two or three—is four included?—trucks. One, two, three or four is exempted from rate filing in this area.

Mr. Worton: Well I think, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Grey North has a very good point here about the report that the ATA people have sent in to all the members about the lack of the department taking any action on this. I think we have had numerous occasions when these operators have been operating vehicles that have not been safe for the road. I think we had an example in Windsor, we had one in Hamilton, and the sooner we take action on something that is 10 years old the better it will be for everyone concerned.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I agree, Mr. Chairman, and I think we are making progress in this direction. The F operators have been organizing for the first time and they are coming under the aegis of the ATA which is a pretty reliable and responsible organization, from their standpoint—leaving out the other aspects of their work. They were in to see us with a brief and we had quite a lengthy, and I hope useful, discussion and we pointed out the responsibility that we think that segment of the industry must be prepared to accept.

Mr. Worton: Can we have some assurance, Mr. Chairman, that your organization will still protect the individual operator? I mean, I do not want you to bring in some fancy regulations and put the individual off the road providing he meets all your requirements.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, that is the point, and that is why we are trying to find some way of doing the two things you want; finding if there is any measure of compatability between them and where we have to draw the line. However, I think we do view with some degree of satisfaction the organizing of this F group, especially if they will emerge as a more responsible body.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: Well, backing up my colleague from Guelph, the Minister has intimated that there is some thought on this. But basically, these men in the dump truck industry are little fellows, without very much financial stability, and they are prone to take such action as strikes when they become disturbed. I think it behooves the government to go to bat for them more than it has. As the member for Wellington South said, they are asking for control and regulation of rates, and they are asking for control in the business; or some type of control. I think the Minister should table, before this Legislature finalizes, some plan of action for this group because they have had a bad deal.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we do just what the member for Grey North says, if we set rates, then you will make life more difficult for the little operator, and this is the squeeze in which this group is caught.

Mr. Sargent: That is what they are asking for, they are asking you to set rates.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Some of them are asking for it and it will help them; but it will hurt the others. Of course, this has to be worked out. This has been studied pretty carefully. As I say, there has been this great forward step—

Mr. Sargent: This should not be your reason for not acting. This group asked you to move and you are not doing anything.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have not yet.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): What is happening in the Royal commission into the Ontario highway transport board? I thought we would get a long and complete report on that. It was announced with great fanfare and, since then, everything seems to have subsided. Is the Minister finding out things he does not want to tell us about?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to hear the member for Downsview say that it seems to have subsided be-

cause I think the problems have largely subsided. It was not a Royal commission, it was an inquiry being made on my instruction by the Ontario highway transport board. They held sittings all over the province and they received some very interesting and very useful submissions.

As a result of their report, I could say to the House, we brought in some very substantial improvements with respect to those areas of licensing that were most controversial. The members will realize that the "A" licences and the "C" licences were the ones that were in the most violent conflict. And I think we have satisfactorily resolved the main problem in those two sections.

The "A" licences varied in measure to absorb the "B" licence, but the particular change which perhaps had the greatest bearing on bringing a measure of peace to the warring factions was the modification that was made to the "C" licences, and you know they are a very extensive group.

The "C" licences formerly dealt with transportation of one person's goods. This was a definition, if you could call it such, that was difficult to fathom at times. So without changing the principle of "C" licensing, we did define such things as consignor and consignee and continuous trip. And some of these segments of the licensing that were at odds, what we have done as a result of this is to completely rewrite every "C" operating licence in the province. And I think this has largely resolved the most important problems the industry faced.

This is not the end of it; the "H" licences have been done away with in some areas and they have been combined with other classes, and there are some sections of the report which have not yet been acted on insofar as regulations are concerned. We have had to research some of them further as a result of the report, and as a result of our studies we will be bringing in further regulations respecting some of the work of the highway transport board and some of it may require legislation. This will follow.

These are continuing examinations of their report because it was a useful report. But as the hon. member has pointed out, we did seem to resolve a great deal of the real battle that was going on in the industry by the steps we have already taken with regulations, and I expect there will be further regulations coming forward and legislation.

Mr. Singer: Well, the Minister is perhaps putting words in my mouth. I did not quite point out that the agitation had subsided; I said the clamour had subsided.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is right.

Mr. Singer: Part of the clamour was government-inspired because it was with great fanfare that the Minister announced the inquiry. And there was public advertising and all that sort of thing. I think, if my memory serves me correctly, the Minister stood in his place and said: "This is what we are going to do, we are going to have a great inquiry, we going to invite the public in," and so on; and then my concern is that we have not seen the report.

Now, if the Minister is having an inquiry and he is spending substantial amounts of public funds, surely the members of the Legislature should be entitled to see a copy of the report. And I wonder why the Minister has not tabled it and made it available to the members.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The member's colleague last year asked if I was going to table the report and I said I did not think so; it was a privileged report, it was a report that I asked my board to make to the Minister. As a consequence of the report, we carried out some actions already that have—whether he recognizes it or not—brought peace into the industry. And I can assure the member it was not government-inspired action that led to the setting up of the inquiry. It was done because the industry was getting into a condition where it wanted something changed and we moved in that way to change it, and as a result of those changes we have seen this improvement come about and there will be further changes.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with that. I think that when we use a government commission, and you can call the Ontario transport board that at least, to conduct an inquiry, and when we expend substantial amounts of public funds for this purpose, and when we have public hearings, as a result of which certain recommendations are made, and as a result of those recommendations the Minister now tells us that some changes in administrative procedures have taken place, and some changes in statutory provisions have taken place, and some changes in statutory provisions are likely to take place in the future, surely the members of the Legislature should be entitled to know the basis on which these decisions are being made.

Why is it a secret? Why is it priviliged? Is the Minister afraid to let us know? Is he

only letting us know as much as he thinks is good for us? Is he sitting on it because it is going to embarrass him? Surely the best public relations the government could have in this department and all of the others is to open the door and let us see what you have. But for some peculiar reason, it is part of this government's mentality that they want to hide things; they want to keep things secret.

Now here this inquiry was announced, as I said, Mr. Chairman, with all sorts of public fanfare. There were public hearings, there was public advertising. I do not know what the costs of the inquiry were and probably whatever they were they were well worth the investment, because apparently at least in the Minister's mind it has produced some improvement, in the form of the results of the inquiry and the actions taken.

But why can the Legislature not be taken into the confidence of the government in a matter such as this? An investigation was being conducted to determine whether or not certain public procedures were being properly carried on and apparently everyone came to the conclusion that there was room for lots of improvement. And now the Minister tells us certain improvements were made and certain others are being contemplated. Why then, Mr. Chairman, will the Minister not make available to the Opposition and to the public the result of this inquiry? What does the government possibly gain by keeping it a secret report?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I should correct the impression the hon. member for Downsview has given that it was a Royal commission of any sort; it was nothing of the kind. It was simply an inquiry I requested the board to make within its own operations. And because they wanted to hear the views of people, they advertised the hearings so that those interested could come before them and make their representations known. As a consequence of those hearings and the study made, the board gave a report to me which I repeat is a report of the board to the Minister, and we are working it out.

We have already brought in some changes by way of regulations on the classifications of licences which have brought a substantial improvement in the trucking industry. But there are other things we are planning to do and some of them may require legislation. I think it would be premature to go into the details of those further changes until we are prepared to bring them in.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, the essence of my objection is that the government runs the business of the province completely unilaterally. They tell the Opposition and the public only as much as they think the Opposition and the public could know to their advantage. Big brother will decide for you; not the public, not the Opposition, are even allowed to have an opinion.

We think we should change and we should eliminate a certain class of licences and consolidate other classes of licences. Maybe the government is making absolutely the right decision, but it escapes my understanding completely as to why there is such a secret procedure made out of it. You do yourself more harm each time. Perhaps you are making all the right decisions, perhaps you are not, but why are you afraid of public discussion?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think what I have said this afternoon is pretty much the same as what was made known to the industry and appeared in extensive print in their own official publications, so the industry knows well.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want to find out from the Minister—his staff will recall that we have a processor of horsemeat in Owen Sound. He ships his meat overseas to Belgium and Germany via New York. After many negotiations with some of your senior staff, Mr. Minister, this man has to pay an extra $25,000 a year because he cannot get from your department a permit to enable him to save this amount of money in his shipping charges. I do not know how this is going to be resolved. At this point he is paying this great amount of money extra, about $500 a week more than he would be if he could get cooperation from The Department of Transport of Ontario.

The cooperation on the other side of the border is great. But when it comes to the Berlin wall we had between The Department of Transport, Ontario, and the easy movement of goods to New York shipping points, this is stymied. My impression was that there was an area that the government could do something to help business, that you could have given him a temporary permit until the thing had been resolved properly. I do not want to blow this up now, but I do want to say that I think your department should be more flexible than it has been to help business.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, without knowing more of the details in this specific case, and I presume it was one in which an application was made to the highway tran-

sport board for "X" licence, we have limited reciprocity between Ontario and New York state, and this may be one of those cases. I would like to know the particulars, if the hon. member would give them to me.

Mr. Sargent: I have quite a file on it now, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not know what it is, though.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I wish you would go into it, please.

Vote 2202 agreed to.

On vote 2203:

Mr. Young: On vote 2203, is this the vote, Mr. Chairman, under which I will get the answer from the hon. Minister, I just asked?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The hon. member was asking with respect to the confusion I caused by saying that we had 16 of the 20 items being mandated in the United States under order of the national highway traffic safety agency; and then I made reference to the fact that we were discussing further safety equipment with the motor car industry at the present.

Is that the point? Well that is easily understood, Mr. Chairman, because we do not stand still. We were working before they were accomplishing things in Washington in this direction because, as I have said in this House, two years ago we got six items of safety equipment put on automobiles in Canada as non-delete standard equipment that they did not get in the United States. Last year we got three extra pieces as non-delete standard equipment, including one item that was not going on in the United States.

But we do not stop with this and we do not stop with the list of items in the United States safety agency's list. We have that list before us, and we have also the list brought forward by the specifications board in Canada, and we have our own ideas as well. We do our own rating with respect to priority, and I think we have been very successful in this work.

We are discussing other items, as I have said, with the manufacturers, but I would prefer not to identify them at this time. But we have the list of the 23 items that were first of all called for by the national highway traffic safety agency. It was reduced to 20 and it looks as though it is going to be reduced to 19 with litigation on two others. We have those lists and if the hon. member for Yorkview does not have those lists, although I expect he has, we would be glad to let him have copies of them all, together with the list of the specifications board items as well.

Mr. Young: I have the list, Mr. Chairman. There still seems to be then a realm of darkness here because we in Canada have no knowledge of what the Minister is really asking for. There are two or three specific things that I would like to ask him about.

One is the Ben Hur hubcap, the one with the long flanges that are dangerous. Is that being negotiated?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, to specify a particular type of hubcap that was outlawed might be difficult, because if we outlawed one, I imagine the ingenuities of these creators would come up with another that would be just about as bad. But we have an equipment section that enables a pretty general description of many pieces of equipment that can be prohibited.

Mr. Young: But surely, Mr. Chairman, the Minister would find no more difficulty in banning hubcaps with knife-like projections than we have difficulty in banning the projections in the front of a motor car which spear a pedestrian. Both of them are highly dangerous. Certainly he would not want to mandate the style of hubcaps if they are smooth and not dangerous, but if they have projections, which are a threat to a person who might bump against them—a pedestrian, or a threat to a child on a tricycle or something of that nature, a person on a bicycle —then I think the Minister has a right to mandate that these projections shall not be there.

This was the question I was asking. Is, in fact, this kind of thinking going on?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I am just trying to identify the section and the regulation under which these pieces of dangerous equipment are illegal today, whether it be on the front of the car or on the hubcap, and I think if I can put my finger on the section of the regulation he would be satisfied. It is only a matter of enforcement. But those pieces just should not be there and I find them as offensive as he does.

Mr. Young: Well then, Mr. Chairman, I gather that the operation is going forward.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, the section is here under which the prohibitory regulations are drawn. I do not have the regulations.

Mr. Young: Well the regulations are drawn but are not yet in force?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think, Mr. Chairman, I would want to say that we have the authority to prohibit those, but I would want to see the regulation before I would say for sure that hubcaps were mentioned.

Mr. Young: Yes. Well I understand these hubcaps are still being sold in the province, Mr. Chairman, and I think the Minister ought to look carefully into this. If in fact he has drawn regulations which say that they are illegal to wear, they should not be worn; and yet one sees on the streets, almost every day, this kind of fancy hubcap which is a potential danger.

The second question which I would like to ask is in connection with the standardization of inferior fixtures on motor cars and the removal of these from points of danger. One little item, which should be a very simple thing the motor car industry should have seen years ago, and yet which has been continued even up until this year's model, is the location of the ignition key.

In many models, including the model that I drive at present, the ignition key is set right in front of the kneecap of the driver. It could be lifted six inches or put in another place, and not be nearly as potentially dangerous. This, as well as other knobs that are inside the car, are very often different in various different makes; so that a person getting into a car which he is not used to driving—he may be hiring a Hertz or an Avis car and just does not get the model he is used to driving—in an emergency might reach for a certain gadget, only to find it is not there because it is in another location to his own car.

Now this kind of standardization, it seems to me, is desirable and is the kind of thing which I think the Minister could well negotiate with the motor car companies. But so far there has been no evidence of that kind of negotiation taking place. I wonder if he would like to comment on this today?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the offensive hubcaps, I may say to the member that I thank him for the suggestion and, if we do not have it in regulations—if there is a deficiency there or if it needs some strengthening—I think I will be happy to look into that.

The registrar of motor vehicles tells me that we have had discussions with the police on that very item.

At the moment, he raises the question of the projecting key. That is a matter distinct from the others he raised with respect to the standarization of location of controls. The standardization of location of controls is under study by the industry and I think that the first positive step of significance to come from that was the standardization of the lever positions for automatic gear shifts. There used to be a variety of various positions for the gear shift lever or control and they are all being standardized now.

Now with regard to other controls, there might be some controls that are critical and should be considered in that same vein, and there might be other controls again that were not critical so that there might be no harm in allowing some choice by the manufacturer where he would locate the several controls. The projecting key is a useful point the member raises. I think they have been getting them recessed deeper and deeper as the instrument panel has been recessed in its total as between—

Mr. Sargent: Do you not know? You say you think.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I could not speak for every make of car, Mr. Chairman, but as regards most of our standard cars, this is a development that is becoming very manifest. But the position of the key—if there be some of the modern cars with keys that are projecting into the area where they might very well be engaged by a passenger or the operator in the event of the second crash as distinct from the initial collision—might be a point that I would like to raise with the manufacturers too.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, to continue, there is another area which has been a killer in the car; that is the dash itself. We have had in recent years a safety dash—so called—that has been a dash which is padded, but unfortunately when the padded dash was introduced some of the manufacturers brought in behind that padded dash an angle iron so that it became more dangerous than the old metal dash itself.

Now there is a dash available which is built of collapsible metal and covered with a pad. It is so designed that the head hitting it, or the part of the body hitting it, will gradually collapse the metal. The angle iron is not in there and so the danger is not as great as when the angle iron was introduced. I wonder if that, too, is part and parcel of the negotiations which the Minister is carrying on?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Could the member identify the vehicle that includes the rigid angle iron behind the dash in modern structure?

Mr. Young: Well, I do not have the information right here with me on file, but I will be glad to get it for you.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think, Mr. Chairman, the member is quite right in his reference to the better developments and the more recent structure of the dash where the panel is constructed, not only of a padded surface, but is constructed basically of an impact-absorbing material that is deformable under impact and in that way provides a substantial measure of cushion when it is struck.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, it appears that the discussion touching on safety to the present has been restricted to alterations to the automobile to prevent or to lessen injuries received in accidents. All the stress seems to be placed on the fact that accidents are going to be with us and therefore we have to keep on altering the car. I think it is about time that we started placing some stress in avoiding these accidents, because if you can avoid the accident you do not need the padded dash or anything else.

Now, for instance, it strikes me as strange that the Minister of Transport has not made it compulsory for trucks to have both fenders and mudguards, or splashguards. The greatest nuisance on the highway today is these large trucks which do not have any guards or fenders over the rear wheels. They have dual wheels and the amount of mud that is splashed up on the drivers following, regardless of what distance they keep behind a truck, is probably enough to lower the car on its tires from a quarter of an inch to half an inch.

Surely it is time that the trucks were compelled to put on fenders so that the spray does not fly out to the side and then be carried by the slipstream backwards and also splash guards or mud guards for the same purpose. I think the same ought to apply to motor vehicles—that they ought to have these rubber slash guards or mud guards hanging down.

Now the statistics that the Minister has filed here indicate that accidents involving motorcycles are increasing daily—completely out of proportion to the number of accidents we have with motor vehicles—and yet the Minister has not seen fit to put into the Act a requirement that motorcycles be equipped with rear view mirrors. Even the police motorcycles do not have rear view mirrors. You would think that they, at least, would try to set the trend for other motorcyclists because it is essential when you are driving today that you not only look ahead but look in the rear view mirror to find out what is coming behind and also keep your eyes to the side at the same time. Now surely a simple little requirement like having a rear view mirror on a motorcycle ought to be made mandatory.

Then there is the question of the handlebars that they use on these motorcycles. They have some of the most distorted shapes that you ever saw. Some of the fancy ones now twist up so that the hands are level with the shoulders and I question how an operator of a motorcycle could properly keep that motorcycle under control when he has his hands up shoulder high and he has to manoeuvre them in a most awkward and unfamiliar fashion.

Surely the Minister of Transport ought to carry out some investigations to determine whether or not the design for a handle that has been standard to this time has been the proper design and what effect we have on having these handle bars twisted so far up that they are almost upright.

While we are on the subject of steering—getting back into the motor car—I think there ought to be a provision that you cannot move your seat closer to the steering wheel than a prescribed distance.

I suggest to the Minister that another cause of accidents is these young drivers who have their steering wheel right up to their chest and they have their arm almost hitting their chin. You cannot manoeuvre an automobile properly when you have that steering wheel up to your chin. But that seems to be the fashion these days because of these racing films that they show where the racing car drivers have the steering wheel close to them. I suggest that there ought to be a minimum prescribed distance between the steering wheel and the driver so you cannot get any closer to the steering wheel than allowable.

Now these are small items but they could easily be implemented. You could pass these regulations or make the necessary amendments to The Highway Traffic Act without any difficulty. In reading this particular estimate, for instance, there is $350,000 for highway safety publicity. I would like to know what this publicity consists of. For instance, last year you paid out to McKim

Advertising Ltd. $70,000. Now we all know that they are a Conservative minded outfit and I was wondering what kind of a film they produced or what kind of material they produced for that $70,000. Chetwynd Films Ltd., $20,000; Designage Industries, $29.000. What did you get for this money? What does your highway safety programme consist of? Describe to us the material that you sent out. We would like to know this. We would like to know where this money went in order that we can determine where the money that you are asking for is going to go. Tell us this. Do not tell us you are going to give us the answer tomorrow. We want to know now so that we can question you on it.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I have noted each of the items that the member for Bracondale has mentioned with regard to vehicle safety. The matter of splash guards or fenders for trucks is covered in section 37 (2) of The Highway Traffic Act:

> Every motor vehicle shall be equipped with—

And we come down to the trucks and trailers.

> —mudguards or fenders or other device adequate to reduce effectively the wheel spray or splash of water from the roadway to the rear thereof unless adequate protection is afforded by the body of the motor vehicle or trailer, or by a trailer drawn by the motor vehicle.

So there would seem to be a provision in the Act. If there are offences under this Act it would be a lack of enforcement of that situation, and I think that we must all know that it is violated in large measure.

Mr. Ben: Well would the Minister give consideration to being a little more in the Act because the Act may cover it but obviously the wheels are not covered.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In other words the equipment being carried under the Act just is not adequate to do what—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): It is totally inadequate.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Is says that the device shall be adequate to reduce it. I will look at the wording of that section and if it could be improved, consider what might be done. The difficulty lies in drawing laws on the one hand and getting enforcement on the other, and there is where the gap so often occurs.

With respect to the motorcycle equipment he mentioned, we had some items in with motorcycles in the bill that just went through, but there were pieces of equipment for motorcycles that we can cover by regulations and they are in the course of preparation. He dealt with the rear-view mirrors, and I say that this is a controversial item as to the desirability of rear-view mirrors among the operators.

He spoke of high handlebars, which is one of the great problems that crept into the motorcycle operation; they are a very dangerous construction. As we looked into how we would regulate the high handlebars we were warned by the motorcycle people that they have developed some way, sir, of keeping the motorcycle handlebar from rising above the maximum limit by some extension of the front wheel that adds still further to the danger of the driving, and we have to get the handlebars down without going into that situation as well.

There has been the matter of crash bars, and the crash bars, I say to the members, is another item that has been pretty carefully studied. New York state introduced a crash bar item in its equipment and found that it was not useful; but rather added to the hazard, in the case of the light motorcycles, so crash bars are necessary only in machines of 500 pounds and over. The foot guards, and the type of pillions are all being examined carefully now and there will be regulations dealing with motorcycle equipment beyond what was in the Act that has just been given Royal assent.

I do not know what to say to the hon. member with respect to the position of the steering wheel in consequence of the adjustment of the seat. There may be cases where the adjustment of the seat is not more than is needed for some passengers. I do not know if there is a maximum forward adjustment that could be defined or not; I have not considered that.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, there are a few other items I would like to mention. For instance, getting back to trucks, I think the Minister will accept the fact that many trucks have their turn indicators located under the body of the truck, that is, the floor of the part that carries the load. Not only that, but they are the old-fashioned type approximately three inches in diameter. Even their stop lights and licence plates are underneath the body of the truck, and I hope I am not confusing this House when I speak of the body. I suppose you could call it the platform or whatever—

Mr. Young: The rack!

Mr. Ben: The rack or the body. The licence plate is under there, the stop light is under there. That light that is supposed to illuminate the licence plate is under there; the turn indicators are under there. Regardless of what the Act stipulates, the mudguards are not adequate. These lights get splashed with mud so they give out no illumination whatsoever, that you can see. Therefore, you cannot even see the stop light when it goes on when the brakes are applied; you cannot see the turn indicators. Surely the Minister ought to make provision that the turn indicators, the licence plate, the licence plate light and the stop light are in positions where they are clearly visible to any person to the rear of these vehicles.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would say to the member for Bracondale that I would think the Act was perhaps adequate and the enforcement is the problem. If there is deficiency in the Act we could study it. But there is no use putting it into the Act, as it is now, that these signals and these lights must be clearly visible and then have them so covered with mud that they are useless; and that is what is often the case. But writing it into the Act in different language is not going to overcome that, and that is our problem, is it not? We get a lot of convictions under this section, but it does not seem to correct it completely.

Mr. Ben: Perhaps the hon. Minister, the next time he is speaking to his colleague, the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), might ask him as a special favour to the Minister to perhaps instruct the OPP to pay a little more attention to the infractions of this particular section of The Highway Traffic Act.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: May I just say to the hon. member that this is the kind of thing I have been doing? I have spoken to the Attorney General, I have spoken to the commissioner of the OPP and I have spoken to the Ontario police chiefs association on the need for more stringent enforcement of some of these vitally important situations.

The police cannot be everywhere all the time and they have to make a choice as to what kind of enforcement they are giving, when and where. And it is very obvious that there are some laws easy to enforce that are not too important, and there are some laws more difficult to enforce but that are very important for safety. And I have urged the provincial and the municipal police to give their attention in the interest of safety to the enforcing of those laws that are of vital importance to the safety of the users of the highways. The member can be very sure of that.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the—

Mr. Ben: The Minister did not answer the question pertaining to the expenditures of the last fiscal year, nor did he give us an answer to my request as to what the present safety programme consists of. In other words, the $350,000 contained in the budget; what specifically are they going to buy the people of the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Just before we leave the matter of the obscured lights, I do not have it broken down into lights that were broken and those that were obscured. But in 1965 we had 25,782 convictions for inadequate lights. It is, perhaps, a small part of the problem but at least it shows that the provision is there for preventing it if the enforcement is adequate.

The member asked further how we were spending this money for advertising and I could read him the list of the items that are going into the current advertising programme. It would not be greatly different to the one he was referring to, which was probably 1965, but would he accept the current one as an indication? I think it would be very similar. We have expanded and changed.

One item he asked about particularly was the Chetwynd film for $22,000 or $24,000. This was a 14 minute, 15 second, coloured movie on pedestrian safety entitled "Step in the Right Direction". That is the kind of film we find is most useful, because not only is it used before gatherings of all kinds in ordinary meetings, but it fits in with the television programmes. That particular film was run at least once on every television station in Ontario. It was very well received and I know of one station that ran it no less than three times. That was the film he referred to—$20,000 or $22,000, I think, was that about the cost of it?

The other items of publicity in connection with our safety programme include nursery school and kindergarten programmes. Those are coloured pictures and posters and what-have-you; elementary school programmes, and the bicycle safety programme, our Crusader bicycle club; the secondary school traffic safety programme and the high school driver instruction programme.

The high school driver instruction programme includes a very good textbook entitled *Sportsmanship Driving*. If the member

has not seen it, I would like him to see it. I think it is a very splendid work. As I say, there are studies being made on the relative driving records of those who have had the benefit of the high school education and those who have not that would point up the benefit that comes, or the good that comes from that programme.

There is a course in modern driving techniques; motorcycle safety programme—our motorcycle materials have been changed substantially in very recent days, as you will understand, in consequence of the changes that have been made; indoor posters and place mats that are used around the province on occasions; the licence expiry date programme. This came into the publication as distinct from the safety part of the programme.

Exhibitions and displays: We have a new mobile trailer, very well equipped, that is going around the province. We have a monthly bulletin. We have a standard publication. There is that film production that we have scheduled for this year for another $20,000, which is about the same as the "Step in the Right Direction", which was the last one. We have our film library, photographic supplies and the senior citizens programme, "The Lost Art of Walking", and some miscellaneous and reserve.

I think that covers basically the type of programme we are dealing with.

Mr. Ben: I presume that this "Lost Art of Walking" is an endeavour of the Minister of Transport to put himself out of business, is it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, it is simply to make walking safe for those who have passed the age when it is really safe for them to drive.

Mr. Ben: I see. Now there are a few other points I want to raise while we are on this topic. First of all I should say I believe, at least I try to follow the principle when I drive, that you should keep your eyes, not on the car ahead, but on the car ahead of the car ahead; then you know what the car ahead of you is going to do, by looking at the car ahead of him. It is a practice that I have developed and I find it aggravating when I am driving along to have the cars stop at an intersection and then start making a left hand turn and as they do so, turning on their indicators to indicate they are making a left hand turn. It strikes me as strange that it never occurs to the drivers of those automobiles that I do not have to have them turn on their left turn indicator to let me know they are turning left, because I can see they are turning left. The purpose of an indicator is to notify the drivers behind that you intend to make a left hand turn, or you intend to make a right hand turn. The turn itself indicates you are making a turn, it is too late to turn it on then.

It strikes me as strange that The Highway Traffic Act does not provide that the signal should be made at least a specific distance prior to making that turn, 100 yards, for example, so that traffic can move to the right, or move to the left, as circumstances require. Traffic need not stop then because a driver is going to make a turn.

There are a few other points. For instance, I feel there should be a law which would apply to any person that gets stranded in the intersection when the light changes, thereby preventing cross traffic from proceeding. This would compel people to look at the car ahead of the car ahead of them. I think it is just sheer rudeness and inconsideration, and perhaps the Minister can tell me that we can charge them under section 29, using the highway without reasonable consideration for others; but at least there should be some penalty for these people. They just pull into the intersection, like at the corner of Bay and Queen Streets, or the corner of Bay and Richmond Streets, and block the road for the use of—in the case of Richmond Street—westbound traffic for a space of two lights simply because they just had to get across that intersection; they just could not wait before entering the intersection to see if they could proceed beyond the intersection.

I would like to have the Minister's comments on those points.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I will be charging lessons for instruction in the law. But 69 (4) of The Traffic Act under rules of the road, specifies that the signal shall be given to be seen by a vehicle for a distance of 100 feet before it turns left or right.

Mr. Ben: It says a distance of 100 feet. I see them when they are already turning. I want them to turn on that indicator 100 yards before they come to the point where they are making the turn. That is only 300 feet, the length of Sunnyside swimming pool, or slightly more than twice the length of this chamber.

Mr. Sargent: As critic for the Opposition in this department, I am not as sharp as some of the members across there on this business of safety, so I have tried to get it from the top pros in the business, which I

think the Minister probably would like to have too. I have been talking to a man, called Mr. E. H. Van Pike, who is a native of Grey county and who is one of the top authorities, I think, on safety; and he has a letter here from Dr. Shulman.

An hon. member: You have heard of him, have you not?

Mr. Sargent: You have heard of a real buddy of the government there. He says:

> Thank you for your letter of September 27. I would sugegst that if you could get the automobile dealers in southern Ontario to express their wish to the provincial government that legislation be brought in for (1) setting up of minimum safety standards for automobiles and (2) insisting upon annual or semi-annual compulsory inspection of older cars and (3) providing use of the implied consent law as is now done in California.

He says that these three measures would produce a tremendous reduction in the carnage on our highways.

Now Mr. Chairman, I want to say that—first of all, insofar as the setting up of minimum safety standards for automobiles—I think it is a shocking thing that, in view of all the stories in the press about Ralph Nader and his troubles with GM, this government, as I understand the member for Yorkview discussing this across the House with this Minister, and this Minister has not yet set a target date with the manufacturers with a specified list of modifications they must make on cars sold in Ontario.

Now I think this is a starting point, that you must start some place and you must define to me and to the Opposition, I think, what your definite planned target date is. Is it 1968 you are starting this, sir? We do not know this yet.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We started in 1965.

Mr. Sargent: When is the date with the manufacturer, Mr. Chairman, insofar as to having these modifications on cars sold here?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Some of them were 1965. More in 1966. There will be more in 1967 for the 1968 models.

Mr. Sargent: All right. Do you have the adapted mufflers now? Is that coming into being in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Is the member referring to fume controls?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I am leaving that with my colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond).

Mr. Sargent: No, that is not good enough. This is under you. The adapters on mufflers is a definite responsibility of The Department of Transport because they are an appendage on a car and this is your baby. I think someone has got to take the responsibility.

Now, dovetailing with your department is a bill that was passed in the House last week.

We are talking about safety, Mr. Chairman, and if you rule this is to do with the motor vehicle inspection, you have a subsection here under 2204. Would you rather hold it until that?

Mr. Chairman: On the following vote.

Mr. Sargent: All right then. I will leave that, but it does relate to safety, Mr. Chairman. I will leave that, but I do want to say in the discussion yesterday on luminous licence plates, and I think we got a real snow job from you on that. I do not think you know what you are doing on this one. You say it is good, yes, but nothing happens.

Now if you will look at this thing again in 26 of the states to the south of us, they have luminous plates. They have them in Newfoundland, they have them in the Northwest Territories; they have them in Alberta starting this year.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Is this in order; having this all over again?

Mr. Sargent: You may be right, Mr. Whip, but we did not get the pay dirt on this stuff. Now the pay dirt is, these plates cost 30 cents for a set of plates. Now the motivation for this whole discussion is saving lives and this is your job in this department—the safety of people. I think motivation can be described—as the fellow said to the other chap, how long have you been working for this firm, and he said, ever since the day they threatened to fire me.

I think the Minister is in a very precarious spot unless he moves on it. And regardless of the outcome of the election, he is in a very shaky spot. In very brief summary, after reflectorized luminous plates were introduced in Minnesota in 1957—and Minister, hear this, please—the rural auto deaths were reduced from 24 per cent to 9 per cent of total fatalities. The urban area deaths involving collision with parked cars dropped from 28 per cent to 7 per cent, a reduction of 21 per cent.

We are talking about 1,500 deaths in Ontario and if that ratio were projected we would be talking about 300 lives that could be saved on a factor like this. And we are talking about a tried and proven accessory that works and the Minister is looking out the window; he has not used it. I think it is a shocking thing that he cannot move on even a simple thing like this.

In this regard, these states are using such plates and they help the police in the enforcement of their duties. But the report says this department has studied it and it cannot make up its mind whether it is good or bad; it does not think perhaps it is a good deal. But other administrations or jurisdictions think it is a good thing and it works.

This next one comes under inspection; I had better leave this point, but I would like the Minister to show what action he is going to take on this important thing for cars, for safety.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think we dealt with this quite adequately yesterday, The member has been quoting figures and percentages, and I think in the overall context they relate to percentages of collisions at dark with parked cars; it is a very small part of the overall collisions that occur.

He has also referred again to the fact that Newfoundland and the Northwest Territories have adopted them and they are coming into Alberta. I do not think their expertise in motor vehicle administration—and I do not intend to deprecate these people who are doing the business in those areas, but I do not think they exceed the expertise of the motor vehicle administrators we have or that they would have in the state of California or the state of New York or the state of Pennsylvania or most of the leading jurisdictions.

I said to the hon. member yesterday that we are concerned with the need for reflectorization as a need by itself, and it is being looked at from that standpoint. It is being very carefully considered by the motor vehicle manufacturers and I think it would be a mistake to go into it at this time and find that we are duplicating additional reflectorization that the motor cars may be carrying.

Mr. Sargent: The Ontario motor league, representing 300,000 car drivers in this province, want this safety factor. But the Minister has the power to say, "No, we don't think this safety factor is worthwhile."

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have brought this same topic up for years now and I have mentioned the fact that the chambers of commerce had recommended this. They once again in their policy book recommend the use of reflectorized licence plates; they do not say it is the whole answer to safety, but it is another safety feature that could be added to an automobile. My own municipal council has recommended this for three years in a row now and they always get the same answer, that, well, it is not as safe as the individuals who recommend it imply; they say there are other safety features that could be added to the vehicle. That might be quite true, Mr. Chairman, but why not put on reflectorized licence plates and at least have that little added feature?

In addition to simply reflectorized licence plates, I would say that you maybe need some type of reflectorized material on the back end of the car—it may not be on the licence plates—as an added safety feature.

Last night, in the city of Windsor, the junior chamber of commerce had experts down from the various manufacturers, plus other interested groups, and they had a demonstration of the safety features of reflectorized licence plates.

Mr. Chairman, the chambers of commerce, both junior and senior, would not be pushing this were they to be assured that it did not have some merit. It must have merit. If 30 states in the United States have it, and the international association of chiefs of police, the Ontario traffic conference, the Ontario municipal association, and the Canadian highway council recommend this, Mr. Chairman, why does the Minister hold back on it?

Surely they would not recommend it if it did not have some benefit, if it was not to the advantage of safety generally. They only recommend things that, in their estimation and with their experience, have some merit. I think, Mr. Chairman, the Minister should act on this. The cost is not that great.

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville in his remarks about reflectorized licence plates. I spoke at some considerable length on this matter last year. I do not think there is any need to go all through that area again except to say I think it is something we should have.

There are two areas of night driving that have disturbed me during the last year or two, and the first, Mr. Chairman, is in regard to the newer vehicles—those that have the very wide bars that extend right across the whole width of the vehicle.

I find personally that it is very disturbing, when you close up on one of these cars. I am not sure what I am approaching. I would like the Minister to comment on this and let me know if he has had similar complaints.

The second thing I find very disturbing when I am driving at night—and again I would like the Minister to comment—are these sequential turn signals that flash in different places. I am not being facetious when I say this—I do not think they are as safe as the single flasher when you are making a right-hand turn or a left-hand turn, as the great big flasher.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I got the first point the member was raising about the bar across the back.

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, the member raised the matter about the reflectorized plates and I would like to make a comment or two.

Mr. Chairman: This seems to be a very popular vote, perhaps the Minister would wait until the others speak on it.

Mr. White: About 15 months ago, several executives from Minnesota Mining in London took me out to a concession road not far from their plant, northeast of the city, at dusk.

They put on a series of demonstrations which convinced me that reflectorized plates are a very, very good thing. I cannot describe in detail those particular experiments now, but to give you an indication, we were driven in a car along a dark roadway.

Some distance ahead was a car sitting with its lights on, and it was bearing a reflectorized plate on the front.

We saw the reflectorized plate a long time before we saw the headlights of the car. We were then driven from the other direction and once again we saw the reflectorized plate a long time before we saw the stop lights of the car.

The same thing was done with different variations, sometimes with a reflectorized plate and an un-reflectorized plate being put on the car, sometimes with one light on and the other light off, sometimes with the "brights" on and the "brights" off, but always the reflectorized plate could be seen before the lights of the car.

I did make representations to the department and was very disappointed to find that they were not willing to change their policy.

If I remember correctly, the standing committee on transport had a meeting a year ago, and the members of that committee made a very strong recommendation to the Minister that this matter be re-examined. I am certainly not convinced by the reply given by the department that this is not a good thing.

Strangely enough, a few weeks after the Minister had once again turned the idea down, my own car was parked in front of my brother-in-law's house—my wife and I were in there—and we heard a thump; we thought one of the youngsters had fallen out of bed upstairs. A couple of minutes later, a fellow came to the door and said, "I just crashed into your new car."

I am completely convinced that collision with my car would not have taken place if there had been—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Your insurance goes up.

Mr. White: His insurance paid for it.

Mr. MacDonald: Your insurance will go up.

Mr. White: But I am convinced the collision would not have taken place if there had been reflectorized plates, and I do associate myself with the previous speaker in asking that this matter be re-examined.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two at this stage about our driver education programme as it has developed in my home area of Port Colborne, Welland and Thorold. Much of the credit for the excellent progress which has been achieved there must go to Mr. J. H. Woodhouse, magistrate for Welland, a dedicated servant of the community in every respect.

About six years ago, Mr. Woodhouse accompanied by the local chief of police, called upon each board of education with high schools and persuaded the boards to consent to local police engaging in an eight-hour driver education course in the months of January, February and March. This course was designed to train those persons who would be 16 years of age in that year and therefore eligible and likely to be applying for a driver's licence.

This initial course was very well and enthusiastically received by all the students and was continued in most schools until last year. As the result of the enthusiasm shown by the students over this particular course, the Port Dover board of education two years ago adopted the driver education programme sponsored jointly by The Department of Education and The Department of Transport.

This idea has flourished until seven of the nine high schools in the area have adopted this programme. Thorold high school is one of the few dissenters at present, but they are now thinking very seriously of entering into the programme. The other school in question is Notre Dame, in Welland, which I hope will be included in this programme very shortly, and therefore we have today a driver education plan, sponsored by the two government departments, in the high schools of Port Colborne, Fonthill, E. L. Crossley, Pelham district high school, Centennial high school in Welland, Eastdale high school in Welland and the Welland high school.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to compliment Mr. Woodhouse for his efforts, and also the local boards of education and the schools concerned for the manner in which they have cooperated to make this programme possible. I know, too, from my communications with Mr. Woodhouse, that this has been achieved through the excellent cooperation of the local authorities received from The Department of Transport and The Department of Education.

I know too that the Minister of Transport, who is deeply concerned with measures to improve highway safety, will be gratified to learn that the results of this programme are already beginning to show in the police courts. The younger violator is becoming less and less frequent each year and each month. I am assured by the magistrate that he has yet to receive before his court any young driver who took either the earlier police course, or the new driver education training. I am sure all members will agree that this speaks very well of the advantages of such a programme.

Some insurance companies are already giving a reduction in premiums to those students who took the original course, sponsored by the police department, and of course all insurance companies, recognize by reduction in premium those students who have taken the officially sponsored course.

Finally, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is one of the most important measures in the field of highway safety which has been introduced in a great number of years. I would like to see this programme expanded and extended so that all high school students could receive this training in future.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, would highway inspection of vehicles come under this vote?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Under 2204.

Mr. Chairman: Not this one, the following one.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself again with the sentiments expressed in connection with reflectorized licence plates. I raised this yesterday and we had some discussion about it. I agree with the Minister in the sense that we should have other reflectorized surfaces on the motor car, but every bit of safety, as has already been said, is to the good and this is something that we can do within the next 12 months, if we so desire; at least as soon as the next batch of motor car licences are to be made. Perhaps the ones for next year are already under way, I do not know, but then the one following that, and this simply adds to the whole field of safety devices which can give us greater visibility on the highways.

In connection with the after burners on motor cars, which the Minister has just said he is turning over to the hon. Minister of Health, I quote from his press release of May 26, 1966, when he said this:

> Other safety devices are in an advanced stage of development, including rear window defrosters and a system to reduce the emission of deleterious pollutants from the exhaust.

Now a year ago the Minister had a great deal of interest in this matter and said that this was in an advanced stage of development.

Perhaps the Minister could give us some information he may have, which the Minister of Health does not have at this pont, as to the exact stage at which this development is.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, before we depart from the question of reflectorized licence plates, I think, in view of the representations that have been made today, I ought to say to the House that I will refer the matter again to the officials of the department for an examination of the situation, because I recognize the views that have been expressed, and the concern in this area.

Now with respect to fumes controls; I made a quite extensive statement on this subject about a year ago, and, at that time, I felt that this was a piece of automobile equipment and, not fitting anywhere else in the programme, it might very well have devolved upon me and my department.

Since that time, as the House knows, it has been assumed as part of the responsibility on

air pollution by my colleague, the Minister of Health, and so I feel that I should merely leave this matter with him in its entirety and to give him what information, and what help, I can.

A year ago, I spelled out in pretty good detail the various approaches that were being made to the reduction of the discharge of deleterious gases.

In that case, I enumerated the various approaches that were being made and I think that we all must realize that the various motor car companies are deeply concerned with finding a solution to it and the member for Yorkview said a year ago that all they had to do was use this old patent that came out—I think it was in 1911—and the thing was answered. I think he realizes now that it is far from being that simple, and that some of the best after burners, which is the type most generally accepted, in California, have proved to be very inadequate.

The motor car companies are not satisfied that is the answer and they are not stopping their examination into, and work on, developing better exhaust control devices. Yet, I think I emphasized in my remarks some time ago, that I thought the best chances of success lay in either a new fuel in its entirety, or an additive to fuels, or a reconstitution of present fuels on the one hand—or an entirely new approach to carburetion and the combustion that would yield the best results.

I think it is in those areas that we can look most hopefully for success, rather than in the after, or secondary, treatment of the output, or the products of combustion from the cylinders.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, again I point out to the Minister that while the motor car companies may not be satisfied that it is possible to get these results quickly, the United States government seems to be satisfied. They are mandating them for the 1968 cars.

I mentioned the patent last year, the 1909 patent, as I remember, which was used in the California situation.

I mentioned that because the motor car companies were delaying refusing to do anything until they were forced to do it, and then when they were forced to do it, it was pointed out that they were basing their new devices on a patent of 1909. In other words, they had known for years the general principles about how to develop these things—now the heat is on in the United States.

It should also be on in Canada and, Mr. Chairman, as soon as we apply that heat sufficiently I think that these channels which the Minister has mentioned will be explored much more seriously by the motor car companies and by others interested, and that we will get results. I hope that we will. It may be that the electric car will be the solution if we get a quick breakthrough and then the motor car companies, from sheer competitive interest, will have to produce the more or less exhaust-free car, as far as deleterious materials are concerned.

Yesterday I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, the matter of rear lights and the necessity of thinking in new terms in this regard, and I pointed out that we ought to be thinking of matching them up with the signal lights along the highways and on our street corners, with the same general colour pattern—that is, green for the running lights, red for the stop, and perhaps with an orange interlude in between.

I was interested last night to hear that the traffic conference has endorsed the same general idea and I wonder if the Minister has some comments. I notice that the Ontario safety league, too, has pointed out in February of this year that drivers confuse a red tail light signal with a red brake signal 8 per cent of the time. With different colours the confusion is reduced to 1 per cent. As I said yesterday I realize that this is something that the Minister would have to discuss with others across the country, but I hope that some progress is being made.

I would also point out to him that the Ontario traffic conference, in a resolution as far back as 1960, asked him and asked other Ministers for a maximum and minimum dimension for rear lights on vehicles, so that some uniformity can be achieved within certain limits. This, they felt, would make for much greater ease for the police and others who have to enforce regulations. I wonder if he has a comment on these. Then I would like to bring to his attention certain other resolutions of the Ontario traffic conference which he knows about and which that conference is concerned about at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: With respect to the size of rear lights, the requirement under equipment does not deal with size but with the distance at which the light must be clearly visible. That is the measurement used. There is a great deal of common sense in the proposal the member has brought to our attention. I think I was discussing it not long ago with Dr. Arthur Secord, who was perhaps one of its proponents, namely the

changing of the colour of the tail lights from red to green for running lights and using the red lights only for braking purposes.

It is a very sensible arrangement. I think it commends itself to everyone that the tail lights of a car might better be green and only the stop lights red, but in a situation like we have on this continent where these things fall within the jurisdiction of so many different states and provinces, the only way we can advance in an area like this is to get uniformity, because to have two systems operating contemporaneously would lead to great confusion. This matter is receiving active study by engineering groups in the various critical areas in the American association of motor vehicle administrators, in our own Canadian conference of motor vehicle administrators. The motor car companies are aware of what is desired in this direction and I think it is largely a matter of how and when it will be worked out because, as I say, there is so much to commend it. It is a very sensible idea and it is just too bad we got off on the wrong foot in this area, as in so many others, because of the rapid growth of the automobile industry.

We got started in local jurisdictions with such a multiformity of regulations that it is difficult to get them back on the tracks, and into a degree of uniformity that is needed.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I can understand the Minister's difficulty but, at the same time, this jurisdiction could start a process like this, mandated after a certain length of time, that green running lights should be in effect.

I doubt that it would make for the confusion that the Minister talks about, because we are used to the red running lights and the red flare lights for stopping—and those red stop lights will always be there. I do not think that the average motorist who sees the green running lights ahead of him would be confused.

He would see some red ones and some green ones for a period of years—a changeover would take time, but I cannot see that that would make for any great confusion. We are used to different standards, for different things, in motor cars and if the start were made by some jurisdiction, and it would seem that this jurisdiction, where motor cars are made in Canada principally, would be the one.

If the Minister would give a lead here, I think that the other provinces of Canada would follow along. Certainly many of the states in the United States, and finally all of them, would come as well.

I do think that the green running lights would not confuse at all, because when the car is stopping, we would see the red flash and we would know what that means. So I commend to the Minister the idea that perhaps he should do some pioneering here; he should negotiate a little more firmly with the motor car companies in this field, and write into the regulations that, beginning at a certain period of time, the green running lights should be adopted.

I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, whether the next item is under this vote or not, but I bring it to the Minister's attention and you can direct me if you wish.

The item again in the Ontario traffic conference—a recommendation to the Ontario Minister of Transport to consider amending The Highway Traffic Act by setting in legislation, the enabling of a suspension of a driver's licence of any person who is suspected of driving while under the influence of alcohol and who refuses to submit to the taking of a specimen of his blood, urine, breath, or any other bodily substance for chemical analysis.

This is pretty wide sweeping in its wording, but I think the matter has been before this House a great many times that we ought to be setting standards for the content of alcohol in the blood. I brought this up before in the House—and since that time I have received a copy of another survey which has been taken, I think this time by the state of Massachusetts. They point out, in their testing, that this is becoming a very great problem across the continent.

They have conducted a five year study of highway fatalities and their relationship to alcohol and they have investigated 3,894 deaths.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if I could find out from the Minister whether he has any money for this particular subject or whether this properly comes under the Attorney General.

Mr. Young: This is a matter for highway safety, I would think, Mr. Chairman, more than any other concern—and I am approaching it from the point of view of highway safety because this becomes very, very—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think, Mr. Chairman, it might properly be discussed in this vote. I considered the matter arising and it seemed to me that this is where it should be discussed—the matter of impaired driving or alcohol content. It is a very significant subject.

Mr. Young: Let me proceed, then, with a short résumé of the Massachusetts study where 518 of the dead operators out of the 3,894—and pedestrians were included—were analyzed in the laboratory of the state:

> Of the 236 operators who were killed in single car accidents, 53 or 22 per cent were sober and 166 or 70 per cent, were impaired by alcohol. Some of these drivers also killed their passengers. Of the 133 operators tested who were killed in two-car accidents, 45 or 34 per cent, were sober, and 73 or 55 per cent, were impaired by alcohol. In some of these accidents both drivers were impaired. The majority of drivers responsible for the accidents were impaired. The majority of those not responsible for the accidents were sober. Of the 149 dead pedestrians tested 55 or 37 per cent, were sober and 81—54 per cent, were impaired by alcohol. Thirty-two of the sober were over 63 years of age.

Now, the note is appended to this study. The reported results are based on all of the blood samples submitted to the laboratory by the medical examiner.

They point out that, in many cases, samples were submitted because there was a suspicion of alcohol content in the blood. But it is believed that 90 per cent of these samples were from medical examiners who submit samples on all the auto cases.

My point is simply this, Mr. Chairman, that more and more reports—and I brought a couple of them before the House earlier—are pointing out that the blood alcohol content has a very important bearing upon automobile accidents and automobile deaths.

In a very dramatic programme on TV last fall, and again in February of this year, it was pointed out that the generally accepted blood alcohol level of 0.08 is just too high and many of our courts, of course, accept 0.15 as the dangerous level.

So the old point of 0.05 comes back into focus as, perhaps, the break point, where we ought to be thinking in terms of penalties. The question is, how we can establish 0.05 without some way of measuring the blood alcohol. It seems to me that this Minister ought to be giving very serious attention, in the light of an increasing amount of evidence, to the establishment of the 0.05 level in law, and the establishment of the breathalizer as a legal means by which this alcohol level can be established.

The Ontario traffic conference has backed this move; they certainly want the power to enforce this level and I think all of us are very interested in hearing from the Minister just what progress may be made in his thinking, and in the investigations of this department, in respect to this very important menace on our highways.

Mr. Chairman: There are others interested in this particular subject. I wonder if the Minister would prefer to wait.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, my subject was not going to be on—

Mr. Chairman: A different subject?

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I might like to get in here.

Mr. Chairman: On the same subject?

Mr. Bukator: No, but there are subjects that have gone on, that we, apparently, have by-passed, and I would like to get back to them, and then you can continue with your breathalizer argument.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, then you will follow the member for Downsview. If he defers to you, it is fine.

Mr. Bukator: There were two problems brought up here this afternoon—

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, are we going to get an answer to this question—

Mr. Chairman: It is on a different subject, the Minister may as well answer now.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, we are having great difficulty. This vote covers a variety of things and I have been trying, on and off for two hours, to get the floor on a number of things. I will have some thoughts to express on the breathalizer and I want to deal substantially with motorcycles.

I think there are still some words to say about reflectorized plates and so on, and merely because the member for Yorkview is now holding the floor, and continued on until he spoke about breathalizers, does not end it at all.

Mr. Chairman: I must point out that I had you listed to ask some questions and comment previously, but you had left the room when we discontinued the subject of reflectorized plates.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria): Mr. Chairman, a lot of us did not have the opportunity to discuss reflectorized licence plates and

running lights because we apparently were never looked at.

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest to the member that it is very difficult for the Chairman to see 108 members at one time. If any member, at any time, wants to get the attention of the chair all he has to do is stand up and say, "Mr. Chairman" and I will recognize him as soon as I possibly can.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, I do not think it is reasonable to say that the question of reflectorized licence plates has been exhausted by any means, or that merely because the member for Yorkview now has introduced a new subject, that that will be the be all, and end all of it.

Mr. Chairman: No, in connection with this point of order, I would say that the vote is still before us.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if it was possible to name at least some subjects—there is the matter of reflectorized licence plates, on which we apparently have not had all comments members wish to make, there is also the question of the running green light and there is now the question of alcohol content of the blood and the breathalizer test.

I wonder if we could designate to begin with those three subjects, and when there is no further discussion on one of them, then we can go on to the other one, but not get them all mixed up together.

Mr. Chairman: May I say to the member for Woodbine that there were perhaps eight or ten members who spoke on reflectorized plates, and the Minister did answer the questions at one time. I thought we had pretty well exhausted the subject.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I had thought that the subject was completed, but apparently not, Mr. Chairman, and I would not like to see any member cut off.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on reflectorized plates?

Mr. Bukator: The point that I tried to make was most refreshing, as a member in the Opposition to look across this House and see the member for Beaches make the same argument this year that he did a year ago. And the member for London South gets up and tells of his experience where actual tests were taken for him to convince him that reflectorized plates could be seen much better if they have this particular paint on them, and they are the plates that should be in existence today. So when the member for London South told us of his experience I was already convinced, although the members on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, for years have made this point, especially the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

I was so pleased to see again—it must be something in the atmosphere, Mr. Chairman—to see the Minister get up and say he would take this up with his department again. I can tell you how to simply bring this to a conclusion, a successful conclusion. That is, if the Minister takes this up with his department and makes the recommendation that they bring it into existence this fall—that is how simple it will be.

It will be brought about and it ought to be brought about. I know the Minister is fair enough, and that when we get through speaking in this House, if each man had a chance to speak, each one would say that we ought to have that type of plate on our cars. Having said that, I would like to go back to the safety features of trucks, because we were on that subject also just before the plates.

The trucks that are on the highways with this particular fender, call it a fender if you will; a piece of canvas with a rubberized surface that hangs behind the tires of the tractor. They are not wide enough; they are not low enough. And if many of you have done the same thing that I did in the winter time, on a slushy road, driving by one of these trucks, Mr. Chairman, you cannot help but get your windshield so splattered that you cannot see where you are going.

I would think that a safety feature on trucks would be to make them a little wider, yes, even curve them rather than a straight plate, to make it safe to pass a truck. I have found myself driving along the highway where I thought I ought not to pass that truck because I know exactly what is going to happen: I will get splattered and I will not be able to see where I am going. So by sitting back, the truck passes me and I find myself in a difficult position with the snow bank on my right, if I could see it, and the truck on the left, which has splattered my windshield.

If your wipers are not working too well, if they are frozen up, you do have a problem. If they are working it takes at least four or five swipes across that windshield to clear the situation up. Each one of you has had an experience such as the one I speak of. Has this problem ever been approached—I do not suppose I have ever heard anyone in this House speak on this particular item.

A constituent wrote me a letter and said:

> You talk about safety features on the highways; building better trucks, better cars with these features and here is one that could be simply remedied by just a little more imagination by the manufacturer of these units.

And I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to this House, that this is a problem that can be very easily remedied. I have seen trucks, these little tractor affairs, without any particular fender on them at all. I suppose they get ripped off in the process of backing up to the platforms or backing up to the tractor.

I would think this would be a feature worth looking into. And there may be a chance the Minister was approached on this problem. If he was, I would like his comments and ask if this is not a reasonable request and what he and his department intend to do about this very urgent matter. It ought to be remedied immediately.

Mr. Chairman: As suggested, we will stay with the reflectorized plate issue first.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Chairman, last year the committee on highways, transport and tourism recommended to The Department of Transport that reflectorized licence plates be considered. They did this only after we had a full showing of a film and a display of plates wherein the members of that committee could thoroughly understand all the factors.

There is one point that particularly struck me, and the one reason I was in favour of reflectorized licence plates in particular had to do with the on-coming car with one headlight. It defines which side of the car that the one headlight was on and I thought for this reason alone the reflectorized licence plate was worthwhile. The parked car is defined where the car is on the shoulder of the road, without its signal lights. I recently had the privilege of listening to Dr. Secord in North Bay, along with my friend, the member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith) wherein he talked about green running lights.

I would commend the green running lights to the members of this House very highly. I believe a combination of the reflectorized licence plate along with the green running lights would provide a great measure of safety. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on the reflectorized plate or the green running lights?

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Chairman, can I go now? Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have an opportunity—

Mr. Chairman: What I would like to do is stay with this vote.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested. We had a touch of the debate on the reflectorized licence plate yesterday afternoon and the Minister was telling us the degree of reflectorization was being reflected, I suppose, by the attitudes of the manufacturers, and they are building something in and around the lights; front lights, apparently, and back lights. I was watching as I was driving last evening as to the extent of this effectiveness. I criticized the Minister at that time, and I repeat that criticism: it seems so frequently that he allows the industry to set the pattern, and for the life of me, both at dusk and at night I could not see any effective reflectorization being built into what surrounds those lights.

I mentioned very briefly, and I am going to read it in full, the submission by the Ontario motor league made to the government on April 17, 1967 and for the benefit, at least of the record, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps for the information of some of the members, I am sure that most people are aware that the Ontario motor league has, in its membership, some 300,000 motorists in the province of Ontario. It represents or speaks for something better than 12 per cent of the people who drive vehicles. I would think this kind of an opinion should have some effect on the government.

The motor league respectfully recommended, and this is their first recommendation —one would think by reason of its position in this well-prepared brief that they submitted, that they give it very high priority— that the government should require the reflectorization of licence plates for all motor vehicles.

As part of their argument, they state that in 1949, the state of Maine was the first to acquire light-reflecting plates and that, at the present time, more than half the states in the United States have adopted this requirement.

In Canada, the Northwest Territories and Newfoundland have already done this and Alberta and Manitoba are planning to inaugurate these systems in the year 1967.

Why then is the Minister still considering it? Why then is he still prepared to let the industry determine what degree of reflectorization there shall be? There seems to

be unanimous opinion, at least amongst people other than the Cabinet, that there should be reflectorization of licence plates—it is an unusual event in this House.

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt my colleague but it is not the industry that is responsible for the plates, but the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman).

Mr. Singer: No, no, he only manufactures them.

Mr. Ben: He manufactures them, that is right so you could blame two Ministers over there, not just one.

Mr. Singer: I suppose if he was here, he would say that he only does what the Minister of Transport tells him to do, or his people only do that. By all means, let us not let the Minister of Reform Institutions escape from whatever responsibility there is. He has that responsibility. In addition, he and his colleagues have a greater responsibility. They sit around the Cabinet table together and one would think they make collective decisions.

Mr. Ben: Oh here he comes now.

Mr. Singer: Here he is now, it is his fault.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): How did I get into this?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the point I was making is that it is significant that the hon. member for Beaches and the hon. member for London South—occasionally I am in agreement with them—and the hon. member for Victoria, yes, three very important members of this House, have stood up and told their own Minister that there should be reflectorized plates, and the Minister just does not seem to be impressed by any of this.

He does not seem to be impressed at all. Sort of similar to his argument—I am going to be coming to this later—last year, about crash helmets, when you said you would not expect us to legislate about style of dress.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I never got any demerit points in my life.

Mr. Singer: I will come to you a little later. But the thing that puzzles me, Mr. Chairman, is that with all of this good intelligence being directed towards this Minister, and from all sections of the House, why it does not make some impression? Why he still sits back and waits for the industry to do something?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The member was out.

Mr. Singer: No, I heard you. You said that now, as a result of some of the arguments, you are going to, perhaps, go back to your people and ask them for another point of view. Surely the Minister has been around long enough that he could have canvassed the view of his own members.

He knows the views that have been expressed in this House. He had before him, as I had, this brief of the Ontario motor league, and surely he should not have tried two goes at the subject. The first one was, "Let us leave it to the industry", and, as the pressure got a little hotter, later this afternoon, "Well, maybe we will have another look at it".

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am not impressed with the Minister's second looks, because in the years he has occupied that particular portfolio, his second looks have produced nothing more than his first looks—and his third looks have produced even less.

Why does he resist these things that seem to be so universally accepted as good safety protection methods and which would help save lives in the province of Ontario?

Mr. Ben: Because he is a Conservative and resists change.

Mr. Singer: My friend from Bracondale is absolutely right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): That is the first time you people have agreed.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, these are some of the arguments that are put forward by the Ontario motor league in regard to these reflectorized plates. They say—they ask the question: "When and under what conditions, are reflectorized licence plates of value? We submit that their value is easily evident in the following circumstances:

"(a) When a car is inoperative or stalled on the highway or adjacent to a highway at night"—and that must be obvious even to the hon. Minister.

"(b) When a vehicle has faulty tail lights"—and that must be obvious even to the hon. Minister.

"(c) When a vehicle is approaching another vehicle"—and that again should be equally obvious to the hon. Minister.

"(d) When there is damage to conventional plastic or glass tail light reflector assemblies"—and the way these modern cars are constructed that is the easiest thing in the world to occur, and that should be obvious again to the hon. Minister.

"(e) When such assemblies are inoperative as a result of accumulation of dust or dirt"—and anyone who drives a car knows this can happen so easily, including the hon. Minister.

"(f) when driving at night, generally as an aid to judgment of the relative speed and distance of other vehicles moving on the highway"—and that again should be obvious to the hon. Minister.

The member for Halton (Mr. Kerr) has indicated that, perhaps reflectorized plates could get covered with mud and not be too easy to view. I agree that is a possibility, but I do not think the hon. member for Halton is against reflectorized plates. If he is, I would like him to stand up and say so, because I would like to hear one argument from somebody on the government side in support of the Minister's "do nothing" attitude. If there is one let us hear what it is.

Surely it is specious to suggest that we should not do it because it will not be effective if mud covers the reflectorized plates.

I am sure that even as intelligent a member as the hon. member for Halton, would be in favour of anything that could save lives on the road, and he would join with his colleagues from London South, from Beaches and from Victoria, in urging the Minister, in pushing the Minister, into this very simple step. The motor league goes on to say:

> We respectfully endorse a number of conclusions in this regard—

and then they list eight reasons for this endorsement:

> 1. Whereas some safety devices aim at reducing the severity of an accident, reflectorized licence plates aim at preventing the accident in the first place.

Is there any answer to that? Can anyone say "nay" to that argument?

> 2. If such licence plates were issued to all motorists at one time the benefits would be immediate.

Is there any answer to that and is there any reason why it cannot be done?

> 3. Rear end collisions are the most common form of motor vehicle accident. Reflectorized licence plates would, in large number, reduce the probability of night time rear end collisions.

Is there any answer to that?

> 4. The cost of the programme would be insignificant compared with the benefits that would flow to every motorist in the province.

Has the Minister any cost figures that negate that argument?

> 5. Reflectorized licence plates would, in effect, give every motorist in the province a further insurance policy aimed at reducing night time accidents—the most dangerous time to drive.

That is just so obvious, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how any hon. member can fail to agree with that point.

> 6. In addition to their contribution to accident reduction reflectorized licence plates would be an important aid to law enforcement.

And again that is so obvious even the hon. Minister must be aware of it.

> 7. Reflectorization has reached the point of technical development where the federal government, military and some provincial department specifications, setting forth minimum requirements, are in common use. It is long past the experimental stage.

This is one of the favourite havens that the Minister has taken; that they are all in the experimental stage, and he has given us no argument at all to back up his original statement that he made yesterday afternoon. His retreat today is a retreat in face of concentrated opposition from all sides of the House and it really was not a retreat it was the usual meaningless Ministerial statement—"Well, if you are that excited about it we will take it back and have another look at it".

Why cannot the Minister stand in his place this afternoon and say, "Now I am convinced —there is not an argument that I have to the contrary as to what has been put forward from all sides of the House and, next year in 1968, we will have reflectorized licence plates in the province of Ontario"?

> 8. Experience in other states in the United States has proven that following the issuance of the first reflectorized plates the great majority of citizens have indicated their approval even when registration fees were increased by more than the actual additional cost of the reflectorization.

There is the argument summed up most capably, Mr. Chairman, by the Ontario motor league, which is not a pressure group, who have no particular axe to grind. Their reason for submitting this brief is to promote highway safety.

What possible excuse can the Minister give for saying, "I am going to have to study it again"? Why is he not brave enough? Why does he not have enough courage to stand

up this afternoon and say "I am convinced, we will have reflectorized licence plates in 1968."

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with motorcycles, but in view of what seems to be our present procedure, perhaps we will let the reflectorized plates go on for a bit more and when we come to motorcycles again I would like to get back up.

Mr. Chairman: Have we exhausted this subject now?

Mr. Ben: Just on one point—

Mr. Chairman: On this particular subject of reflectorized plates?

Mr. Ben: Yes. May we direct a question to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions? May we ask if he is prepared to start manufacturing the reflectorized licence plates? After all, there is a good chance that he would sell at least two million pair. He does not care.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, of course I do not have to go out and look for customers. We have one customer. The Minister of Transport orders them and we will have to decide then, whether we can manufacture them. I have not gone into this at all.

We are only in the position, as the hon. member knows, of being a supplier. We have nothing to do with policy, insofar as the department is concerned, as to whether we have reflectorized plates or any other kind of plates.

Mr. Sargent: You are not charging too much, are you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am looking for business for some of my clients.

Mr. Ben: Could I ask the Minister of Reform Institutions whether he has ever been approached by the Minister of Transport on this subject?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, at a moment's notice, I really cannot say that I recall whether he has or not. I would have to look at the files and find out.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further under that particular subject?

Mr. Singer: Will the Minister accept my suggestion that they begin in 1968?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has answered previously.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: You might like me to indicate that section 33 (2) of The Highway Traffic Act as of now requires:

> That no person shall sell, or offer for sale, a new motor vehicle after January 1, 1966, unless there is affixed at each side of the rear thereof, and placed in such a position as to reflect the light from the headlamps of a motor vehicle approaching from the rear, a red reflector approved by the department, or in lieu thereof red reflective material covering a surface of not less than 16 square inches.

We require reflectors on both sides of cars now on the rear, and that is what I was referring to the other night.

Mr. Chairman: Under the—

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, apropos to what the hon. member for Yorkview was discussing, that is, drinking drivers—

Mr. Chairman: Yes, impaired driving.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, while the hon. member was speaking, I ran down stairs to try to get some statistics so I missed the last part of his address. The statistics that I endeavoured to get was my copy of the accident statistics which the hon. Minister of Transport was so kind as to supply to all members of the House.

What fascinated me about the statistics that the Minister supplied, was that they are rather contradictory to those that were supplied by the hon. member for Yorkview. I am not questioning his figures, I am just pointing out the contradiction.

In the state of Massachusetts, as the hon. member pointed out, I think some 56 per cent to 60 per cent of the drivers involved in accidents had been drinking. If the hon. Minister would look at the statistics he supplied to the members of this House, and unfortunately I was unable to find a copy, but if my memory serves me correctly, in non-fatal accidents only 2.7 persons involved—and I stand to be corrected—had been drinking.

In fatal accidents, I believe it went up to 12 per cent or someplace in the neighbourhood. Then there was another statistic, I believe, that said another 6 per cent had been drinking but had not been impaired. At any rate, the number of people involved in motor vehicle accidents who had been drinking was less than 13 per cent. These figures caused me to do a lot of thinking. I am not up here to face a liquor industry or to push their product, but to my mind there arises a suspi-

cion that perhaps we are overemphasizing the drinking aspect, as regards accidents, to the point where we are disregarding taking the proper action against the major causes of accidents.

Here again, I am handicapped because I do not have the figures before me, but if my memory serves me correctly, one of the major causes was failing to yield the right of way, or failing to yield half of the road—that was one of the major causes.

An hon. member: Drinking drivers could fail to yield the right of way.

Mr. Ben: Oh yes, drinking drivers could fail to yield the right of way, but drinking drivers total less than 13 per cent of the drivers involved in motor vehicle accidents.

I am not saying that we ought to stop the programme dealing with drinking drivers, but I am asking: Are we overemphasizing the drinking driver to the point where we are not taking proper action against the major causes of accidents—improper care, or lack of due care and attention, failing to yield the right of way, or driving too quickly under the circumstances?

What are the Minister's thoughts on this? How does the Minister reconcile the statistics given to us by the member for Yorkview, and the figures that he has given to us here? Are the people in Ontario who drive motor vehicles, that much more virtuous than the people in Massachusetts?

There must be some answer to this. Or, are the hon. Minister's figures inaccurate? Will he please try to enlighten us in this regard? He might give the correct figures if he has them available.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The member has them in the accident facts there, I think.

Mr. Ben: I was not able to get my copy.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will send the member a copy.

Mr. Chairman: Is there something further on this subject?

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think—

Mr. Ben: Would the Minister please give—

Mr. Bryden: Did the member want to continue?

Mr. Ben: Yes, I wanted the Minister to reconcile his figures and the figures—

Mr. Bryden: Well, his figures are not the last word by any means.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think the member for Bracondale is referring to figures he probably gleaned from our publication called *Accident Facts of '66* where the condition of drivers is listed as: Apparently normal, 88 per cent; under fatal accidents 69 per cent; ability impaired 1.7 per cent in all accidents; and 3.9 per cent in fatal accidents; had been drinking 6.1 per cent in all accidents; and 14.5 per cent in fatal accidents.

Is that the section he was referring to? These are figures we glean from police reports and that is the data reflected in those compilations. I shall have some further comments to make on this later.

Mr. Ben: I was just looking over these figures. For instance, 192,384 were apparently normal, the drivers were apparently in normal condition; ability impaired 3,832; had been drinking 13,334.

When it comes to the causes of accidents driving improperly, 1,987; speeding, 15,843; drove off roadway, 18,713; did not have right-of-way, 19,000—in other words more than people who had been drinking.

What is the Minister doing to place more emphasis on that aspect of driving, other than driving with ability impaired, to try to cut down on these accidents?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the Minister could bring this whole discussion to a quick conclusion by announcing that he was going to bring in an amendment to The Highway Traffic Act to the effect that it would be an offence to drive a vehicle with a greater concentration of alcohol in the blood than 0.05 per cent, and that for enforcement purposes of this section breathalizer tests would be compulsory and accepted in court. If he would announce that, then none of us would have anything to say.

However, since I do not think he is going to announce that, I am prepared to make my comments before he comments. This is a subject that I have raised in this House so many times I have lost count. I think the member for Downsview, who was then the member for York Centre, raised the subject about 1960, and I raised it not later than 1961, possibly also in 1960. But off and on both of us have been hammering away at it for a long time with no apparent effect. And yet the evidence accumulating in support of the proposition becomes greater and greater all the time; in my opinion the case was quite convincing as far back as 1960. It is now an overwhelming case.

What I am suggesting—I will not speak for the member for Downsview; he may not have the precise idea in mind that I have—but the idea I have in mind and that I have advanced many times, is, as I stated, that we create a specific offence in The Highway Traffic Act. It would not necessarily override at all the offences of driving while impaired or driving while under the influence of alcohol, which, I think, are set forth in the criminal code. Perhaps those offences should be reconsidered, too, and I believe a study has been given to them in Ottawa.

What we should do in this area is essentially the same sort of thing as was done many years ago in relation to excessive speed. The Highway Traffic Act now provides that in certain circumstances a driver may not drive his car at a speed in excess of 30 miles per hour, 40 miles per hour, 50 miles per hour, 60 miles per hour, whatever the case may be, and no consideration is given here to individual variations.

It is quite true that some drivers who are particularly skilled could perhaps drive safely at a greater rate of speed than some other drivers who are less skilled; the point is, it is impossible in law to take individual variations of that kind into effect, and therefore we simply set arbitrary speed limits. And all drivers are required to observe them or face certain unpleasant consequences.

It seems to me that we can deal with the problem of drinking and driving in the same way. The Canadian bar association, I think, has now come to accept the type of proposition I have talked about, but they have put it in terms of a concentration of alcohol in the blood of 0.08 per cent. Many experiments have demonstrated that level is too high.

I have no doubt the Minister and many other members saw the two, I think it was two, TV programmes, put on by channel 9 last winter. The essence of what was demonstrated in these programmes related to tests which were made on racing drivers. I suppose the most skilled drivers are men and women who are accustomed to racing, and therefore have to have very, very fast reflexes; very great skill in controlling cars. So the experiments concerned used the most efficient drivers there are.

In the experiments, these people were asked for the purposes of the experiment to consume alcohol, and they gradually built up a concentration of alcohol in the blood. It was found that once they passed the point—in some cases before they reached the 0.05 level—but once they passed the 0.05 level, their capacity to drive efficiently declined at a most alarming rate. Most of them, by the time they had reached 0.08 per cent, were really quite incompetent to drive even though they were highly skilled drivers.

Of course, most of them were not conscious of any diminution of capacity, but the objective facts demonstrated conclusively that their capacity had diminished. This is what makes the drinking driver so dangerous. He is not necessarily conscious of the fact that he is much less capable than he normally is and so he goes out on the highway, assuming that he is as competent as ever when he is not.

As a matter of fact, it has been said by some authorities that the most dangerous driver is not the fellow who is dead drunk or close to dead drunk; that driver will have a tendency to be excessively cautious. I suppose if one is to have any fault in driving, excessive caution is the least dangerous fault. But the person who has had a little bit to drink, just enough to suppress some of his inhibitions, can become quite a dangerous driver on the highway. And it is the person who is, shall we say, between 0.05 and 0.15 who is the really dangerous driver on the highway.

The hon. member for Bracondale cited the statistics that the department produces with respect to drinking in relation to highway accidents. I would merely point out to him and to any other member who may be interested, that those statistics are far from conclusive. They are based exclusively on reports from policemen on the basis of their observations on the scene. And all the statistics purport to show is that a certain percentage of drivers were apparently drinking. Now that is quite a lot different from saying that a certain percentage of drivers were, in fact, drinking. Any other studies specifically directed to this point have indicated that in accidents liquor is a more serious problem than the statistics produced by the department would indicate.

However, Mr. Chairman, even if we take the statistics of the department, I think a significant fact to note is that the percentage of cases in which alcohol is a factor increases greatly with the severity of the accident; in cases of fatal accidents it is about 15 per cent, as against two or three per cent in all accidents. So that even in the department's statistics, we see the kind of hazard that arises from drivers who have imbibed enough alcohol to impair their judgment to some

degree. It is in the serious accidents, especially the fatal accidents, where this starts to become a significant factor. I would also suggest Mr. Chairman, that one should not regard this as an either/or proposition, as sometimes I think the member for Bracondale and the Minister himself tend to regard it. It may very well be true that other factors, such as lack of attention, or wandering attention are a bigger factor in accidents than alcohol, but that does not mean we should not try to do something about alcohol as a problem in accidents, even though there are other problems.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I do wish that the hon. member would stick to facts. I do not know when he came in here, but I stated specifically and definitely, sir, that no one has suggested that we disregard the influence of alcohol or that we ought to stop imposing penalties upon people who drive after they have been drinking. The only point I made was that, are we over-emphasizing the question of drinking drivers, and not paying enough attention to the causes of the majority of the accidents? I wish he would stick to the facts here and not put words—

Mr. Bryden: I think that last question he asked, Mr. Chairman, is irrelevant. I would say it is almost impossible to over-emphasize anything in this field. As I think every member will agree, the problem of automobile accidents is a multi-faceted problem and you have to attack it from a great many different angles. When I say that we should get a more rational and logical type of approach to the problem of alcohol, I am not in any sense suggesting that we should not also give attention to the other problems.

However, we are at the moment dealing with the problem of alcohol in relation to driving and that is why I want to concentrate on that point.

Mr. Ben: May I ask the hon. member a question: If he is so interested why does not he make the content more realistic, rather than 0.05?

Mr. Bryden: Well, I accept the figure of 0.05 because it seems that over a great many years of study this has been established as the figure beyond which any driver will be impaired to some extent—to the point where his capacity to drive the vehicle safely will be in some question. I will agree that it is—

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member is saying here is that each and every one of us sitting in this House—we have not had a drop to drink—should not be driving because anyone here will have a reading of 0.05.

Mr. Chairman: That is no point of order. He is making a statement in connection—

Mr. Ben: Oh, he is making a statement, completely erroneous statement, when he talks about 0.05, this 0.05 is five parts per 10,000. Now what they convict on is 0.15—

Mr. Bryden: Of course, the thing they convict on is absolutely ludicrous on the basis of any studies at all. But the 0.05 has been well established, not as sufficient, I would suggest, to convict for impaired driving or for driving under the influence, but my point, Mr. Chairman, is that those penalties provided in the criminal code are simply not satisfactory to deal with the problem.

A person can have sufficient alcohol in his blood to call into question his ability to drive safely, and still not be in a situation where he could reasonably be convicted of impaired driving, much less driving while under the influence. That is why I am suggesting that we should create a new specific offence in The Highway Traffic Act, that it is an offence to drive with greater than 0.05 per cent alcohol in the bloodstream, just as it is to drive down Yonge Street at more than 30 miles an hour. They are both arbitrary types of provision but I think they are both necessary to provide for adequate safety and protection on the highways and the 0.05 figure, I think, has been well established.

There are some who suggest it should be lower, but in my opinion there are no expert studies that indicate that it should be higher. Once the alcoholic content of a person's blood exceeds that figure, he should not be driving a car and we should have a law that says he may not drive a car, without subjecting himself to penalties.

Of course the problem here, Mr. Chairman, is not only in establishing the penalty, it also is in enforcing it. And the problem in enforcement, as we all know, is in devising a method of determining what the alcoholic content of a driver's blood is. I am suggesting that the breathalizer test has been well enough established that it can be accepted as satisfactory, at least for this specific offence. It is true that a breathalizer test can show an unduly high reading if it is administered immediately after the person has had a drink. In other words, while some of the fumes of alcohol are still in his mouth.

But in actual practice, if a person were picked up by the police, charged with offence, and taken to a police station and subjected to a breathalizer test, there would be an interval of probably at least as much as an hour and probably well over an hour between the time he imbibed the alcohol and the time when the test was taken. Therefore, I do not see that the test could in any sense be considered as being unfair to him. Any error there would be in the reading, if anything, would be on the side that favoured the driver.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, in order to make enforcement effective, it is necessary to provide that as a condition of having a licence to drive a vehicle, a driver must agree that if asked to do so by proper authority under proper circumstances, he will submit to a breathalizer test. If he refuses to submit to it, that fact would not be used in evidence against him in court. But he would lose his licence. That would be a condition of having a licence.

I say that is a perfectly reasonable condition to impose. I do not think there is any inherent, inalienable right to drive any vehicle up to 200 horse power on the highways of this province or anywhere else. I think that it is a privilege. The fact that we issue licences indicates that in public policy we regard it as a privilege. It is a privilege that in my opinion should be exercised only subject to certain conditions being met. And this Legislature I say, Mr. Chairman, has a right to impose the conditions under which the privilege will be granted, and that provision relating to willingness to accept a breathalizer test for the specific purpose I mentioned is one that should be imposed.

It has been argued on many occasions that this is an interference in civil rights; to require a driver to submit to a breathalizer test is a form of self-incrimination. Well, Mr. Chairman, a great many years ago the Supreme Court of Canada dealt with this specific matter in relation to a law from Saskatchewan and the Supreme Court of Canada stated, or judges thereof stated, that this had nothing to do with self-incrimination.

They said that if an analogy was to be taken, the analogy should be made with taking fingerprints; that the breathalizer test merely discloses an objective fact with regard to the person's body, just as a fingerprint discloses an objective fact. And the Supreme Court of Canada could see no invasion of civil liberties, no suggestion of self-incrimination. I would say that the highest court in the land is well qualified to decide such a matter and I would say that its reasoning should commend itself to all hon. members, that it is not self-incrimination, it is merely a matter of determining an objective fact for a specific purpose and the purpose is an important one.

I think it is important that we should discourage people from driving on the highways when their capacity has been impaired sufficiently that they create a hazard for themselves and others, even though it has not been impaired sufficiently to give rise to an offence under the criminal code.

I would say that if we passed such a law, as we should, we should also couple it with a strong educational programme. And in particular we should make information available to the public as to the number of drinks it takes to create the 0.05 percentage concentration of alcohol in the blood. This can be set forth fairly clearly. Of course, it depends on the length of time over which the alcohol it consumed; it also depends on the body weight of the subject.

But many tables have been produced showing how many drinks will produce what concentration of alcohol in the blood of a person of 160 pounds or 200 pounds or whatever weight you want, and also the period over which consumption takes place in order to create that concentration. This sort of information can be made available to the public, but generally speaking one could say that if a person has had more than one or two drinks—either an ounce and a half of hard liquor in each case, or a bottle of beer or a glass of wine, constituting one drink—he should not drive his car unless he has laid off for two or three hours.

If, on the one hand, we could by education bring these facts home to the public and, on the other hand, bring them home to them very strongly by making it apparent to them that if they do not follow that counsel of prudence they will be making themselves liable to a penalty—I am not suggesting a jail term; I am suggesting a penalty in much the same sort of category as the penalties we now provide for exceeding the speed limit.

If we had those penalties coupled with the educational problem, I think we could significantly reduce the amount of driving that is done after a person has had three or four drinks. You see, there is still too much of a tendency for people to think it is very funny for a guy to have a few cocktails and then go out and drive his car. In fact, jokes still go around to the effect that this man has to drive home because is too drunk to walk.

It is not funny, and I think that we as lawmakers should do everything in our power to bring it home to the public that there is nothing funny about it, that they are breaking the law if they have three or four drinks and then go out and drive.

In that way, I think that we could reduce alcohol consumption as a factor in accidents and I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that there have now been enough studies to demonstrate that it is a sufficiently serious problem to deal with by way of legislation.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member for Woodbine pointed out, ever since I became a member of this House I have been attempting to convince the government of the merit of doing something about drinking and driving. In 1960, I made quite an elaborate presentation in this regard. And I am not going to repeat the reasoned argument that was presented at that time other than to say this, Mr. Chairman: as we receive from the hon. Minister each year his accident statistics, there is only one conclusion that any literate person can arrive at, and that is the incidence of death and injuries on the roads is going up in such a fantastic proportion that one must wonder why the government does not do something about it.

In my years in this House, the most frustrating vote I have had to deal with is this vote dealing with highway safety. No matter what suggestions seem to come from the Opposition, sir, we get blank stares from the government and a lack of action. This is the government's saddest hour, really, Mr. Chairman, in dealing with safety on the roads.

We were talking about reflectorized licence plates a few moments ago; it meets all sorts of resistance. Safety in motorcycles, and that sort of thing, again meets all sorts of resistance. Safety insofar as vehicle construction, driver examination, driver training, compulsory vehicle examination; all these things—I do not know why the government resists things that are so obvious. Why they have not looked at what has gone on in a state like the state of Connecticut, where a determined administration enforced safety measures and produced results that were startling on the North American continent, why the government does not look in that direction is beyond my comprehension at least, Mr. Chairman.

Let us come to this business of drinking and driving. The government has in its employ one of the foremost authorities in North America in this field, Dr. Ward Smith.

We have talked about him in this House on many occasions. Fascinatingly, Mr. Chairman, the estimates dealing with the crime laboratory—I think it has a new name now, something like the school of forensic medical studies—in any event it is the old crime laboratory run by Dr. Ward Smith, the estimate for that, a very substantially increased one, went through the House without a murmur because there is general recognition on all sides of the House and throughout the province of Ontario that it is a good operation.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Ward Smith is one of the foremost authorities in North America on this subject and he is not an outside expert, he is right in government employ.

He has written books and articles and made speeches about the importance of compulsory breathalizer testing, and about the importance of fixing as an offence in The Highway Traffic Act any driving with a blood alcohol content of over a certain per cent.

There is nothing to be gained, Mr. Chairman, in arguing about whether it should be 0.05 or 0.08, or 0.15 of what-have-you; the fact is—and no one can possibly deny it—that when people drink and drive, there is much more likelihood of having an accident. The figures prove this, whether they are the figures from Massachusetts or the figures from Ontario. The accidents are more serious, and the fatal accidents have a higher percentage.

I would be quite happy if the Minister took as a start 0.08. I think there is abundant good argument to take 0.05, but let him start somewhere. And the compulsoriness of the test; again this must be obvious, Mr. Chairman. It has been tried, and successfully tried, in other jurisdictions.

There is the old cry about an invasion of personal liberty, the idea that no one should be forced to incriminate himself. But surely, Mr. Chairman, that test goes by the board when the greater public good can be achieved by enacting law. I have heard government members in past years say: "Well, this is a horrible thing, you are going to have some policeman standing over somebody's prostrate body and forcing a breathalizer pipe down his throat".

There is no suggestion of that at all. The scheme that has been put forward is the alternative. If you are asked by a competent law enforcement officer to submit to this test and if you refuse, as you have a right to do, then you have given up your right to drive for a stated period of time. It is just as simple as that.

What puzzles me completely, Mr. Chairman, is the complete resistance by government and by this particular Minister to take modern steps in bringing about safety on the highways of the province of Ontario.

His own statistics do not lie. On the death toll—there are more people killed on the highways than have been killed in all of the wars fought either by the Canadians or by the Americans.

Surely this should give the Minister pause to consider something. He has charge of a very important department that affects the safety and the well-being and the happiness of almost all of our citizens here in the province of Ontario.

And what do we get? We really get nothing. We get votes for conferences, grants to the safety league, grants to the Ontario highway traffic conference, grants to the Canada highway safety council. All these bodies are good bodies, and when they meet and they make recommendations; reflectorized licence plates again; the government expert insofar as breathalizers are concerned; and the amendment of the traffic law so far as alcohol content of the blood is concerned.

But nothing happens, Mr. Chairman!

Well I am trying again this year and I am not much more hopeful but it seems to me, for all the reasons that have been put forward this afternoon, and over the past years—going back eight or 10 years since I have been here—that this is so obvious, I do not know how the government can resist it. But as long as this government is there, it is going to find out a way to resist.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on alcoholic content under this vote—highway safety?

Mr. Ben: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would like to point out that the Minister did not answer the question I posed to him—that is to point out the inconsistencies in these figures—that he either admit that his figures are inaccurate, or make a statement that the Massachusetts figures are inaccurate, or give some reasons for this difference in figures.

I have also to comment on the statements of the hon. member for Woodbine. As the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) has pointed out there is a new gospel here—the know-it-all from Woodbine keeps stating 0.05 per cent, 0.05 per cent. He is obdurate, he knows it all. Take the average man—take the hon. member for Woodbine—estimate his weight at 200 pounds—

Mr. Bryden: You are wrong on that to begin with.

Mr. Ben: All right. Take an average man of 200 pounds—a good sized man, larger than most of us around here. The rule of thumb is that one-tenth is blood—so there will be about 20 pounds of blood, or roughly 20 pints of blood. That is 400 ounces of blood.

Just write it down and do a little calculation—400 ounces of blood.

If we take the figure given by the member for Woodbine and you are going to send a man to jail because he has 0.05 per cent alcohol in his blood, it would mean that he has one fifth of an ounce—

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It actually involves two points, because the member for Bracondale is so far off the facts most of the time, it is hard to keep up with all his misstatements. First of all, I specifically stated in relation to this offence, that I did not think that a jail penalty would be appropriate.

Secondly, as to the figure of 0.05 per cent which he very flatteringly attributes to me, I can assure him that it is not my figure at all—it is merely a figure that I, as a layman, had derived from the studies of a great many authorities in the field.

Mr. Ben: Then he must have been deriving those figures with his eyes shut, and in his sleep, because the figure is not 0.05 per cent, as I have pointed out with simple calculations which would make it down to one-fifth of an ounce, but 0.5 per cent.

I tried to point it out to the hon. member while he was on his feet but he knows all, he is the end-all—

Mr. Bryden: You certainly know nothing.

Mr. Ben: It is obvious that you did not know the subject—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Bryden: I would not recommend the hon. member as a physiologist or anything in that field, Mr. Chairman. I do not pretend to be one myself.

Mr. Ben: He certainly knows a whole lot more than—

Mr. Bryden: Well, I would say that Dr. Ward Smith, for one, knows an awful lot more about the subject than our loud-mouthed friend from Bracondale.

An hon. member: You are out of order.

Mr. Bryden: No, I am not out of order. Dr. Ward Smith—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Bryden: Dr. Ward Smith has persistently used the figure of 0.05 per cent and I may say another man, an eminent man in the legal profession, Mr. Edson Haynes, as he then was, now a judge, has also used this figure—to take only two Ontario people.

The hon. member for Bracondale can try to dismiss me by saying I am a know-it-all, or whatever he likes. Of course this argument *ad hominum* has nothing to do with the merits of the case, Mr. Chairman. I will say this—I do not pretend to be a know-it-all, but I do try to study available information before I speak on such matters.

I would defy anybody to tell me that there is not a substantial body of expert opinion—I will not say the unanimous body—but a substantial body of expert opinion, to support the remarks I made earlier. I do not think there is any kind of opinion, expert or inexpert, to support the kind of remarks the hon. member for Bracondale has made.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: Do I take it we are through with the booze—

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on this particular phase of the subject?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, sir. I do not let a matter like this pass without making a comment on it and I do not appreciate the remark of the member for Downsview that I am not concerned.

I doubt if anyone has the matter more on his heart and conscience, than I have, and as for saying that we go on year after year, unconcerned about highway safety, is uncalled for.

In this province last year, our people drove 1,400,000,000 miles more than the year before, without an extra fatality, in fact with fifteen less, and that is a record in which the people of this province, and the officers of this department, and those enforcing highway safety across the province, can take pride.

Mr. Singer: The Minister knows as well as anyone else does—on a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister without Portfolio): Let the Minister finish!

Mr. Singer: —that the test is not the number of fatalities. The test is the number of accidents, and the accident rate went up, what—ten, 12 per cent?

Mr. Chairman: This is really not a point of order, but you have made your point.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: With the terrific increase in traffic, and the concentration of vehicles in some areas, and all the complexities, we might very well have had a bad record, and we are happy that it has been a good record.

The member for Bracondale asked me a specific question and I think I would point this out to him: There is, of course, great discrepancy between the reports we get and the records that are kept in different jurisdictions. This is one thing that makes it difficult to equate the reports from different areas.

The specific one he referred to—he asked me how do I figure we had eight per cent of our accidents by drivers who had been drinking or were impaired. I have before me a record of a study that what made in our department last year, on the post mortem findings of drug tests of drivers who were fatally injured in automobile accidents.

It is a very good and interesting one, and in the closing pages, the researcher pointed out that these studies suggest that the officially reported occurrence of alcohol in the accident-involved drivers, may be understated by a factor of perhaps 100 per cent. That is instead of being eight, it might have been as high as 16, or more, per cent.

A figure of 16 per cent is suggested from very extensive surveys in the Grand Rapids, Michigan, report, to be quite reasonable as an estimate of the occurrence of alcohol in drivers involved in accidents.

So there we have an estimate in our records that it might have been 16 per cent instead of the eight, and here we have from the Grand Rapids, Michigan study, a suggestion that the figure is probably 17 per cent.

I have a comment here on that Grand Rapids survey. I think it is the one to which the member for Yorkview made reference some time ago. I thought he gave emphasis to the fact that a driver with 0.04 alcohol in his blood might be safer than a stone sober person. I thought it was rather an unfortunate kind of statement.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, that was not the case. The 0.04 is the

danger point where a man is becoming dangerous as a driver. At that point, the Grand Rapids study pointed out that a person with one or two drinks is often a safer driver, because it sharpens his awareness and also makes him more careful. After the two drinks, he becomes dangerous until we get to the 0.15, where he is 25 times as dangerous as for the first.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I was going to point out that it was recognized that there was some danger in the published findings of the Indiana University survey, that might be interpreted uncritically, as suggesting that it was safer to drive after consuming a small amount of alcohol than abstaining.

The difficulty arises because their findings combine the accident experience, under alcohol, of young, inexperienced drivers who normally have higher than average accident risks, with the accidents experienced under alcohol of middle aged, affluent and experienced drivers who normally had lower than average risks.

The latter often were regular, moderate drinkers who drove a great deal, so they formed a high proportion of the drivers observed in the 0.02 and the 0.04 range. Although their own risk was increased by small doses of alcohol to a level above the average in their group, it was still lower than that of the driving population as a whole; and it would further be noted that there was insufficient data from this survey to show positively whether there were any real differences in the risks observed at these low levels of blood alcohol concentration.

The controversy served to point out the need for considerable care in the interpretation of the elaborately constructed research. In this particular case it should be recognized that the study was designed to determine the risk of accident involvement associated with blood alcohol levels actually observed in drivers selected at random from traffic, but did not examine the relative risk of accident involvement at different levels of blood alcohol in the same driver.

The study we made dealt with the incidence of alcohol in the 279 fatal traffic accidents reported in Ontario in the three months of April, May and June, 1964. Blood alcohol test records were available for 67 of the 120 fatally injured drivers involved. These records indicate that it is highly probable that 44 per cent of these drivers had blood alcohol levels exceeding 50 mg per cent at time of accident.

That would be the same as 0.05. For a comparison of the post mortem blood test records with the official report of the driver's condition submitted by the investigating officer, it is concluded that police reports underestimate the occurrence and levels of alcohol in such fatalities. Examination of the results of research conducted elsewhere suggest strongly that the same findings would apply to reports of all traffic accidents.

A very high proportion, 94 per cent of fatal accidents involving alcohol, occur on rural highways mostly, 70 per cent, at night. About one-half, 56 per cent of these rural fatalities occur on King's highways, and the remainder on county and township roads.

The extremely high alcohol levels observed, 150 mg. per cent, and over, that is 0.15, suggest that alcohol was probably the most important cause factor and 79, that is 41 per cent, of the 191 non-pedestrian fatal accidents examined. Such levels suggest also that more than merely social drinking, was involved in these cases.

I do not think anyone can underestimate the seriousness of the drinking and driving problem, here and across this continent, and we have to find some way to combat it.

It is a very easy thing to suggest that all we have to do is to bring in the implied consent law, and this House knows that we have not been anxious to get into an implied consent law.

We have seen in the last year or two, a very substantial development of public opinion in favour of action by the federal government to amend the criminal code. After all, the offences of impaired and drunken driving are laid down in the code.

The Canadian medical association has asked the federal government to amend the code to make it an offence to drive with a blood content above 0.08. That was the title of that very effective movie and I would like—

Mr. Young: That was too high.

Mr. Bryden: The movie demonstrated that was too high.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Leaving the 0.08 as a movable figure, let me tell the House that we have copies of that film available in our film library, and they are available for showing anywhere. It is a very fine picture and I commend it to the members.

The Canadian bar association also made representation to the federal Minister of Justice, recommending amendments to the criminal code, asking that it be made an offence for one to operate a motor vehicle

with a blood alcohol content of 0.08 per thousand of alcohol in the blood.

The conference of provincial Ministers that met here last fall, considered how it was best to deal with this matter of the drinking driver, whether by implied consent laws that would circumvent the criminal code, or whether we should all act to obtain action from the federal government.

Until recently, it was understood that the federal government was reluctant to touch the criminal code until it was going to amend it all at once. That position, apparently, seems to have eroded very greatly in recent months and I think we can expect that there will be some amendments to the criminal code coming in the near future.

At our provincial Ministers' conference, varied views were expressed on the manner in which the provinces might take effective action, but we agreed unanimously to approve the following resolution:

> In the light of the jurisdiction exercised by the federal government under the criminal code in the matter of drinking and driving, the provincial Attorneys General be urged to continue their discussions in this respect with the federal Minister of Justice.

Since then, as you know, the standing committee on justice and legal affairs in the House of Commons, has recommended that the criminal code be amended to provide legislation as follows:

> 1. Making it unlawful for anyone with a blood alcohol level of .08 per cent or more, to drive a motor vehicle; that the blood alcohol level be determined by analysis of breath with provision, at the request of the accused, for blood and wine tests as confirmation of the results; that the accused be offered a sample of the material to be tested to determine the level; that the analysis on behalf of the Crown be conducted by a duly qualified technician, and that the accused be afforded the opportunity to cross-examine anyone who takes part in the sampling and analysis, including the person responsible for maintenance of analysis equipment.
>
> 2. Make it an offence for any person to refuse, without cause, to give a sample of breath when required to do so by a law enforcement officer who has reasonable grounds for believing that such a person has committed an offence, as set out in the previous paragraph.
>
> 3. That the offence as recommended above be punishable on summary conviction.

Mr. Singer: Could I ask the Minister a question, Mr. Chairman? Does the Minister deny or assert that this power is not available to the province of Ontario, or does he assert that it is exclusive to the dominion government?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Because the offences of impaired driving and drunken driving are in the code, it is our opinion that this is where the matter should be dealt with, and I prefer to have it dealt with in that area rather than to have the provinces individually circumventing it, by the implied consent law, or a law that might be similar to this one, proposed by the standing committee of the House of Commons.

Mr. Singer: If the Minister is through, Mr. Chairman, I just really cannot understand the approach on this thing. We get the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) for instance, who stands up and says the reason that farmers are not getting fair prices for the milk, are those terrible fellows up in Ottawa. "If they would only move."

Or, we get a variety of Ministers who stand up and say, "We show the rest of the world, we have the greatest legislation". But when it suits them, they pull the federal cloak around their shoulders as a protection. And when it does not suit them, when they hesitate to walk, they say, "If only those fellows up in Ottawa would help".

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the responsibility of this Minister is for safety on the highways in the province of Ontario, not in Manitoba, not in Quebec, not in any of the other nine provinces—it is for safety on the highways of the province of Ontario.

It is no excuse at all, Mr. Chairman, that the Attorney General suggested that maybe it would be a good thing if Ottawa did something. He has the constitutional power; the Supreme Court of Canada said so, and that cannot be argued about.

There is the problem—the Minister has brought us a step further. Apparently now there is thinking; ten years ago or eight years ago, when I first mentioned this, it was a great joke in the House and many of the members who sat on the government side at that time thought this was a horrible suggestion. Well, at least we have moved along to this stage. The Attorney General, at least,

is joining in a petition to the federal Minister of Justice that something be done about it and that something be done in the form of legislation. So we are making progress.

But, Mr. Chairman, if the government has moved to this extent and they have the legal power to take action, why do they not move to the full extent and do it? They can do it. They are just passing the buck; that is the only reason we do not have these laws in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would say that no one makes fun or a joke of the serious situation of drinking and driving, but I think a great danger lies in assuming that this law or any other law will end the problem of drinking and driving. That to enact a law that will require a driver to provide a sample and to be convicted if he has a blood alcohol content in excess of 0.08, will end the problem, is just wishful thinking. The only real solution to this great problem lies in a sense of responsibility being assumed by people using cars.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if you follow the Minister's theory, we should not have any statutes. No statute is going to eliminate a particular ill that it is directed against, but it, at least, expresses the view of the members of this Legislature as to what should be done and what should not be done. The question of enforcement is another thing. But that is another one in the series of so many weak excuses.

It being six of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 79

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, April 27, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 27, 1967

Estimates, Department of Transport, Mr. Haskett, concluded 2737

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 2779

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 1967

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT
(Concluded)

Mr. Chairman: Before starting into our estimates, I know the members of the House would like me to say a word of welcome to visitors under the Speaker's west gallery, the 87th guide company of York Mills, along with their leader, Mrs. Ronaldson.

On vote 2203:

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, there are some questions I would like to ask the hon. Minister with respect to the submissions made by the Ontario traffic conference. These submissions are now a year or more old, some of them much older than that. Some of them may have been brought up-to-date but I am not aware that they have been.

There is one recommendation upon which I would like him to comment and that is:

> We recommend that The Department of Transport study the problem of the hazard in rear-end collisions by reason of lack of rear bumpers on large trucks and trailers, with a view to standardizing rear bumper requirements on the same.

I do not know whether action has been taken on that or not, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could tell us.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Chairman, I do not recall the action on that. I think there was a standardized elevation of the bumper.

Mr. Young: The problem was that the traffic conference wanted the bumpers standardized so that trucks and cars would meet at this point, without the car going under the truck, and all the rest of it.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes. This was a great difficulty having regard to the variety in sizes of units, that is to have the bumper low enough on a truck that it would meet the elevation of the small car. It seemed to pose a very real difficulty there.

Mr. Young: So that nothing has—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Nothing has materialized.

Mr. Young: Well then, another resolution which started actually in 1961—and they are persistent about it:

> We recommend that owners' names on the side of commercial vehicles be required to be in letters of a minimum size of two inches high and to be of a colour contrasting to the colour of the sides of the vehicle.

This is for easy identification, of course, on the part of the traffic enforcement officers.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Would the member refresh my mind as to what the specific request was by the traffic conference?

Mr. Young: They recommended this: that the owner's name on the side of commercial motor vehicles be required to be in letters of a minimum size of two inches high, and to be of a colour contrasting to the colour of the sides of the vehicle.

The problem is that you get a lot of home-made signs, and people using a paint brush to put the letters on the side of vehicles. Sometimes they are very hard to read and identification is not easy.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have not acted on this specific request they have for the size and the colour, but section 51 of the Act calls for every commercial motor vehicle having attached to, or painted on both sides, in a clearly visible portion, a sign showing the name of the owner. We have not designated the size.

Mr. Young: Yes. I think the problem is that some of them are so tiny and some of them so illegible that it is hard to read them—no action there?

Then, one submitted in 1963:

> We recommend that side marker lamps on vehicles, etc., be required anywhere,

including within a city, town or village, and that a pull-type trailer be required to use only side marker lamps and not allowed to use reflectors in place of them.

This is a requirement for lamps on the back of pull-type trailers, particularly. This might be at variance a bit with our discussion this afternoon, but this would be lamps in order to identify the trailer.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think this matter falls within the studies we are making on the matter of lights and reflectors on the sides.

Mr. Young: Then another recommendation, dating back to 1963, and again year to year:

We recommend that vehicles carrying loads which might be distributed by the wind, such as waste paper, straw, fine sand and so on, be required to be covered with tarpaulins or otherwise enclosed in such a manner as to prevent any portion of the load from being blown off or falling from the vehicle.

I think all of us have had experience with this. This morning, coming downtown, I faced a blizzard of paper and debris coming off a truck ahead of me. This, I think, is a thing which worries a great many people and which can be the cause of accidents and a great deal of discomfort.

I wonder if any action is being taken on that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the member that action was taken on that. He may recall that it was in last year's amendments to The Highway Traffic Act. We spelled out in a new way the requirement to cover a load where it was necessary to prevent the contents being blown or distributed. I am just trying to put my finger on the section, because that was an amendment to The Highway Traffic Act last year.

I am not saying it is completely satisfactory, but it was an endeavour to meet the situation that we have all faced—sand and trash blowing off—and I think that the member for Yorkview is the one who has been most annoyed with the spreading of trash along the highways, after being blown off loads. We think that there is better enforcement occurring this spring.

Mr. Young: This has been proclaimed and is now in force? It is just a matter, then, of enforcement at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It is a matter, I think of finding some way to define it so that it will be enforced. We have been trying to reach that. I hope the change we have made and the better enforcement this year, will produce some measurable improvement.

Could I just read the member the section of the Act? I have put my finger on it:

56 (1) no person shall operate or permit to be operated upon a highway any commercial vehicle or trailer unless the load that such vehicle or trailer is carrying is firmly bound, sufficiently covered or otherwise secured or loaded in such manner that no portion of the load may become dislodged or fall from the commercial vehicle or trailer.

We have yet to see how the convictions under that section compare with what they were under the previous section, to see how effective it is.

Mr. Young: Is the Minister aware of any convictions that have taken place under that section yet?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not have them available, but I say we are watching. I am sure there are convictions being registered under it, as there were under the previous section, but the previous section was more difficult to enforce I think, than this will be.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, on the same point, the complaint of the Ontario chambers of commerce was that 56 (2) of The Highway Traffic Act be strictly enforced. That deals directly with the topic of discussion right now and the same reasons that the hon. member for Yorkview made are contained in their presentation. They are apparently very much concerned about this spillage or blowing off from the open type of vehicle.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I just hope that they find the new law is more effective than the other was. We worked hard to get this language. We scanned the corresponding sections of Acts in other jurisdictions, and we have come up with this in the hope that it will satisfy. As you say, the chambers of commerce have asked that this section be strictly enforced.

That section came into effect September 1 last, so I say we will watch to see how the convictions under it compare with those under the previous section.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, there is another one which is perhaps a little more controversial. It was item 16, submitted to the Minister in 1956, 1957, 1960, 1962 and 1963 and again last year, I understand:

> We recommend that legislation be enacted requiring that pedestrians must correctly identify themselves to a police officer when apprehended after committing a violation of pedestrian legislation.

I wonder if the Minister would comment on his ideas in this respect, because this evidently gives the law enforcement authorities a great deal of trouble.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think this is very much in the public mind today and it is a matter really for enforcement. I think it is matter that must rest with the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) and the powers of the police. I understand the difficulties the police have and I think that their case is being put forward too, as well as the views of those who think they should not have further powers.

Mr. Young: One other question in connection with this brief is the use of "stop" and "yield" signs on the left hand side of streets:

> We recommend that the use of stop and yield signs on the left hand side of the street be legalized by proper legislation.

I am wondering whether this is possible and what the objections are to having stop and yield signs on the left hand as well as the right.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, I cannot answer the hon. member offhand as to why we do not allow—if that is the fact—the erection of "stop" and "yield" signs on the left side of the street. Except where it is a one way street, in which case I can see no reason for it.

Mr. Young: I think this was the point.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This was the point.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Yorkview, earlier in the debate this afternoon, brought up the topic of green tail lights. I would like to bring to the attention of the members of the House the approach taken by the accident prevention association. They in their bulletin, No. 164, November, 1966, carry the following comments that, I think, lend themselves to a greater study on the part of this department and of departments generally involved in accident prevention, into the use of green tail lights. The remarks are not very lengthy at all, so I think it would be good to read most of them into the record:

> Dr. Arthur Secord of Brooklyn College, New York, a frequent speaker at IAPA meetings, and other people in the United States, is advocating that tail lights on automobiles and trucks should be green instead of red. The thinking behind this idea is that as long as lights ahead of you show green, following drivers would know the road was clear, but once the red brake light went on, the following driver would slow down knowing there was a problem ahead. Some points brought out by Professor Merrill J. Allen of Indiana University include—

He lists five points of the many that could be listed, and his five are as follows:

> Green is a highly efficient light source because it corresponds to the peak sensitivity of the human eye. Green and red are the two best signal colours known. Green and red provide maximum colour contrast. Red vs. blue or yellow or purple or any other colour is much less effective. Green is best in focus of all colours. It is not subject to depth delusions due to lateral colour dispersion in the eye or spectacle lenses. Green is the logical choice within our colour system.

Now, there are other points that could have been made but he emphasizes the five, Mr. Chairman, and I think from his comments that studies should certainly be undertaken to see if the introduction of green tail lights could not perhaps be phased in over a fairly extended period of time so that the manufacturers would know that green tail lights definitely are an accident preventive measure.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, we dealt with this this afternoon and I think I commented very favourably on the matter of adopting a green tail light for the "go" light, as and when it can be done. I think it was left when the member for Yorkview suggested we might be the leader in this and do something about it. I do not think it can be done that way. I will say to the House that it is being studied very carefully by the authoritative organizations in this field and Mr. Ed. Brezina of our Department of Transport is a member of the SAE, the society of automotive engineers, and has this under study at the moment.

With regard to Ontario adopting it, for instance, unilaterally it would be impossible I think for us to consider that kind of action because an Ontario-equipped car with green lights going outside this jurisdiction could find itself in violation of the requirements of neighbouring provinces and states. I think we will just have to recognize that this is one of the things we will have to struggle with

until we can get unanimous approval of it and get it brought in, in that way.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may pursue another topic in here—that is the safety code for automobiles. It covers cars that are manufactured in Ontario and, I would assume, manufactured likewise in the United States, manufactured on the North American continent. But how about imports, Mr. Chairman, cars brought in from Europe or from Asia; would they have to come under the Ontario code?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Insofar as required equipment is concerned, they would. As regards other than mandated equipment they could still slide in without it, but I think there would be such a prejudice against it that it would very quickly put them in a defensive position.

Mr. Newman: Does the Minister not think it would be advisable actually to have them come under the code completely? One of the recommendations made was that the impact-absorbing steering wheels in the new cars coming in from both Europe and Asia—this type of safety feature will not be on the cars. I think it would not be too difficult at all, Mr. Chairman, to see that all cars brought in from these other jurisdictions contain such a safety feature in the 1968 models.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think you can expect that this is the way this is going to be carried forward because you could not very long allow imports from abroad to provide less safety in those essential areas than our own cars. I think the member's suggestion is quite right.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, I notice in the accounts of this department, the name of the Deputy Minister of Transport as drawing about $15,000 a year salary; further down in the highway transport board we have a man by the name of Mr. Shoniker drawing about $18,000 a year. What is the function of Mr. Shoniker?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think we have passed this. Mr. Shoniker is chairman of the highway transport board.

Mr. Sargent: How does he rate a higher salary than the Deputy Minister?

Mr. Chairman: I do not want to open up another vote.

Mr. Sargent: All right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, I think if I might intervene, it might be interesting to have the Minister explain how Mr. Shoniker rates a salary higher than the Deputy Minister. Is that an actual fact?

Mr. Chairman: Under the circumstances I would suggest to the members of the House that if the Minister wishes to answer the question there is no harm done as long as we do not debate it.

Mr. Oliver: I am sure he would want to answer that question.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Shoniker is drawing $17,999.93, and Mr. McNab is drawing $15,594.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: These figures are not up to date, I can assure you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: They are not?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: These are out of date; Mr. McNab, as you know, has retired. His successor, I think, is drawing more than Mr. Shoniker, but those figures are set by the civil service and by Cabinet.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): A good boss should know what he is paying.

Mr. Sargent: Sometimes I think, Mr. Chairman, from the mouths of ordinary people come a lot of intelligence. I do not class myself to be an ordinary person in that regard, but a wife of a truck driver writes in—she was a member of the women's auxiliary 938. Several of the women were concerned about certain legislation which they feel should be enacted, concerning the trucking industry. The first point she made was that there should be a special licence for truck drivers. Apparently anyone with a chauffeur's licence can drive a truck.

Secondly, she thinks the driver of a truck should keep a log with a company in the company's files, the number of hours worked and the number of hours lay-over, and that these men should be off the road eight hours out of every 24.

The third point she is concerned about, being the wife of a truck driver, is that many of these men use pep pills. Many of you bald-headed men probably use pep pills for other reasons, but they use them to keep awake. The companies know this and turn a blind eye to this. Her submission is that the men should be laid off if they are taking these pills and should be forced to have a medical examination before they are taken on again with a certificate that they are free from the habit. These are points that are

very important to those of us who are driving on the highways.

Has the Minister any observation on those points?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the matter being raised by the member may have a factor in highway safety, and we are interested in this, but I think this is a matter for The Department of Labour concerning hours of work.

Mr. Sargent: What about the idea of truck drivers having separate licences? Does the Minister think there is any merit in that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The suggestion is put forward at times that those who are driving big pieces of equipment should have special tests and special licences and—

Mr. Sargent: They should have?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, the suggestion is that they should have.

Mr. Sargent: Do they have, though?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No. But we find in the main that the companies that operate that expensive equipment, give their drivers very intensive training and run year-round campaigns on safety, so they do have some very excellent records. I think that the truck drivers in the main have a splendid record.

Mr. Sargent: I have another letter from a taxpayer. She complains that she is an admirer of the Liberal Party—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Did the member say she complained about it?

Mr. Sargent: No, she is complaining about the general government—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The member said she complained about his hon. leader (Mr. Nixon).

Mr. Sargent: She did not do that; I made a mistake I guess, Mr. Chairman.

She says that she wanted to let us know that file No. 13413, The Department of Transport, re Motor Vehicles Claims Act, which file is located here—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, this is item—

Mr. Sargent: This is about a hidden file in the director's office at 10 St. Mary Street. She writes:

> An investigation of this file I feel could tumble the government of Ontario regarding its dishonesty in the administration of public funds.

Mr. Chairman: This would not be under the highway safety branch.

Mr. Sargent: We do not know that, it is a hidden file.

Mr. Chairman: No, no!

I am going to ask the member to conform with the other members in this House and deal with these in sequence. If there is something under a claims fund it may come under vote 2206, but certainly do not introduce this now, under vote 2203.

Mr. Sargent: I do not know that, Mr. Chairman. The point is this, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Jack McGaw, our special assistant, wrote back to her and said "We have been attempting to investigate this matter but we are unable to get access to government files."

Mr. Oliver: Right!

An hon. member: Do you want to steal the files?

Mr. Sargent: We have a right to know what is in the files. This is big business.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the hon. member?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Is that the Mr. McGaw who came from the press gallery before he was employed with the Liberal Party?

Mr. Sargent: That is right, yes.

Mr. Oliver: What difference does that make?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh, just the point you have been trying to make, we just want to identify him.

Mr. Oliver: There is nothing wrong with that.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I agree, nor is there anything wrong with my having Mr. Robert Campbell in my office, with your leader criticizing—

Mr. Sargent: We think you are lucky to have him.

Mr. Oliver: I do not know if Bob is any good to you, but you sure need him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Now, here is a taxpayer of the province of Ontario, a person you are working for, and she claims dishonesty; 13413 is the file number—and this is the key maybe to a lot of hanky-panky here, but we cannot find out.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This comes up in vote 2206 and if I am given the file number I will ascertain what it is all about and clear with the member on it.

Mr. Chairman: If the member wishes to give him the file number under vote 2206.

Mr. Sargent: All right, on the understanding that when this section of the vote comes up, we will have this file out here for us to look at.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Oh, I cannot do that but we will get the information.

Mr. Sargent: We are told we will get these things but we never get them.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is a misleading statement.

Mr. Sargent: Aw, come on.

Mr. Chairman: I know the member wants to conform with the other members of the House in following the sequence, and it does not come under this vote.

Mr. Sargent: Why give us this snow job? He says he will have it—

Mr. Chairman: I am going to ask the member to stay with this vote at this time. If he wants to introduce it under vote 2206, we have no objection at that time.

Mr. Sargent: All right, under vote 2206 we would like to see that file.

Mr. Chairman: Anything under vote 2203, please?

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, through you, if his department has made any study of these turn signals which can be seen from the side? They are on certain models this year but not on the cheaper models of cars. Has the hon. Minister looked into this and have there been any studies made as to whether or not it would be advisable to make these mandatory?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, it has not gone that far. I think we are seeing that the turn signals and lights that are visible from the side have a very real value. We discussed that issue this afternoon in connection with another matter where the visibility of a car from the side is important. I think you will see this type of light growing more common. Whether we mandate it early or not, it is growing in importance and in value. My own car, I might say, has it, and I think it is of very real value.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if there is such a thing as a provincial Act concerning jaywalkers? Is there provincial legislation on jaywalking?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The practice of crossing à la jaywalker between blocks is not prohibited in the Act. The pedestrian is required to observe traffic signals. There was a change in the Act that just received Royal assent yesterday with respect to the rights of pedestrians at intersections, you will recall. But there is no prohibition against jaywalking.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, is there no safety value in having legislation concerning jaywalking on the books at a provincial level?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I am not sure it would be a very easily or very widely enforced law. If we had it and it was breached so frequently as to bring it into contempt I do not think it would serve a useful purpose. But I appreciate the members' concern because we know that one-quarter of all those who are killed in traffic accidents are pedestrians and that the chief cause of pedestrian fatalities is crossing the street between intersections, that is, jaywalking. I think he points his finger at a very real problem, but that does not mean it would be easy to bring in a law that would prohibit jaywalking and expect it to be enforced. I am afraid it would not be too good.

Mr. Newman: Is there permissive legislation allowing municipalities to pass such laws?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Municipal by-laws include regulations on pedestrian crossings in certain areas and these are approved by our department.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, during the early part of the year, there was an unfortunate accident on Highway 3 in the county of Essex in which a loaded gravel truck rammed into a bus carrying students from school. In the unfortunate accident eight youngsters lost their lives. As a result of that accident, Mr. Chairman, is there anything that the inquiry found that could be put into general legislation or could amend regulations

so that such an incident would not happen again?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The very unfortunate, very sad accident occurred when that gravel truck overturned. It was not one that called for further specific action because it was caused by the breach of a number of laws and regulations. I do not think I have a report of the inquest but the driver, in that case, of the International tractor-trailer, was charged with and subsequently convicted of dangerous driving. You can put your finger on what happened there as regards the driving and equipment that he was operating, which were in violation of regulations.

Mr. Newman: Was there something mechanically wrong with the equipment, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not have it in my records but my recollection is that the brakes were not in good shape. The equipment was not in good shape.

Mr. Newman: As a result, Mr. Chairman, should not compulsory truck inspection be one of the places where we should start our compulsory inspection of motor vehicles at regular intervals, seeing that the trucks are carrying such a heavy load? Were brakes to fail on a truck, the type of tragedy would be much more serious than if it were on a regular motor vehicle?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This was one of those trucks, I guess, that came within the dump truck group that we were talking about this afternoon. I say it is very difficult to get people to keep that kind of equipment in first-class shape and still give out "F" licences as broadly as some would like. These commercial vehicles are subject to frequent spot-checks on the highways and we have won a great many convictions for vehicles that are not kept in proper condition, with our spot-checks on the roads and at the weigh scales.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, school bus drivers must be inspected, must they not? Then would it not be a good policy to inspect truck drivers regularly, especially drivers of trucks over a certain tonnage?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This may be so. We do not regard the load in a truck in the same way that we regard the value of the load in a school bus. I think you must realize that we have a very great concern for the safety of school buses, the bus itself, the equipment and the driver, which is rather beyond the concern we have for the other commercial equipment.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, if there were regular inspection of truck drivers, or regular examination of truck drivers, and their vehicles, the incident in the Essex county area would not have been as grave as it actually was, because apparently they found some mechanical defect there. The individual would not have been allowed to drive that truck had that defect been known.

May I ask the hon. Minister if flashers are required on slow moving vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The answer I think is "no", Mr. Chairman. Slow-moving farm vehicles are using orange triangles and they are being extended in use until I think we could very well mandate their use. They stand on a staff to hold them, I think, ten feet above ground level so they can be seen by an approaching vehicle even on a rolling type of country road. This is coming into general use on farm vehicles, but I do not think we have any definition of slow-moving vehicles other than this.

Flashing lights are used, of course, on snow-plowing equipment.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if that valuable on snow-plowing equipment, would not the same thing hold true for other types of slow-moving vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have reserved the flashing blue light for snow-cleaning equipment, so that it would be distinctive.

Mr. Newman: I am not suggesting that you use blue for other vehicles, but a special type of light for slow-moving vehicles. In fact, in Burlington—I am reading this from a press clipping: Jury Urges Flashers on Slow-Moving Trucks.

> Transports should be equipped with four-way flashers for use in low gear, a coroner's jury recommended last night.

Here is a recommendation of a coroner's jury that slow-moving vehicles in low gear be equipped with some type of flashing device to warn the motorist advancing that there is a slow-moving vehicle and that there is danger ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the recommendation of the coroner is certainly one that merits attention.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have no definition for a slow-moving vehicle. When one slows

down his car for any reason—the new cars are being equipped with four-way flashers and they could do it, but we do not define a slow-moving vehicle, and there are slow-moving vehicles on every road.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, you can always legislate for a four-lane highway, or a two-lane highway, certain King's routes—or Queen's routes I should use the term—today, so I do not see why you could not define slow-moving vehicles. I do not think it is that complicated.

May I ask the Minister if the regulations require school buses to have their flashers on at all times, when they are discharging students?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think the member knows that the legislation which came in a year ago with respect to school buses requires that only in areas where the speed limit is over 35 miles an hour, and when the bus is stopped taking on or discharging pupils, sir, is the flasher to be working.

Mr. Newman: Is there no merit in having them working all the time while they are discharging passengers, even though they may be in a zone that permits 35-mile-an-hour speeds only?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This whole matter of school buses and stopping and flasher lights is being very, very extensively debated and considered over a long period of time. As the members know, last year we brought in a change in the regulations respecting school buses requiring approaching as well as overtaking traffic to stop when a school bus is stopped and is taking on or discharging passengers, with its red lights flashing. They were to be used only on a road where the speed limit was in excess of 35 miles an hour. We did that in the interests of uniformity. I do not think we have enough statistics yet to show whether this has been any improvement and I would be rather hesitant about making a further change with regard to extending the speed limits on roads further than they are now, until we have had some further experience in this matter.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the hon. Minister if drivers of buses carrying itinerant workers must pass inspection before they are permitted to drive these buses?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Do you mean the driver has to pass this?

Mr. Newman: Yes. Various canning companies and construction companies use buses for the transport of their workers.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, but I think this is a matter that is under consideration by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales).

Mr. Newman: I am looking at it from the safety angle, Mr. Chairman. I think that the individual driving that bus should pass the same type of inspection as the one who is driving the school bus. He, more than likely, is carrying as many passengers as is the other, and the vehicle will more than likely be carrying a greater load. So were it to become involved in an accident, there is the greater hazard.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister about the school buses he just mentioned. This came to my attention about two or three months ago, where we had three lanes of traffic and we had the school bus in the curb lane. We had traffic around it in the second lane and somebody who is driving past in the third lane, in the passing lane—this is the fastest lane—and not being able to see the flasher, is being arrested. I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, has there been any provision for this type of thing, where you just cannot see the lights?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think the member raises a question that has concerned us as regards the adequacy of signal lights that are used. We have examined the equipment that is used in other jurisdictions and I can tell him that in some places they use horizontally extending arms with a flasher on the end of it. In some places the arm goes down; we are examining these pieces of equipment now to see if they have merit over and above our present equipment.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, if I may, the problem seems to be that you find somebody in this fast passing lane, as I say, who goes through—perhaps it is a green light—and who just cannot see this at all. I know the Minister says he is examining the various means of flashers, but I am wondering what happens to the odd person who is caught by a policeman and who has no idea at all that a bus was there? It is very serious in some cases, and I think in this particular case it is a question of the man's licence involved. Perhaps the Minister may remember the case.

In any event, I am just wondering if something should not be done for this type of case until the Minister and his department come up with some solution.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I just have to say to the member that we have no answer to that question at the moment, but it is one that is a real concern. It has developed, of course, only since we brought in the amendment last year that required the overtaking vehicle also to stop.

Mr. Braithwaite: I would ask, Mr. Chairman, if there is not any possibility of the Minister using his discretion in cases such as this? Because here, as I recall the case—I do not have the facts with me here tonight—but as I recall, we have a man whose licence and livelihood depend on good driving and no conviction. And here he is, losing this because of this conviction. Is there any way that the Minister could use discretion in this type of case?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not think the Minister has that discretion, but I would like to discuss it with my colleague, the Attorney General, who answers for the provincial police, who will be the enforcing officers, because it is a new problem that has developed just since we made the change with respect to overtaking vehicles.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Chairman, from time to time when there is an accident resulting in a fatality, and an inquest is held, the coroner's jury may recommend certain changes, either in highway design or the elimination of an obstruction of some kind which may have contributed to the cause of the accident.

I was thinking particularly, Mr. Chairman, of guard rails which protrude and which possibly should be buried, light standards and other such highway property which may be involved in the accident or cause the accident to be more serious than it would otherwise be. I am thinking of at least three fatal accidents in my county where the Crown attorney made some rather blunt remarks about highway property, guard rails particularly, and the location of medians, and so on.

I am sure that there must be liaison between The Department of Highways, for example, and The Department of Transport whereby the department of the hon. Minister, more concerned with safety, could point out certain weaknesses of design or suggest minor changes in highway property location which could eliminate many of the hazards which exist and which may cause the accident to be more serious than necessary. I wonder if coroners' recommendations or coroners' jury recommendations come to the attention of the Minister on which he can act in some way, either by legislation or regulation.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: When coroners' juries and recommendations of this kind are brought to our attention, we discuss them with The Department of Highways if they concern that department. I want to assure the member that they are no less interested in safety than we are, although we are discussing it under our department at this moment, and there is excellent liaison between the two departments. When recommendations of that kind are brought to our attention, they are processed through our legislation committee and carefully studied.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: I thought that the House would like to know that the score is 2 to 0 for Montreal.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the Minister. He is fielding the questions pretty well, I think.

I think that if any director of a large corporation had to take so much abuse from his stockholders as the Minister has to take in these estimates, he would not come through as well as the Minister does. I want to say that he has a wide knowledge of the subject and has a wonderful staff who handle the public well, but it could be so much more effective if he was willing to inculcate more progressive legislation as the Opposition suggests.

I see that the department is going to spend $350,000 this year in safety. Getting back to what I said in my remarks after the Minister's address, this represents about 20 cents per head, across this wide province of seven million people, for education in how to help save their lives and prevent accidents. Most homes have a family car and some have two cars, but most of them have one car, and I think that to spend only $350,000 does not permit a thorough enough education in respect of safety. I think that there should be a strong continuity programme, full-page advertisements weekly or seasonal promotions at different times of the year to educate people on safety when driving their cars.

I say that $350,000 is a pittance compared to the amount of money that should be spent; three or four times that amount should be spent on safety education. I think this is very wrong; 20 cents per head across the province is not enough to save lives.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I thank the member for Grey North for those words. It more than makes up for the things he said earlier.

Vote 2203 agreed to.

On vote 2204:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the Minister's attention a very practical way—we are all getting the Sargent peppermints now—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, before we get into this, I ask if we are going to take vote 2204. It is divided down pretty carefully in the item-by-item consideration. Are you going to proceed with it within those items as we discuss them so that we can clear them one by one?

Mr. Chairman: I think to expedite the work of the committee that, rather than to do it under a sequence of items, it would be better to do them under the sections.

Driver examination branch.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, under "driver examination—"

Mr. Young: The first one is "motor vehicles administration".

Mr. Chairman: I see; the first one is "motor vehicles administration".

Mr. Young: That is right, and in that connection I would like to call to the Minister's attention a way by which he could save 30 cents on the licence plates. It is a very simple way and that is by giving us permanent licence plates that would last for some years. This would cut down drastically on the expense of making the plates.

The Minister of Transport could talk to the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) and have him put his crew on a different type of shift. Certainly much less metal would be required and much less labour, and over the years it would make a very great difference in the expenditure of money. This difference could be applied to the reflectorization of the plates and to other useful purposes within his department.

I know that some thought has been given to this, but I wonder just how far the thinking of the department has gone toward making the change to permanent licence plates.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the adoption of a permanent licence plate, I may say that there has been considerable examination made into the kinds of material that we could use, how we could draw them, and what their durability would be. I think it would tie in any adoption of a multiple-year licence plate—if I might put it that way rather than permanent—with the completion of our data processing for vehicle plate issuing which will be in about two or three years' time.

In the meantime, we will get along with annual plates. But by then we may well be into a multi-year plate. We have been looking at stainless steel, aluminum and other materials, and the business of drawing the different materials.

I would say that the present licence plates are a tremendous improvement over those we had a few years ago. If you remember, when May or June came around, the new plate was looking pretty beat up. Our present plates are in good condition at the end of the year, but a multi-year plate is in the offing.

Mr. Sargent: That means in ten years.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I said in about two or three years.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Etobicoke.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us—I understand he has a machine in his department that cost in the neighbourhood of $40,000 and is used to insert drivers' licences and various other papers in envelopes. Could he give us an idea of what percentage of time this machine is used by his department, and what percentage by other departments?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is the mailing machine into which the driver application for renewal goes, I take it, into which a package or an additional piece can go. I think we use it full time in our department.

Mr. Braithwaite: Do I understand that it is used all the time? Every day throughout the year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would think so. When you realize that we have 1 million applications to be renewed each year and break that down into days, I do not think that it could every really stop running.

Mr. Chairman: Under section 1.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I bring to the attention of the Minister that a resolution has been passed by the city of Windsor concerning a new method of motor vehicle

administration, that motor vehicle issuing and licence plates be done either as a permanent plate or over a period of time, for economy's sake?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In that connection I would add, Mr. Chairman, as it is today, before we get the automatic data machinery working on licence plates, that anyone can write in for licence plates. You do not have to stand in line at any time. Anyone can make his application to our office by mail.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the Minister if he plans on having a slogan on the 1968 licence plates?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Not on the 1968 plates.

Mr. Newman: He does not plan on having a slogan? Does the Minister not think there is value in having a slogan?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We had it this year and we are evaluating it.

Mr. Newman: Is there some physical hazard in having the slogan on the plate? Does the Minister not think we should have a slogan on our licence plates the same as other states in the United States, the same as we are doing this year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have one this year and we were able to nest it between the spots. I think that is interesting, and if we can come up with something of that kind we may use it again.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is missing a perfect opportunity for selling the province by not having a slogan, seeing that so many of our vehicles travel into the United States. Even if it is only "province of opportunity" I think there should be a slogan on the licence plates.

Mr. Chairman: Section carried. Driver examination branch?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, under "Driver examination branch," I would like to bring to the attention on the hon. Minister the recommendations that were submitted by the youth committee. These, I would assume, the Minister received well in advance and I think there was sufficient time this year to act on some of them. I will not read all of them but I will read a few that deserve some attention by the hon. Minister and that is:

> A permanent driver's licence should be granted only to those persons 18 years of age and over who meet all requirements set out by The Department of Transport, and pass an accredited driving examination including written and practical tests in English or French, where geographically applicable.
>
> A provisional or temporary licence should be granted to a person under 18 years of age but no younger than 16 years, upon application to The Department of Transport. Such a provisional driver's permit only to be granted upon the applicant passing the prevailing required tests outlined for the permanent driver's requirements.

The next is a suggested point system for the provisional permit holder so that instead of the conventional 15 points, upon successful application for provisional licence, three points be granted during the first year, six points be permitted during the second year and by age 18, the provisional permit driver be granted the full credit of 15 points and his permanent licence, providing he has not lost his licence.

Mr. Chairman, these are just a few of the recommendations submitted by the youth committee in their report and I think that they deserve the intensive study of the Minister's department and action on them.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, we did not have the report of the youth committee before it was laid on the table for all members. It is before our department staff and these various proposals it has made with respect to young drivers are being very carefully considered.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I just want to follow this matter for a moment. It has been noted, and I know that reference was made in the debate previously, to the great number of accidents which we have in this province.

In the youth committee report—I refer to some of the statistics, particularly in connection with the younger drivers. It states in the committee report that 12.2 per cent of all accidents and 10.8 per cent of all fatal accidents occurring during 1965 have been attributed to the 16- to 19-year old drivers inclusive, or 7.6 per cent of all licensed drivers in Ontario. Further, 18.2 per cent of all accidents and 20.4 per cent of all fatal accidents in 1965 have been attributed to the 20- to 24-year old drivers inclusive, or 18.8 per cent of all drivers.

This means that 30.4 per cent of all accidents by all drivers in 1965 and 31.2 per

cent of all fatal accidents occurring in 1965 can be attributed to drivers under 25 years of age. This brings me to the point that I want to make, and I make it by way of underscoring what my colleague has just said in reference to the recommendations that were made by the select committee on youth, of which I was a member.

It seems to me that young people vary greatly in terms of maturity. Some young people are mature at 16, others, perhaps, take a little longer to mature and they mature quite rapidly between the 16 and 18 period. The point I make is that there may be quite a difference in the attitude of a young person between the ages of 16 and 18 in terms of being able to handle a car properly on the road. I know some friends of mine who work very closely with young people and they have suggested to me from time to time that perhaps 18 would be the more logical age at which to set the driving age. I am not prepared to say definitely that that should be the age, however. I think it comes a lot closer to being the optimum age, if you like to put it that way, rather than 16.

I note with interest that the provinces across Canada have absolutely no uniformity in this connection. Alberta—well, let us start with British Columbia. In B.C. I think, their age limit is 16; in Alberta it is 16; in Manitoba, I believe, it is 16 for an operator's licence and 18 for a chauffeur's licence; in New Brunswick it is 16 with the parents' consent and 18 on your own; in Newfoundland, it is 17; in Nova Scotia it is 16; in Ontario, of course, it is 16 at the present time; in Prince Edward Island, I believe, it is 16 for an operator's licence, 18 for a chauffeur's licence; in Quebec it is 17. There are only two provinces that have a 17 age limit. In Saskatchewan it is 16 for an operator's licence and 18 for a chauffeur's licence.

It seems to me that the one way in which this problem might be attacked and approached would be on the basis of the point system where you have three points initially given to the young driver who—and I think this should be stressed—who passes successfully a driver-education course. It seems to me that these courses given in high schools—not all high schools but certainly quite a number of them across the province—are very useful courses indeed. They set out the rules of the road, they set out the safety principles of driving and I think, generally speaking, they are very, very useful. I think young people could benefit a great deal from this type of course. But it seems to me that it should be extended beyond its present boundaries and made compulsory before a young person be issued a driver's licence.

At that time, presuming that the young person has taken the course which would include the rules of the road, safety principles of driving, courtesy and attitude training, and the accepted practical training in car handling, presuming that this course had been taken, then I think that, at 16, we would be very wise and prudent if we were to give serious consideration to changing the demerit point system to the extent that we allow them three points at 16, another three at 17—provided they have not lost their licence in the meantime—and then at 18 they would be given the full 15 points.

It seems to me that this is one way in which you can develop proper attitudes, proper respect from the young people for a motor vehicle. After all, it is not a toy, it is not something you jump into to hop out on the highway and wheel around as some of these young people do. It is not something to be fooled with; it is a very dangerous mechanical device when it is abused and I think they should be prepared to accept the responsibility on a mature basis.

I just offer these comments by way of underscoring what my colleague has said and I want to make a brief reference, as well, to motorcycles. The numbers of motorcycles and motor bikes on the highways this past few years—particularly since 1963—have increased very, very rapidly. The number of accidents, I believe, involving bike drivers has increased from 560 in 1963, to 1,125 in 1966.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Is the member going to speak on the equipment or the driver examination?

Mr. Gaunt: Well I was going to touch on both of them, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: We were trying to keep within the driver examination branch, if we may, under this section.

Mr. Gaunt: Well Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your ruling. It is rather hard to separate these things, because they are intertwined. However, I will try and stay with the vote.

I do feel that an examination is necessary for young people who are engaging themselves in the driving and the operating of a motor bike, as well as a motor vehicle. It seems to me that they do have a responsibility, not only from their own safety

standpoint, but also from a safety standpoint of other people as well—particularly the passengers on the back of these vehicles.

I feel that some type of testing and examination is necessary for these young people who assume that responsibility. Undoubtedly it would not be as extensive as a motor vehicle test, nonetheless I think there should be some testing involved in this type of thing.

As far as the equipment is concerned, my feeling is that it should be compulsory for all young people who ride on these motor bikes to wear helmets. After all, to me I feel it is not an invasion of the rights of the individual.

Mr. Chairman: The different headings are before us and we are following them in sequence, it is difficult to know where one begins and the other stops.

Mr. Gaunt: Where would you suggest we begin?

Mr. Chairman: Well I think if there is anything specifically under the driver examination branch, in order to be fair to the other members, we should stay with that section at this time.

Mr. Gaunt: Well I would be prepared to do that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The helmet safety deal was on the vote before. We spent about three hours on it under highway safety.

Mr. Gaunt: Well could I discuss it then under the vehicle inspection branch?

Mr. Chairman: Well, actually, we have passed the vote.

Mr. Gaunt: Well I will get my licks in some other time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview and then the member for—

Mr. Young: Well, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the driver examination branch, we have been using certain techniques that try to encourage our drivers to be more careful and to prevent accidents. I had a chance last fall to discuss these with some of the British authorities, the institute for advanced motoring, and I bring that to the attention of the House and the attention of the Minister.

The institute provides a severe driving test for which persons may volunteer and on passing be given a certificate of membership and a medallion that they can display on their vehicle. Only 60 per cent, we are told, of the applicants have passed on the first try and beyond that, they come back after failure and try again—many of them.

This test is sufficiently tough so that it really means something and the people who get by the severity of that test feel they have achieved some real status. Since the proficiency test includes items of knowledge, performance and courtesy of safe driving as well as skill, then the test for advanced driving means that it is just exactly that.

Now this is an appeal to public recognition, frankly, and it is an appeal particularly to the young people who today have a feeling that by smart alec techniques, by toughness and by speed they can achieve certain recognition among their peers. But the institute for advanced motorists has conducted over 21,000 examinations and admitted over 12,000 candidates to its membership and its appeal is growing.

The time factor has not yet been such that the authorities feel that they can really assess this in its true impact, but they are very, very hopeful that this is a technique by which a young driver particularly can achieve recognition; not through speed, not through daring, not through playing chicken, but through the achievement of this medallion which is displayed in a prominent place on motor cars. It is an incentive. It is a carrot instead of a stick, and I wonder if the Minister would comment as to whether any serious thought has been given to this kind of recognition among our driving public in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I perhaps should deal with some of the points raised by the previous speakers.

No, we are not thinking at the moment of giving any award of the kind of medallion form that the member has referred to. We find that, at the present, the graduates of the driver instruction courses in the high schools find a great satisfaction in graduating and achieving the required standards. I do not think there is any particular need for this other type of award at the present. It may be that it will reach that place where we will have to give some sort of incentive, but there is a very real eagerness manifest at the present time without it.

The members before referred to, and I think particularly the member for Huron-Bruce and the member for Windsor-Walkerville, the youth committee reports as regards

young drivers. This matter, as I intimated, is being studied carefully by our officers and being analyzed. There was one area of recommendation that I could not quite follow in the report. It dealt with the incidence of accidents in the 16- to 25-year-old group and gave some quite convincing statistics as to the excess of accidents, or collisions, over the percentage of drivers in the overall driver population in the province.

Then it jumped from that to the conclusion, I took it, that the 16- and 17-year-olds were particularly bad and therefore should be treated differently; discriminated against. There are two things in this connection I should say.

First of all, the statistics do not show that the 16- and 17-year-old drivers are as bad as the 18- to 23-year-olds. I was just reading an article in Chitty's law journal, the last issue, I think—

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may at this point, the youth committee report does not break it up into the ages that you have mentioned. It breaks it up into ages 16 to 19 and 20 to 24. Because of that, maybe there will be confusion in our presentation of statistics.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes. But even in the 16 to 19 group, the 16- and 17-year-old records are quite a lot better than the 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23 age brackets. That is dealt with, mentioned, in Chitty's report on traffic accidents, where he says:

> Male drivers under 30 and particularly 18 to 23 contribute very heavily to the accident totals.

That was just one point I wanted to raise, that we want to be very careful we are not going to pin on 16- and 17-year-olds an accident record that does not belong there, especially if it would interfere with the driver instructions in the high schools and rule out a great many of them. I think one of the most hopeful programmes that we are developing now is the instruction of high school students in good driving and our records, I think, will prove that abundantly.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I have tonight here in this Legislature, a man looking for justice, and it comes under this vote, driver examination.

This is the case of Mr. Zoltan Szoboszloi. I think it is well known. This involves a death and very serious charges, and the members present at this sworn statement here, Dr. Cotnam, inspector McBride, Mr. Zoltan Szoboszloi, Mr. Leslie Horvath—

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me; will the member for Grey North explain how this comes under driver examination?

Mr. Sargent: It is in this brief, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: This is driver examination?

Mr. Sargent: Driver examination. The following statement was made and it was asked of inspector McBride if he had any objection to this meeting being taken down in shorthand and he replied, "No."

On January 3 or 4, Mr. Szoboszloi stated:

> I received a call in a restaurant on Bloor Street. A friend of mine, Frank Kovaks was killed in a car accident in the district of Parry Sound. In that car was present my other friend, Leslie Horvath, wife of the deceased, Mrs. Kovaks, and their three-year-old son.
>
> When I arrived in Parry Sound I made some investigation making pictures from the car.

And that newspaper article here in my hand from January 2, 1964, the *North Star* and the front story is one article: Hits Plough, Driver Killed on By-Pass."

> During my stay in Parry Sound, Mr. Leslie Horvath had wanted me to be present—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this is a case of a man who wants justice, of a jury being tampered with and I am talking about driver examination.

Mr. Chairman: This is not driver examination.

Mr. Sargent: You will not know until I tell it—

Mr. Chairman: This is not driver examination; we are on salaries, travelling expenses and maintenance of the driver examination branch, and you are out of order. If you want to bring that up under something else, you are quite welcome.

Mr. Sargent: You name where I can bring it up, then.

Mr. Chairman: Well, it is not under driver examination branch.

Mr. Sargent: I tell you it is; when this brief is revealed to the House, it will be.

Mr. Chairman: Where are we getting into driver examination on this?

Mr. Sargent: Why are you trying to block this?

Mr. Chairman: I am not trying to block anything. We are on a vote concerning the driver examination branch.

Mr. Sargent: This is.

Mr. Chairman: Tell us where.

Mr. Sargent: Do I start in the middle of it, or do you want to hear the story?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, if it comes under this vote, I would like to give an opportunity to the member to bring this before us, but I do not see the relevance of it yet. But if he says it is relevant, I would like to hear it.

An hon. member: You are being generous!

Mr. Sargent: To continue:

Before the inquest, the coroner, Dr. A. G. L. Wright made the sworn-in members of the jury and foreman separate. At the same time Dr. Wright made the swearing-in of a stenographer to take shorthand and transcript of the evidence to the best of her knowledge.

The inquest was held on the second floor of the court house in the court room opposite the jury room. During the inquest I asked Mr. Telekis who was representing the wife of the deceased, Mrs. Kovaks, if he wished to make cross examination first or after.

We agreed I do first cross examination of the witnesses and by this cross examination—not permitted during the coroner's inquest—the cross examination was made by Mr. McDonald, the Crown attorney of Parry Sound.

During the inquest, the policeman, constable Glen Junkin from the OPP got the testimony that the accident occurred on Highway 69, McDougall township, in the evening and after the accident, all three persons, Mr. Horvath, Mr. Kovaks and Mrs. Kovaks were put to the side of the highway in the four below temperature.

Later it was found that only Frank Kovaks died in the accident. The other two persons, Mrs. Kovaks and Mr. Horvath, with the three-year old son of the deceased, were taken to Parry Sound hospital.

After hearing all the evidence, there was stated that the plough had no licence plate for the road, and must be within 10 feet of the intersection. The jury retired. The jury was asked into the jury room—

Mr. K. E. Butler (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I still have not heard a word—

Mr. Sargent: I will get to that:

The jury were asked into the jury room opposite the court room off the second floor for about 25 or 40 minutes when the foreman of the jury, Ronald Birkus, came out from the jury room and was talking with PC Collins, OPP policeman, about his number. It is 3347. He told the policeman that he wanted to talk with Mr. McDonald. After a while, Mr. McDonald went into the jury room.

When Mr. McDonald was in the jury room, I went back into the court room. I requested Dr. Wright to note my objection that the foreman of the jury, contrary to the oath, came out and was talking to the guard of the jury and at the request of the guard of the jury, Mr. McDonald went into the jury room. Dr. Wright got alarmed and he ran into the jury room too. After a while he came out with Mr. McDonald.

When the jury returned to the court room, Dr Wright spelled something to the jury without giving any chance to the stenographer or to Mr. Telekis or me to hear what he told the jury. I asked at that moment of Mr. Horvath, who is here with me, whether the coroner was spelling some things out to the jury.

Naturally, after the consultation in the jury room with the Crown attorney and the coroner and after spelling it out to the jury, the jury decided the deceased is guilty. After the decision of the jury I did rise and request the court that my objection be recorded. I requested the stenographer to give the answer "yes" or "no" that my objection was recorded. The young lady replied: "Yes, your objection is recorded."

On January 24, I requested a court reporter to send the transcript of evidence of the coroner's inquest and send it by registered mail. The rest is in my hands now and I am going to show this to Dr. Cotnam. Dated January 24, Ontario. The number of the letter is 500 and is addressed to the court reporter but sent care of the coroner. The letter requesting to get a copy was turned over to the assistant, Mr. Ken Howie. Until now I did not receive the answer.

March 3, 1963 I asked in the office of Mr. Howie of his assistant, Mr. Griffith: "Where is the copy of my letter? I wish to have it." He stated that it had been misplaced and could not produce it to me. Now, during the inquest and after the inquest in the court room, I asked the OPP if the person driving the snow plow was charged with criminal negligence or reckless driving. He said, "No, what for?"

Mr. Szoboszloi's complaint is that he feels perjury was committed by the Crown attorney, Mr. McDonald, and the coroner, Dr. A. J. Wright, in entering the jury room. He states that any person who intentionally—"

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Chairman, I must protest the flagrant abuse of the rules. This is really out of order. It is shocking that this member persists—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: To continue, section 112 of the criminal code applied to this inquest and he quotes "everyone commits perjury"—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order, order!

Mr. White: This is shameful; no wonder the Liberals are so disorganized.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: This is symptomatic of your whole caucus, this idiocy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: This citizen of Canada feels that a manslaughter charge should be laid against the driver of the snow plow and he refers to chapter 172, section 60 which states:

Every person is guilty of an offence in driving carelessly who drives a vehicle on a highway without due care and attention and without reasonable consideration for any other person on the highway, and is liable to a fine of not less than $10 and not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for a term of not more than three months.

He also refers to section 221 of the criminal code which states:

Everyone who is criminally negligent in the operation of a motor vehicle is guilty of (a) an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for five years, or an offence punishable on summary conviction—

An hon. member: Shut up!

Mr. Sargent: I am almost finished; I am almost finished; I am going to get this on the record.

Allegations made by Mr. Szoboszloi against the driver of the plow:

He was driving from the side road without due care and regard to an auto, and the life and safety of the other driver in causing death; he stopped within 400 feet of the intersection; and he stopped, disregarding the oncoming vehicle of Mr. Kovaks.

Both vehicles were going north, but the snow plow disregarded the oncoming vehicle. Mr. Szoboszloi feels that unless the driver of the plow is brought to court he cannot be charged.

Dr. Cotnam asked Mr. Szoboszloi if the charge of murder was not dropped against the driver of the plow and he was now charged with criminal negligence and was told, "Yes." Mr. Szoboszloi then states he wishes our office to check and prove it either pro or con. He goes on:

First of all I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Cotnam and Mr. McBride for what they did in the interest of justice and for the public benefit but, my modest opinion is to ask that if you find out that an error has happened in the law or procedure, a further inquest or a new inquest be held; and this is my opinion.

Mr. Szoboszloi is here tonight and I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for letting me put this on the record because there has been a great injustice here.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North has misled the House. He said his statement was about the driver examination branch and it had nothing whatever to do with it. It was completely out of order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: It has to do with—

Mr. Chairman: Take your seat, you are out of order!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I have not misled the House. I was talking about motor vehicles with no licences.

Mr. Chairman: You are out of order!

Mr. Sargent: I do not have to take my seat. I am critic for this Opposition for The Department of Transport, and I will talk as long as I want to.

Mr. Chairman: We are on the driver examination branch. Will the member for Grey North take his seat, please?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask, for the member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson), the status of the driver examination centre at Leamington?

An hon. member: The member for Essex South?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the member for Essex South asked me the other day how it was coming on, and I think I informed him that The Department of Public Works is looking for the site in Leamington.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister predict a day on which the centre will be opened?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, Mr. Chairman, I would not put a date on it. I just say it is coming and I do not think it will be long. The Department of Public Works is seeking the site.

Mr. Newman: If you wait until the election comes, Mr. Chairman, we may have to wait years.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: You may have to, too.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question under this driver examination branch. Will there be any change this year in the examination that the drivers have to take? I have heard no objections or no criticisms of the Minister's officers whatsoever, but our older citizens find the questions that they have to answer in order to get a driver's licence, are trick questions. I was wondering if there would be any change during this coming year that might help the older citizens to pass their examinations on the first test?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any particular change in the standards or in the procedures. We do try to have our examiners deal carefully with older people who, because it is an important affair, are inclined to get rattled. I think most of them show good sense in the public relations and try to put the older person at ease and give them the best chance to make the best showing they can.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the blueprint for traffic safety for Ontario put out by the Ontario motor league makes two recommendations that directly involve this vote, driver examination, and I would like to bring them to the attention of the hon. Minister. The first is that the province should reexamine its present involvement in the high school driver education programme and offer additional assistance as well as approve all programmes of equal standards so that in the near future all new drivers will have the opportunity to receive this type of training. The second is the province should make a thorough study of the effectiveness of the elementary traffic safety education programmes throughout the province and determine means of strengthening this activity to ensure its availability to all school children in the province.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think we know that one of the bottlenecks in the driver education programme in high schools has been the number of trained instructors that we have; there is a drive on to increase the number of available instructors of competence. The problem in the point the member raises is this, that driver instruction in high schools is within the jurisdiction of the individual school board, who will or will not recommend it and pay for it.

I do not think it is our place to interfere with the rights of the school board. The member can be very sure that I am interested in pressing it in any way we properly can but, after all, while it is in the curriculum of the schools or is given as an extramural activity, it is still within the authority of the school board. That is the problem.

Mr. Newman: May I suggest to boards of education that do not conduct such a programme that the Minister's department undertake to conduct the programme? It is not to the maximum benefit to the citizenry of the province if the programme for driver education is going to be only in the more affluent centres.

I think the smaller centres of the province or centres that may not be quite as affluent as the large, Metro areas should have that same type of opportunity. Where the board of education will not provide it, I think The Department of Transport should consider undertaking the education of the young new driver.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would like to urge my colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), to give some help to the school boards, but it is not big and affluent metropolitan boards that are doing it. I am unhappy to say that the school boards of Toronto—

Mr. Newman: Is it the Metro centre that is not doing it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes.

Mr. Newman: Where?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The high schools in Toronto are not generally giving driver instruction courses, nor are the high schools in Ottawa. These are the big blocks of high schools we would like to see included in the programme this coming year.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister mean Toronto high schools do not give driver education as an after-school activity at all? Then they have a lot to learn from other parts of the province.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Right!

Mr. Newman: I am surprised to hear that Toronto would be so slow in moving into a thing like traffic safety May I ask the hon. Minister how many individuals in the driver training are allowed in the vehicle while the driver training is being given? That is, the behind-the-wheel portion of the driver training. Is there some set regulation?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Is the member speaking of—

Mr. Newman: The actual behind-the-wheel training.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In the behind-the-wheel training in the course in the high schools, besides the driver and the instructor, I think they usually allow two pupils in the back seat for observation.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, would it not be better then to have more pupils in there so that more could be learning at the same time? I understand in my community they allow four.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think the total is four. That is, three and the one who is taking the instruction and the driver. A total of five in the car.

Mr. Newman: Yes, five in the car. Are the vehicles inspected at all, Mr. Chairman? Those that have the dual braking system, is the dual brake inspected?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The equipment is provided and the cars used are usually brand new cars provided by the motor vehicle companies. I think they are in top condition.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister conducting courses so that we could have additional teachers in driver education?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There are courses being conducted for the instructors. I said this is one of the bottlenecks and we are pushing to graduate more teachers.

Mr. Newman: Is that under the Minister's department or is that under some other department of government?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The programme of instruction for the instructors is laid down by our department and a bursary for those taking the course is provided by, I think, the all-Canada insurance federation for the instructor while he is taking the course.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister not speed up training the teachers by some type of financial inducement so that we could have more of this type of training going on in our schools as an after-school programme?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think the situation is being pretty well met now. This last fall we had some very excellent sessions around the province for the driver instructors and out of it I think we have developed a sufficient enthusiasm that the shortage will be overcome.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, how much money does the Minister's department devote to driver training?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think we are backtracking, Mr. Chairman, in that the high school driver instruction programme came under highway safety. I think the amount actually is $25,000, contributed by our department.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, how much of that—

Mr. Renwick: Do you mean that in the province of Ontario the government contributes $25,000 to driver training and nothing else?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, I did not say that. I just said the part of driver training promoted by our department in conjunction with the Department of Education would be something of that nature. A more accurate count is in all, $33,500 for the part that we contribute as The Department of Transport. It still comes within The Department of Education.

Mr. Renwick: Perhaps the Minister could assist me in letting me know how much money The Department of Education—

Mr. Chairman: That vote is already passed. Under vote 2203, the highway safety branch, this vote has already been passed.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, surely the highway safety branch does not necessarily include the driver training? It could equally come under driver examination.

If the matter of the number of dollars devoted by the government has not as yet been raised in these estimates, surely it is appropriate that under the driver examination branch—which is the branch, I assume, which decides whether or not a person is going to be able to drive—we are directly within that vote to deal with driver training.

Mr. Chairman: This vote is driver examination. This matter was raised under vote 2203, the highway safety branch.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have not had the opportunity of being in the House during the whole of these estimates. I had not heard the figure during the time I was here. Now has the Minister dealt with the question—

Mr. Sargent: You still have not heard it.

Mr. Renwick: —of the number of dollars that his department is devoting to driver training, before I interjected a few minutes ago? I am suggesting the Minister is saying no, he has not; therefore it is quite appropriate under this heading. There may be some subsequent heading that you feel that it could be dealt under?

Mr. Chairman: It should have been asked under highway safety. If the Minister wishes to answer under driver examination—

Mr. Renwick: No, I do not accept that interpretation of a matter such as this, which has no specific heading and which, of course, should have a specific heading. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly suggest to the Minister that next year, when he is preparing these estimates, because of the importance of driver training, we provide a separate item in these estimates.

It appears to me that in the estimates of this department the Minister should not now duck the problem by saying that it is now under The Department of Education.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I was not ducking the problem, Mr. Chairman. I simply answered the question, that the amount that we had devoted to driver education in the high schools was $25,000. I gave a corrected figure because I find that there were other expenses met, bringing it up to $33,500 that we contribute. We also make other contributions to it, that I could lump with it, but they do not necessarily relate specifically to the driver education in the high schools; that is, we provide the textbooks, we provide the driver handbook and we provide the assistance and the promotion of the work by the accident prevention officer in the area. Other factors like that contribute to it.

Specifically, to the private member's question—which I say I did not duck—I gave a straight clear answer of the amount we would be expending from our department. It is a joint programme that comes primarily under The Department of Education; the amount is $33,500.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I certainly accept the Minister's explanation. He did not duck the question. I thought I had heard him. I must have heard some other interjection ducking the question and referring to The Department of Education.

How much money does the government as a whole contribute to driver training, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It is an inquiry, sir, that I cannot give an answer to, because It is not broken down into that kind of heading. I think you were quite right when you said that driver training in high schools certainly came under the vote, highway safety.

Mr. Chairman: We are on driver examination at the present time.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, until you rule me out of order, I am going to suggest that driver training is intimately connected with the vote of driver examination. I think that a driver has to be trained before he takes his examination; is that not a perfectly proper statement to make about the Minister's department, because we are not dealing with highway safety?

Highway safety is another matter entirely. We are dealing with the training of drivers so that they will qualify to get their licences.

Mr. Chairman: Under this vote, the member for Riverdale, we are just dealing with driver examination, not training. This came under "highway safety branch" and was discussed in full.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It has always been the custom in this House, when we are talking on vote 2204,

you can talk about anything under that vote. Where has this new ruling come tonight that you are going to break it down on sections—because you cannot, they are all interrelated. We are talking about anything under vote 2204; you should be able to talk intelligently on transport. You pick a ruling out of the air and—

Mr. Chairman: Highway safety comes under vote 2203, which has already been passed.

An hon. member: You had better take your seat in the back row.

Mr. Chairman: On driver examination.

Mr. Braithwaite: I want to go a step further on that driver examination.

I understand from the Minister that first of all there is no driver training in Toronto but I know that there is this driver training in Metro. What I would like to know is, of the $33,000 that the Minister mentioned that is spent in conjunction with The Department of Education, how much would go to Metro high schools? If possible I would like to know how much would go to the high schools in Etobicoke.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is a specific question, Mr. Chairman, which I will have to get the answer for the hon. member. I think we can do that.

Mr. Braithwaite: Would we have this before the estimates are over?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That I doubt, sir, but I will try.

Mr. Chairman: Driver examination branch carried?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if, under the driver examination branch, any training is given to students or to individuals in driving motorcycles, and if in the curriculum for driver training, motorcycles are included?

Mr. Chairman: This is the driver examination branch not driver training.

Mr. Newman: You are going to examine the fellow for motor bikes, as you are going to examine—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think you are quite right in that. As far as I know the instruction in motorcycle operation has not yet reached the high schools.

For information, perhaps they could bring it up under motor vehicles, I do not know. In Ottawa the instruction in safe driving of motorcycles is being given under the auspices of the Ottawa safety council. They are using for their instructors a very splendid group, that operates under the name of the Ottawa Valley competition motorcycle club. They are doing a very splendid job because the people they graduate from their course are first-class motorcyclists and very safety conscious. But I do not think it comes in this vote.

Mr. Newman: The programme there is of tremendous value, as the Minister had mentioned, and I have no reason to say it is not. Surely that programme would merit duplicating in other parts of the province, and the people to suggest it be duplicated are the Minister's department.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We may do that.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, under the driver examination branch, the Minister said that the bottleneck in the area of driver training had to do with the lack of instructors. I am wondering whether or not he could tell me how many examiners are employed in the province by his department; what their qualifications are to be examiners; what is the method of appointment and what training they have in order to be qualified to examine other persons for the issuance of licences.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think in our driver examination branch we have a staff of 248. These are trained driver examiners who are kept up-to-date in driver examination procedures; they have met the requirements of the department as laid down by the civil service and have had their subsequent training and are put into work. Just while I am answering questions, may I say to the member for Etobicoke that I think Weston collegiate and vocational institute is the only school in his area—

Mr. Braithwaite: That is not in my area. It is not in Etobicoke.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We will try again; I was just trying to keep my promise to the hon. member, but I will get him the information.

Mr. Braithwaite: While the Minister is commenting on the number of instructors, I wonder if he would be good enough to tell the House if any of these instructors are women and if so, how many, and if none, why not?

Mr. Chairman: Is the member talking about instruction?

Mr. Braithwaite: The Minister just commented on the number of instructors, I am just trying to follow it through and make sure we all understand. We are talking about examiners.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think the answer is no, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Braithwaite: Could the Minister answer the other part of the question, is there any particular reason why women are not allowed to be examiners?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I cannot see any reason why they should not be, and I will make inquiry as to why there are not any. I cannot imagine it would be a requirement that they be male, but I will check.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am very interested in possible amendments to section 4 of the human rights code of this government, and I am just wondering why—

Mr. Chairman: We are on driver examination.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am talking about driver examination.

Mr. Chairman: The member is out of order, we were on driver examination.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am not out of order, I am talking about driver examination. I must disagree with you. I have as much right as anybody else to ask a question and I am asking a question here—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am asking, Mr. Chairman, only, if there is any particular reason why the government is not fulfilling its own obligations under the human rights code and why there are no lady examiners.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: As I say, I cannot see any reason why there should not be. I do not know if there is any impediment to their being, but I will check that out for the member because I think it is a very valid question. If we have women examiners or not, why have we not? I will follow it up and see if we have any. I will also find out if we have not, why we have not.

Mr. Braithwaite: Will we have that answer before these estimates are finished?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes. That is a matter of fact I can put my finger on.

Mr. Braithwaite: All right, thank you.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, of the 248 driver examiners that the Minister referred to a few moments ago, would he tell me what the updating training is that these examiners have and, how his department keeps them up to date in connection with their training? Is there a regular programme or is it just that they continue to do the same task all the time and this passes for updating their qualifications?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, I can assure the House that is not so. They are called in and they have refresher courses. And to satisfy the member for Etobicoke, I find the chief examiner indicates there is no impediment to a woman examiner, but he cannot recall an occasion where he had a woman applicant.

Mr. Braithwaite: I thank the Minister very much.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on the recall of the examiners for training, how many, for example, were recalled and put through a refresher course in the year that has just passed, the year 1966?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will pick up the story, on the number of driver examiners who went through a retraining in the fiscal year, I take it, of 1966?

Mr. Renwick: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We will have the figures. If we cannot find them right now, I will get them quickly.

Mr. Renwick: Where is that particular refresher course held then, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There are regional meetings and the refresher course is held here. The member asked where, and I would say Toronto is the answer as regards the one here at head office. I will find out just what other ones are held around the province and the total number who attended retraining courses last year.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, in the light of the obvious shortage of instructors for driver training purposes, would the Minister not consider that if, in fact—and I gather from the hesitance in the Minister's reply—there is some basic question as to whether or not examiners are brought in for regular training and the value of the course which they are getting and how adequate it is, I make this suggestion to the Minister that it should be possible to enlarge the number of driver examiners to the point where a sufficient

number of them could be released for the purpose of instructing and providing the instruction for persons who might well be driving instructors under The Department of Education course for driver training.

It would seem to me that out of this pool of relatively expert persons, it should be possible for the Minister's department to do a considerable amount toward removing the roadblock on driver instructors. I think this is significant because it has almost become normal now for the government in almost any department to use as a reason for their programmes not getting off the ground the shortage of personnel. They almost make it a virtue, and here is another area where it appears that driver training and the emphasis that should be put on driver training is halted because of the lack of driver instructors. Yet we have this pool of examiners for drivers' licences who, if they are well up to date in their particular skills, would provide a most valuable pool for rapidly enlarging qualified persons for driver instructors.

What I would like to know is whether that is a feasible suggestion, or whether the Minister has any other suggestions within his department related to the examination of drivers, where his department could assist in a very real way in eliminating the roadblock on driver instructors.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think the member rather confuses the role of the driver instructor in the high schools. These are mostly high school teachers, and in giving driver instruction in high schools they draw fees from the school board comparable to those paid to night school teachers. We do not mix those two roles in our thinking.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, if I might just mention, I am fairly certain that in Metro here we have a private driving school which comes—

Mr. Chairman: We are on driver examination.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am just following up what the Minister said, this is what we are talking about.

Mr. Chairman: Could we keep to the vote?

Mr. Braithwaite: I am on the vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: We are talking about driver examination.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am talking about driver examination, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has just stated that these instructors are usually high school teachers, and the point I want to make is that I think—I am almost certain, in one case I am certain—there is a private driving school and they supply drivers. The thing I want to know while I am on my feet is, are these vehicles of these private driving schools checked periodically, what sort of regulations apply there?

Mr. Chairman: We are on driver examination.

Mr. Braithwaite: That is exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. Chairman: The member is not talking about driver examination, he is talking about driver instruction, which is not under this vote.

Mr. Braithwaite: It has already been brought to the attention of this House that driver instructors and examination are closely related.

Mr. Chairman: Vehicle inspection is another one.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, driver instruction is carried out in the main by a commercial driver instructing school, and these are in no way related to the driver instruction programme and our department, in conjunction with The Department of Education in the high schools. These are commercial operations, and those who operate them are licensed as driver instructor school operators.

Mr. Braithwaite: Just to follow that up, does the Minister mean to say that none of these private schools come into the high schools—

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member is out of order. We are talking about driver examination, and we are not going to get back on to driver instruction again.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, will you tell me under what vote the question that has just been raised by the member for Etobicoke would come?

Mr. Chairman: If it is a vehicle inspection, it comes under the vehicle inspection vote which is two down from where we are at the present time.

Mr. Renwick: So that there will be a place to discuss that matter under vehicle inspection?

Mr. Chairman: Under the vehicle inspection branch there is a vote on that.

Mr. Braithwaite: Could I take this one step further? I am going to forget about the vehicle inspection for the time being and I want to follow up on the driver instructors.

Mr. Chairman: We are not talking about driver instructors; we are on the vote for driver examination.

Mr. Braithwaite: The Minister was just talking about driver instructors.

Mr. Chairman: Well, he is out of order too!

Mr. Braithwaite: If I understand the Minister correctly, he was talking about driver instructors.

Mr. Chairman: Order! We are on the driver examination branch vote.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am not going to argue with you; I will wait until it comes up again.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, of the 248 driver examiners, what is the salary range that these examiners are entitled to receive and are they graded in any particular way or is there just one class within the Minister's department for qualification for this particular work?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I find our driver examiners come under classes 1, 2, 3 and 4. With respect to the number that took the re-examination last year, I do not have that yet, but I can tell him that all driver examiners have a refresher course at least once in two years. That would indicate that about 125 took the course last year and, in the last two months, all the driver examiners in the eastern part of the province have had their refresher course.

Mr. Renwick: The classes 1, 2, 3 and 4; are they classifications for salary ranges or classifications for competence?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would say that they were classifications for salary range that depended on competence.

Mr. Renwick: And not solely related to length of service, but having some regard to their qualifications. Who would be the person or persons who would decide on their relative competence?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The director of the driver examination branch is Mr. William McIntyre, who has been director of the branch for some time.

Mr. Renwick: What is the method of recruitment into that driver examination branch? For example, if there had been a number taken on in this past year, say two or three or four, what would their method of recruitment be?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think the usual recruitment procedures of the civil service. We have been advertising in out-of-town papers recently for applicants.

May I complete the story that the member asked me with regard to the classes? Classes 1, 2, 3 and 4 have salary ranges of $4,050 to $5,000; $5,000 to $5,400; $5,500 to $6,000; and $6,300 to $6,600, respectively.

Mr. Sargent: I mentioned to the Minister before that, in outlying areas around Metro, these driver examination centres should be open when the people want them; on weekends and in the evenings. I would like to know why the government is so rigid about this when we ask our police to work on weekends and on Saturdays and Sundays, and our firemen and nursing staffs; but this group in the driver examination branch is not available to the public when needed—which is on weekends and in the evenings. I think they shut down at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and when we have daylight saving that will be the equivalent of closing at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. I think that the government should have some reason as to why it cannot service people properly in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of convenience to the public and it is a matter of fairness to our employees, and we have to—

Mr. Sargent: Can they not go in shifts like everybody else?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Not everybody else does that; but a few years ago in response to much the same kind of request that the member has put forward now—to better service the public, we altered the normal business hours on Thursdays to provide evening service from 6.30 to 8.30, as a trial. We thought there were some people who were greatly inconvenienced by having to come during the day time. However, while these people do not want to be inconvenienced, they are quite willing to inconvenience the employees—

Mr. Sargent: That is ridiculous! You pay these people, why can they not work when you tell them to work?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We tried this a couple of years ago and from our experience in these

off-hours, and from previous reports from other jurisdictions, testings on Saturdays or during the evening hours should be avoided.

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not try a weekend instead of Thursday?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We tried it on Saturdays, as they have done in other jurisdictions, and the inevitable lineups and delays resulted in greater criticism and more problems than when normal hours were observed. We try to find the best way to do this. If we say we will run it one night a week or on Saturday, we are cluttered with people who want just that one day. It is just a matter of trying to find hours that are most suitable to most people.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, at present, when a person applies for a test he is given a set time to come; so it could be scheduled just the same then were the driver examination centres to be open on Saturdays. They could take X number of people only, but at least X number of people would be convenienced.

Mr. White: Do I understand the Minister to say that Saturday examinations were cancelled because too many people wanted the examination on Saturday?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We found that there was a great influx of applications in those other-than-normal hours that most people have to work, and the night hours and Saturday afternoons were very crowded.

Mr. White: That seems to me the best reason to keep the examinations going in the evenings and on Saturdays.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, how can the Minister evade the fairness of this request? He is so hidebound in his bureaucracy that he does not even think these things out and—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is hardly fair. I said we tried it and found that—

Mr. Sargent: What were you trying to find out?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have to keep competitive with industry if we are going to keep our employees. I think we have to be fair to them too.

Mr. Sargent: There are policemen and firemen and nursing staffs in hospitals to work on the weekends, but are the Minister's people different? Are they better? I think this is so stupid!

The member for London South asked a pointed question—I missed it, I am sorry—but this is the very thing—the results that were taken from that finding should be put into operation immediately. But the Minister is trying to prove something else, apparently. So what is going to happen here?

Mr. Chairman: Driver examination branch carried?

Mr. Sargent: I am still talking, Mr. Chairman. You remind me of a new cop who gets a uniform and is drunk with power! You are really a nice guy—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, what may have to happen is that we just keep open nights and closed during the days.

An hon. member: That would be excellent.

Hon Mr. Haskett: We were operating Thursday nights in Toronto.

Mr. Newman: Have you tried other centres? Maybe it will work in other centres.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The problem of keeping our employees and satisfying them on hours is an important thing too, and yet I say we are trying it here again—

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not try to satisfy the public first and your employees afterwards? That is the key.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This we shall have to examine.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I seldom disagree with the member for Grey North, but I certainly disagree on this. I do not think the members of the public either want or expect a large number of people to be engaged working during the evenings, or odd hours, just to suit their convenience. A once-in-a-lifetime operation of getting a driver's licence, which is what it is for most persons, surely is not such an incovenience to the public that it could not be dealt with in the regular business hours.

But the matter that I would like to pursue with the Minister is—

Mr. Sargent: A day's pay?

Mr. Renwick: A day's pay all right. Once in a lifetime is worth it, if a person wants the licence.

Now what I would like to find out is how many examinations were conducted last year by the driver examination branch.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Roughly 300,000. I would just like to add to what I said about the Toronto office staying open Thursday nights.

They are staying open Thursday nights in all centres where there is a demand for it.

Mr. Renwick: Well Mr. Chairman, is there much of a backlog in the length of time that a person would now have to wait to get a driver's examination, say in the Metropolitan Toronto area, as one example; and then perhaps using examples in two or three other of the built-up areas, such as Hamilton, or Ottawa, or Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Well I think we have been able to vary our establishments to meet the various areas where the pressures or amounts of applicants rise and fall. But the difficulty is to avoid build-ups of waiting periods at peak times, and there is no doubt that there are seasons of the year when one has to wait, in the normal course of events, for an appointment, but not normally.

Mr. Renwick: Would we be speaking of a delay, a maximum delay, for example, of three weeks, or two weeks, for an appointment, or would it be over a month?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In some areas in the peak season it could run as high as three weeks, three and a half weeks.

Mr. Chairman: Driver examination branch carried?

Driver control branch.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, under driver control branch, I have waited so long I have almost forgotten the question I would like to ask.

Has the hon. Minister given any consideration to the necessity of maybe re-establishing the speed differential between passenger cars and trucks on the main highways in the province?

If I remember correctly, at one time we had a differential between passenger cars and trucks, as far as speed limits were concerned.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, there is not now to my recollection any differential between the truck speed and the passenger car speed on our highways.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. Minister I am aware of that, and I raised this problem a couple of years ago, I believe it was, just prior to the department removing the speed differential. At one time on the Queen Elizabeth we had a speed differential between trucks and passenger cars and this was lifted overnight.

I think that it is the opinion of the driving public now that this differential served a purpose, particularly on the busy highways and expressways. I am sure that as it prevails through the United States, in all of the states I have driven through, they have a speed differential between the passenger cars and the trucks and I still think that we made a mistake in taking it off here.

If I recollect correctly, the Minister said when we took it off that they were trying an experiment to see if it would speed up traffic or if it had any effect on accidents, and this sort of thing. But I really think that it is a hazard on the Queen Elizabeth, the one that I am used to, driving it most every day. It does create a hazard when we have trucks travelling now up to the considered limit of 70 miles an hour along with the passenger cars.

I would ask the Minister to give it consideration, to having a review done. I do not know whether he has had any reference from the provincial police, or The Attorney General's Department in regard to the problem of speeds, but I think we should give consideration to establishing again the speed differential between heavy trucks and transportation.

I have another question under this department for the Minister. We have what is called a medical review board. I understand this is the board that considers a person's record if his licence is suspended for medical reasons. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes.

Mr. Gisborn: Would the Minister inform the House the makeup of this board, and briefly how it might function in regard to the record of one whose licence is suspended in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the medical review board that considers these cases, where the driver is considered to have a physical condition that makes it unsafe for him to drive, is composed of three doctors—Mr. McCabe, the director of driver control, and three doctors, Dr. C. H. Lewis, psychiatrist, Dr. E. W. Maltby, specialist in internal medicine, and Dr. John G. Humphrey, psychiatrist. I have a feeling that Dr. Lewis is away at the present, or has been replaced, although he has long been on our staff. He is with The Department of Health normally.

Mr. Gisborn: Are all these members of the review board on the payroll? Are they paid by the department, or is it a voluntary board?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: They are paid per diem, for sitting on the board.

Mr. Gisborn: They are just paid when the board sits?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, I had a case that had to go before that board and I felt that if it had not been for my own intervention on request of the individual, he might have suffered unduly because of the procedures of this board.

I understand that the board only sits periodically, and these periods are set by them.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Fortnightly at least. Twice a month at least.

Mr. Gisborn: Twice a month at least! Well that reduces some of the complaint I might have had. But I wonder about the situation where a man has a licence suspended because of medical reasons and then cannot continue in his regular work. If getting back his licence is of real importance to him, and if he had to wait even two weeks for the medical board to make a decision, this would be a fairly costly procedure.

I wonder if this is the case? The specific case I had, the chap had his medical with specialists in Hamilton and they declared that in their opinion there was no reason why he could not go back to his occupation as a driver—a bus driver for the Hamilton street railway.

The employers were willing to put him back to work immediately his licence was given back to him by the department. I understand he came before the board and was told after they had finished their interview that they would have to give consideration to their review and he would be advised at a later date as to whether or not he would get his licence.

I would think in this case that where the livelihood of the driver is at stake, this should be expedited to the fullest in almost all cases. Surely it is a case of direct medical opinion, and that opinion can be ascertained quite quickly because the testing and the medical exams are done prior to his going before the board and are in written statements of medical officers. There should be no delay in the driver getting the opinion and the okay as to whether or not he can return to his regular employment.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would like to look into the case the member raises. I point out that the procedure is this, that the medical board does not suspend a licence. The person in mind must have had his licence suspended for some reason, and was applying for reinstatement and the application for reinstatement would probably be accompanied by some medical opinion and weighed by this board. The applicant normally very seldom appears—I do not know of any case where he appeared before this board. He usually provides the medical evidence from his own area and that evidence is weighed by this board. I would think the licence must have been suspended for some reason, and he was seeking reinstatement.

Mr. Gisborn: That is the case.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: And he was going to drive—

Mr. Gisborn: He was a bus driver and he ran into a telephone post just after he came out of the terminal before he had picked up a passenger on his route. As I remember, it was determined to be not a blackout but a momentary lapse of memory or preoccupation, but he was given a clean slate by the specialist in Hamilton. By that time, somebody had notified the driver control branch and they, in turn, asked for his licence and of course he had to come down to get it back.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I doubt that it was any fortuitous delay on the part of the board. I would think it was just as likely, having regard to the nature of his ailment, that they wanted a period in which to assess whether the ailment was likely to recur or whether, in fact, there had been an improvement or correction or recovery. I think sometimes these things, by their nature, take time. In cases of epilepsy there is often a delay to assure that the treatment is being effective and that the person is not likely to black-out again to his own hurt or that of others.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister how many licences were cancelled or suspended this past year in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: For various reasons, a total of 43,535 licences were suspended during the course of the year.

Mr. Newman: How many were cancelled?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: What does the member mean, cancelled? Suspensions or cancellations, how do you distinguish?

Mr. Newman: Where they were not given their privilege to drive after three or six months. Suspension, I understand, would be for a period of time, three months, six months, maybe only a month; but the cancellation would mean the individual would not be allowed to drive.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The member is thinking of how many were suspended indefinitely?

Mr. Newman: All right, suspended indefinitely.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is a very extreme case. Mr. Chairman, I could not give the member the number now. I could find it. Those that are under indefinite suspension are not listed separately.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, how many suspensions were there for drunk driving?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Driving while intoxicated, 305; driving while ability impaired, 10,197; for a total of 10,502.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, are there any of these who were given back temporary licences for any specific purpose?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I am trying to put my finger on the number of registrations of restricted licences. I think that is what the member is referring to.

Mr. Worton: There is none without restrictions, though?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is what we call a restricted licence. In answer to the number of indefinite suspensions, 1,029.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this topic, is the statute strictly enforced that the first three months of the suspension is automatic and that there is no provision at all for a restricted licence during that first three-month period?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: For what kind of suspension?

Mr. Renwick: For an impaired driving charge.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Under the criminal code, there is no provision for any restoration of any of the three-month period.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the suspension is automatic, I believe, under The Highway Traffic Act for the first three months if there is a conviction on an impaired driving charge; the restricted licence, as I understand it, is only available after the first three months. If that is strictly true, I would just like the assurance of the Minister that no restricted licences are being issued or have been issued by departmental practice, or otherwise, in contravention of that provision?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the member.

Mr. Renwick: Another aspect that bothers me about the driver control branch. I think it is a very accurate branch of the Minister's department; there is no question about the accuracy of the information which you get and the full information which you get. The Deputy Minister knows of one instance—I am not specifically thinking of that—where I needed some assistance on this question, and I received it. But in a number of instances I find that the actual slip of paper which is sent to a person advising him what his status is—that is, suspension has been raised or his licence is suspended, or he has been reinstated or what procedures he should now follow—is something less than clear. For example, a person in my riding had had his licence suspended on two occasions, he received—he had not been driving at all—the usual notice from the driver control branch that he was eligible for reinstatement or words to that effect, or his suspension had been raised. The notice was in fact only referring to one of the suspensions, the other suspension continued in force. He assumed that it meant that he was completely cleared. He then went out and got himself his driver's licence and his owner's licence and was stopped by the police a little while later. We had a great deal of difficulty explaining in the court how this could have happened.

I have noticed the same thing on a number of occasions, and I wonder whether the Minister would give consideration to a different form of communication, going from the flimsy blue paper to either a thin cardboard or a firmer form of communication; and if the department would give consideration to the actual language that is used, so that when a person receives it he has a very clear communication to him of exactly what his status is under the Act.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I see the difficulty the member raises, that is, of communicating with ordinary people these legal matters, and to make it clear to a person that one suspension has been lifted and another has not. I do not know if that could be accomplished that way. He was probably notified quite correctly of his status of one conviction, or one suspension, and he assumed erroneously that it applied to both.

In another year we will be using our data processing equipment in these matters and the form will be changed. In the drawing up of the new form, I will keep what the member has said in mind. If there is some way of making it clearer or more easily understood, I think we could endeavour to do it. I do not know just how we will do it, because it is a problem to communicate, and to make it understandable for all. But we will look at it when we are drawing up the new forms.

Mr. Chairman: Carried?

Vehicle inspection branch.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister, under driver control branch, if the department has ever considered different colours of driver's licences, after an individual has lost a certain number of points. In other words, when they are at the 12-point stage, having lost 12 points, requiring them to turn in their driver's licence and re-issuing them one a different colour, so it could identify him?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the use of licences that would designate has been considered. I think the rejection of it thus far has been because it could prejudice a person's position and might deny him fair treatment.

Mr. Newman: Well Mr. Minister, have you maybe considered it in the case of an individual who has had a suspension because of impaired or drunk driving?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, on points.

Mr. Newman: I did not mention that originally. I thought maybe just the loss of 12 points, regardless of the reason would require the individual to turn in his licence and be re-issued with, let us say, a blue licence, or a red licence. In that way, if the individual were ever apprehended on the highway, the officer knows immediately that the individual has a poor driving record.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is what I thought would be a discrimination against the person, perhaps unfair, and mitigate his fair treatment.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I only bring it up from a safety point of view, because the fellow apparently must have a poor driving record to have lost the 12 points.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: You are right.

Mr. Chairman: Vehicle inspection branch.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under this heading, could the Minister inform us if the officers of his department that carry out the vehicle inspections are licensed mechanics? If not, what qualifications have they, and how many vehicles were permanently put off the road in 1966 by your staff?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I apologize, I did not get the specific question.

Mr. Spence: The officers that carry out the vehicle inspections for your department, what are their qualifications? Are they licensed mechanics, or what course do they have to take, or do they have to take a course in order to carry out vehicle inspection for your branch? How many vehicles were permanently put off the road in 1966 by your officers?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I answered the last part of the question yesterday, in introducing my estimates. I think it was 3,341 had the plates removed last year.

Not last year, but now I think, on each lane we have a licensed mechanic.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, under this section of the vote, I suggest that the only way to promote auto safety where it involves the mechanical condition of a motor vehicle inspection is if we have—not a compulsory—but a mandatory system to take a lot of the junk off the road that we have on the highways today. With the system you have now, I would not want to venture how many cars are inspected through your hit and miss method, because you have no intelligent plan of inspection at the present time. Whether or not you think you have, I submit you have not; and this is what I think is the answer to the problem, insofar as doing a complete 100 per cent job in Ontario.

In Massachusetts, a system is in effect that guarantees mechanical soundness of an automobile, not only for the used car buyer, but used car dealers, police, insurance companies and anyone else that might be interested. Twice a year, in Massachusetts, around May 15 and October 15, an owner is required to take his car to a local inspection station for a check-up. Now these inspection stations are usually service stations, or garages licensed by the state or the province, and are instructed to check all pertinent parts and the function of the car that could possibly make it unsafe or not roadworthy. This is the most important thing you can do under inspection. The system is not working now, and there is no organized plan.

In this check-up, they do the following five points: They check windshield wipers, head-

lights, tail lights and horn; secondly, they check the brakes, parking brake, front end alignment, tires and suspension. Now, my informant says he is not sure this is everything since he has been in Canada for over a year now, but this will give you an idea of what I meant. He says the cost of this inspection, Mr. Chairman, is $1 and you receive a sticker that is to stay on your windshield in a prominent place. If for some reason your car fails the inspection, you are given seven days to have the offending part or parts repaired and report back for another inspection.

If a car is deemed not roadworthy, the licence plates are seized until such time as the car is brought up to specified standards.

This system of inspection is compulsory. Every vehicle, new or used, has to be inspected.

Now we put through last week Bill 72, I think it was, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act, and the section pertinent to inspection—section six—is an amendment of section 49 of The Highway Traffic Act; and it says:

> Except as provided for in subsection two, every dealer—

this is a case of where the government, trying to do a job on inspection of vehicles, passes the onus on to the car dealers who are ethical people. They are conscious of the fact they want to sell safe cars. But this Act we have passed will not work. It says:

> Every dealer in used motor vehicles, before he enters into a contract to sell a used motor vehicle, shall give to the purchaser—

When you buy a car—

> —give to the purchaser a certificate of mechanical fitness on the form prescribed by the regulations that is duly completed and signed by the dealer stating that the motor vehicle is in a safe condition to operate on a highway.

Now to sell motor vehicles to the public which can be declared safe for operation on the highways, it cannot be left to the dealer. If the car is not roadworthy and safe, the dealer must take the plates off and send the plates in to you and sell the buyer a car that has no plates on it.

So what will happen to this Act when the dealer sells the car and says on the bottom of the stamp that the car, to his knowledge, was okay at the time of sale? An hour afterwards the car could be no good but, at the time of sale, the dealer thought the car was okay. So this Act we passed last week is not worth the paper it is written on, because it is not going to work.

It is a joke, and I think that you must get a firm programme of car inspection such as this method used in Massachusetts. It is worth it. It is simple. You appoint authorized licence stations in every community that has a mechanic on hand who can do the job; give out a sticker, charge a dollar and you have mandatory inspection. They do it twice a year in Massachusetts, but we do it once a year in Ontario. The method you have now, I submit, while your motivation is good, is not doing the job.

My car has never been checked. The programme is a hit and miss method, and you have so much junk on the road today that something has to be done about it. Take it off the highways; and this plan will do it.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has a good point, but I do not know whether it can be made effective by allowing the person to go any place he likes and have someone give him a certificate.

Mr. Sargent: I said a licensed person appointed by the government.

Mr. Gisborn: I am sorry, I did not hear that.

Anyway, I want to commend the department and the Minister for the compulsory inspection programme that they conducted in Hamilton last year. I understand that it is going to continue this year and I think a splendid job has been done.

I call it compulsory because when the cop steps out and says, "Come in", you go in and your car is inspected.

I am sure that the Minister has some of the records, and this is only one of several reports. On this particular day there were 60 vehicles inspected, and out of those 60, there were six voluntary inspections, 44 non-voluntary, and 10 re-checks.

Out of these we find vehicles declared unsafe numbered 17; vehicles scrapped by owners, nine; safety stickers issued, two; unsafe front wheel alignment, 26; unsafe wheel bearings, six; unsafe kingpins, three; unsafe tires, 15; unsafe shock absorbers, nine; unsafe tie rods, three; unsafe ball joints, 10; unsafe suspension, nine; unsafe steering, 10; faulty mufflers, 23; faulty directional signals, seven; faulty brake lights, nine; faulty tail lights, five; marker lights, seven; poor foot brakes, 17; no foot brakes, eight, broken or

obstructed windshields, four; no rear view mirror, one; no horn, four; no bumpers, front or rear, two; no windshield wipers, four; no headlights, two; faulty headlights, 52; torn fenders, nine; broken seats, six; no parking brakes, 12; broken or unsafe brake linings, seven; improper insurance, 11, and failure to change ownership, two.

I think that we are getting at the hub of the problem with this kind of inspection. The fact that we are having these inspections becomes quite a deterrent because we are finding now that people are talking about it and saying that they are going to have their car looked after and they will not be pulled in. I hope that these inspections continue in Hamilton this year.

I want to raise another matter: Last November, I sent a letter to the hon. Minister informing him of two serious accidents because of faulty brakes on trucks in the Hamilton area. One was on October 14 when an overloaded dump truck went through a stop light at a busy intersection when the brakes and horn failed to work, killing a 63-year-old woman and causing injury to three other pedestrians. On November 17, a 41-ton truck ran away when the brakes failed on the grade at the foot of the Hamilton mountain. It was a miracle that this only resulted in property damage.

I asked the Minister to consider strongly:

Mandatory mechanical inspection depots on truck routes; log books of mileage and inspection certificates; and dual brake systems for all trucks.

I received a reply from the Minister that consideration would be given to this problem. I also received word from the trucking council association in Hamilton that they supported the request and they would back the mandatory mechanical depots. Of course, they back the log books of mileage and inspection certificates. They could not understand what I meant by a "dual" braking system because they told me that all trucks now have to have both mechanical and air brakes. What I meant by a "dual" braking system was two air brake systems, not just one set of air brakes and the mechanical hand brake. Two sets of air brakes is what we mean when we talk about dual systems.

I would ask the Minister if he has given any consideration to bringing about the mandatory mechanical inspection depots on truck routes. I would think that they would be more effective if they were on highways at the access routes to the major cities.

I know that in the United States they have such depots and trucks are pulled off the roads and the drivers asked for their certificates of the last inspection. It is stamped by the officer and if it is not up to date then they are taken in for a complete inspection.

Shortly after I referred to those accidents to the Minister, we had another large truck loaded with 10 tons of material where the trailer disengaged from the tractor and almost caused serious injury. It took many hours to get the highway opened and things back to normal.

There is too much of this going on across the province, and I think it is about time that the department took action in this regard. The log books of mileage and inspection certificates would let any officer know right away how far the truck had travelled without inspection. The log books used in the United States have a record of the driving hours of the drivers who are under strict control so that they are not driving excessively long hours and are thus affected by fatigue or loss of sleep.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is one that comes under The Department of Labour, rather than this department.

The matter of braking is a serious one in the heavy vehicles and section 35, as amended —35 (1) reads:

> Every motor vehicle other than a motorcycle when operated on a highway shall be equipped with at least two braking systems.

That is what the truckers referred to when the member raised the question, I am sure. To continue:

> Each with a separate means of application and effective on at least two wheels, one of which shall be adequate to stop the vehicle as required by regulations made by the department and the other of which shall be adequate to hold the vehicle stationary, but in addition to the one that shall stop the vehicle—

The stopping requirements are laid out in regulations:

> The brakes required under section 35 of the Act shall be adequate to stop the vehicle, or a combination of vehicles referred to in column 1 of the table, within a distance not greater than the distance set opposite the vehicle, or combination of vehicles in column 2, while being operated at a rate of speed of 20 miles an hour on a dry, smooth, hard asphalt or other paved surface free from loose

material and having not more than one per cent gradient.

These are the standards, and the only way brakes can be measured, I think, is against an operating standard of this kind. It is spelled out there.

What I think I said to the member—and I may have mentioned it in the letter—was that the manufacturers are endeavouring to produce something equivalent to the divided braking system that we now have on cars called "dual" braking systems. Actually, we do not have dual brakes on this year's cars any more than we had in previous years. We have a braking system that is now divided into two unrelated halves so that if one is rendered inoperative the other is unaffected. I think that is what the manufacturers intimated to me is what they are trying to do on their trucks so that they would have something in the nature of half a braking system.

Mr. Gisborn: What is the Minister's opinion of the necessity for the inspection depots?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think there is very real value in doing that. We inspect buses, as you know, pretty thoroughly and pretty regularly. We have not got to the place yet where we have the equipment for doing a full job on trucks, and I think it is the one that should be coming. I agree with the member on this.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister if there is any consideration being given to compulsory vehicle inspection?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I take it, Mr. Chairman, the member refers to a periodic compulsory inspection that we would have once or twice a year operable in all parts of the province.

Mr. Newman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Because of the size of our province, it just does not seem a practical step at this time. But it certainly is the ultimate, and the one to which we are moving, and the one toward which we have made a very substantial step in the last year. The next step, I would think, might be to establish permanent inspection lanes in the largest municipalities and free our mobiles for extensive use in the other parts of the province. Freed from the kind of work that the one was doing in Hamilton to which the member referred, these would be occupied all the time in the outlying parts. Last year they operated at 180 points. We have a substantially increased fleet of mobiles this year which will be doing a bigger job in more parts of the province.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister consider having compulsory vehicle inspection for all vehicles over a set age? In other words, all vehicles before 1961 must be inspected by the department. Has the Minister considered a thing like that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not know that we have decided it is on the age of the vehicle we should be working.

Mr. Newman: Age may not be, but it would be a starting point.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: On the spot checks we are doing now, I think you will recognize that the police are using their intelligence and discretion in directing into the check lanes those vehicles that are suspect of being in poor condition. It is not the perfect answer, but it is a big step in the right direction.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, just one thing, in the United States every car of vintage '61 or older has a special yearly permit. They have this in the United States.

An hon. member: Which states?

Mr. Sargent: I am not sure, but it is in my notes here. About 20 states. This is along the same line; it is a yearly compulsory inspection of every vehicle in B.C.—every vehicle must have proof of roadability—that is a good word. Every other jurisdiction is doing something about it, but you are dragging your feet here.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to deny that story. The member first of all referred to what was being done in certain states in the union, where they use licensed garages. I think we have discarded that as a policy that we will follow here and that we will use government inspectors on what inspections we are doing. I think the province that has just gone into vehicle inspection using licensed garages is Nova Scotia. I would be interested to see if they have any satisfaction. They have done it in New York.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister is going to wait for them to show him, is he?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, we are not. I would be interested in seeing what comes out of their experience because it has not been good in the states, such as New York state, where they did use licensed garages. In one year they cancelled the licences of something like 1,900 garages for improper practices. This is the risk you run if you use private garages. They will either, for a fee, pass the car that

should not be passed or ride the owner of the car for costs of repairs that are not warranted. I say we prefer in this province to use our government inspectors on the job and to expand it that way.

Mr. Sargent: But the end result is to get the junk off the highways. It does not matter how many garages are found bad actors if you get the bad cars off the highways; that is the motivation.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The member for Hamilton Centre (Mrs. Pritchard) thinks we are doing a pretty good job as a start. I think that is all we want to represent—

Mr. Sargent: I cannot agree at all.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I still think that setting an age limit for a vehicle so that the vehicle must go through a compulsory inspection is a good start. I would strongly recommend to the Minister that he use some age as a criterion to start compulsory vehicle inspection. We all know that the older the car, the greater the chance would be that it would not be safe. I cannot see why you could not come along, even if you have to take it as a 10-year-old car, and work and slowly get to the point where we have compulsory vehicle inspection annually or even semi-annually.

There is another point that I would like to bring up, Mr. Chairman, and that is concerning the vehicle inspection as it is now. It is such that perhaps it scares a lot of people and they do not bring their cars through. I noticed a press release concerning the town of Leamington, where five out of 234 cars which went through the check lane had passed one test and at another test, only seven out of 192. This certainly does not speak well for the vehicles on our highways if so few could possibly pass, five out of 234. In other words, 97.5 per cent of the vehicles on the road would not be safe, according to this type of inspection.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister want to answer that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, I think the member is pointing out the obvious, and I think it would have to be analyzed in the light of the fact that these vehicles which are being put through are being screened by the police. Those that are over-age, or those that are suspect, are the ones that are going through; when the traffic is heavy, the police are passing cars that look newer, not necessarily in perfect condition. They are screening out the poorer looking cars and putting them through.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister: What is the purpose of bookkeeping of $950,000 for registration plates and supplies in both the first part of 2204 and in other services, too?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Could I have the question repeated?

Mr. Worton: I am told it is a summary, but I see here there are two figures of $950,000 in vote 5 of vote 2204; then it gets down to other services and it is listed again.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It is the same amount; it is just separated out under those different headings. That is where it came from.

Mr. Worton: All right, sir.

Mr. Chairman: Vehicle inspection branch carried? Motor vehicle licence branch?

Mr. Young: Under the motor vehicle licence branch, Mr. Chairman, I have just one bit of correspondence to lay before the Minister, correspondence from Garco Enterprises, 4854 Bathurst Street, and a part of the letter reads this way:

> In the latter part of 1965, a letter was forwarded to all agents of motor vehicle licence stations directing them to have all plastic laminating machines removed from the premises immediately. An explanation was given to the effect that the public had been laminating their licences, and, therefore, offences could not be entered on them. Our firm's prime locations were motor vehicle licence bureaus, and these machines were immediately removed at a great loss of income to us. A few months hence afterwards, approximately December 1965, it was brought to our attention that similar machines were being operated by other individuals in two motor vehicle licence stations, one at the Yonge Arcade and the other at Woburn and Bathurst.

And then the lady who writes this letter outlines some of the steps taken.

> Then on July 14, 1966, we received correspondence from the director stating that action was being taken immediately.

I will not use the names here.

> On August 5, another call was necessary to the director as these machines still remained on location. After threatening to take the matter up with those higher up the machine at Woburn Avenue was re-

moved. On April 21, 1967, it was brought to the attention of one of our principals that a machine still remained in operation in the Arcade. The director has since been notified of this. Is this our democratic society?

(Signed)
JOEL O. COHEN

I do not know whether or not these machines have finally been removed, because I can see the problem where the police would have trouble in entering any infractions on the licence itself and I would hope that that practice has been rectified.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not recognize this situation at all, I am sorry. I cannot identify it.

Mr. Young: Perhaps the Minister would look into it. I can make the letter available to him.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: If the member would let me have the correspondence I will not only look into it but I will let him know what we do about it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister if he has considered special licence plates for historic vehicles or for radio operators, as has been mentioned year after year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and it is still a problem. As we get into more and more licence plates and get into the mechanization, I think the chance of doing special ones becomes more difficult. The last proposition we made to the radio operators was that we would produce a special licence for them to be used in conjunction with the regular licence. They would pay for the special addition with their numbers on it and they have not accepted that. What they do want is just the one licence plate that will run their call letters, as distinct from all the other numbering in sequence across the province. It would create quite a problem.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, do you not think this might give some variety to the individuals involved in the manufacture of licence plates in our reform institutions? Instead of just hammering them out mechanically, they could be involved in doing something special. It would provide a little different work from what they have normally been occupied in, and at the same time it would convenience those who are seeking special historical plates, or even the radio operators' plates.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: If the ham operators want these other plates made, they will be made out at the same establishment, Millbrook.

Mr. Newman: I know that, Mr. Chairman, but you see they could be doing this. They have a lot of time to do it there. Time is no problem there.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I am not so sure.

Mr. Chairman: Carried? Traffic engineering branch.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, under the traffic engineering branch, the traffic safety booklet put out by the Ontario motor league makes the recommendation that the department take whatever action is necessary, either by administrative order or by legislative action, to require the determination and posting of realistic speed limits, based on proper speed studies, as part of an effort to restore confidence of the motorist in constituted authorities.

I would assume that they refer to having speed limits on highways according to safety.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, there is a continuing study made on speed limits on all the provincial highways and week by week they are being adjusted and corrected. I think perhaps what the member is really referring to, and what may be behind the recommendation in the brief he has, is the raising of speed limits on some of our main highways. This is a matter that is being given consideration.

Mr. Newman: Is it under consideration, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes. I said it was being considered.

Mr. Newman: Will we have action on it this year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would hestitate to say.

Mr. Newman: Well, it was under consideration last year.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, I know.

Mr. Newman: And under consideration the year before last. Do we not ever act on these "under considerations"?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We will.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I wondered if the Minister had anything to report to the House regarding the brief that the Ontario

medical association presented to him sometime in February regarding the doctors reporting the physcial condition of the drivers considered—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the member will find this in Bill 72, that was given Royal assent yesterday. It is there.

Mr. Gisborn: Thank you very much. I would like to look at it. I was not here.

Mr. Chairman: Any other services?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister, what the $10,719.30 was for in the public accounts under professional, legal and adjusters' fees on page U-7?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: What was the amount?

Mr. Newman: The amount was $10,719. What was that for? It was paid to Donaldson, Charters and Brockenshire.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Let me just backtrack.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, you can provide it to me later, if you wish, so that you can go on, but as long as I know what it is for.

Mr. Chairman: Other services carried?

Votes 2204 and 2205 agreed to.

On vote 2206:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, under this vote, I asked the Minister earlier if he would provide to me file number 13413, The Department of Transport Motor Vehicles Claims Act, which file we have not been able to have a look at. We have a responsible person's charges that there has been dishonesty in the handling of public funds and the Minister said he would furnish that file when we got to this vote. I would like to have it now, please.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, before I deal with this member, may I just direct the member for Wentworth East to refer to section 13 of Bill 72, with respect to requiring medical officers to report patients who are in condition where they deem it unfit for them to drive.

The member for Grey North asked about a matter that would come up under vote 2206. May I inquire of the member if the name of the party he is dealing with is Daley?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would be happy to give him the file and show him the whole matter and go over it with him carefully.

Mr. Sargent: I will take it now.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I have not got it in my hand.

Mr. Sargent: You said you would have that file here when we came to this vote.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will tell the House that the question is one of a case being before the court and the person in question being at odds with his solicitor and the—

Mr. Sargent: I do not know this. I asked you for the file.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The member can see the file in my office. That is the situation. The matter is before the court and the client and solicitor are warring.

Mr. Sargent: You can deliver it to my office.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, I will not—

Mr. Sargent: You told me you would let me have the file and I think that you should back up your word. You said you would have it. If you have the file, I would like it down in my office. We are just as important as you are.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, how many people have paid the fee, say, in the last year under the uninsured motorists?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I am just trying to give the member an exact figure and I am trying to compute the amount that we have received as fees by uninsured vehicles at $20, I think, for 11 months, and one month at $25. I will have to do a little fast arithmetic, unless somebody is faster than I am on it.

This is approximately 140,000. But some paid more than once. This could be more than one fee paid on one vehicle.

Mr. Renwick: So it is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 130,000-135,000?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think in that area, yes.

Mr. Renwick: My problem, Mr. Chairman, amongst others, is that I cannot see any financial accounting for the fund as a fund, that is to show the income of the fund and to show its expenses and show the burden the fund casts upon the government of the province of Ontario, and therefore, the people of the province of Ontario, by the government choosing to use this method of covering people who do not have the usual form of automobile insurance.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think you will find the expenses set out in public accounts—revenues and expenses.

Mr. Renwick: Yes, in the last issue of the public accounts. The expenses are set at $581,000 and, as I understand it, the statutory amount which is provided out of the consolidated revenue fund is in the last available account at $5 million-odd.

Would the hon. Minister explain how this fund operates in terms of the dollar, income and the statutory amount which is made available under The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Fund Act related to the expenses, and what portion of it is covered by this $20 fee?

If, for example, one considered the motor vehicle accident claims fund as some kind of an insurance fund—I realize that it is no insurance to the person who pays the fee—there are claims made against that fund for people who are not insured. Now, within that small world, what part of that burden is covered by the $20 fee as compared with the outgo which has to go out to pay claims made against the fund which are never recovered from anyone else?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The member would note, Mr. Chairman, that we have sources of revenue that are three in number: $1 per year is paid by each driver with his driver's licence; the $20 and now $25 uninsured vehicles fee; and the recoveries from judgments that are paid into the fund. At the year ended March 31, 1966, the receipts were $8,198,141.08; the payments of claims including administration costs, $4,103,303.52.

Mr. Renwick: The income available to the fund or to the consolidated revenue by these charges is substantially in excess of the cost of operation of the fund. Is that correct?

What is the rationale for charging that additional substantial excess against the motorists of the province of Ontario when your experience obviously shows that your pay-out plus your administration is very much less than your income?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think the operation is one that requires a certain cushion, and you will notice the increased amount that is estimated for payment out of the fund this year has gone up about 25 per cent over what was paid out last year in anticipation of increased claims, larger claims and among other things, claims that may be made by gratuitous passengers. These are increasing the costs of the operation so that we anticipate this year that the payments out of the fund will be something in the nature of $5.25 million.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I assume that with the additional increase from $20 to $25, and the additional number of persons getting licences in the province, that the proportion is going to be substantially the same. Therefore, there is going to be an excess of the revenue over the expenditure and expenses of probably about the same amount. I am wondering whether the Minister ever gives consideration to the rationale of charging some additional $3 million every year for the purpose of this fund.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, I would say that we have given consideration to it, indeed. In a loose way you were using the term "insurance"—a supplementary coverage. How would you break it down? To 87 cents or 83 cents or 79 cents? It is a fraction of a dollar. We think that the increase in the uninsured driver from $20 to $25 was justified in having him pay his share of the cost of the fund. Proportionately at $20 he was not, and that is why we justified the increase from $20 to $25.

If there is to be a reduction, it lies in the other area where the driver pays $1 a year. If we could find a way of collecting a fraction of a dollar, that might be the answer.

Mr. Renwick: The $1 a year levy on every person who gets his licence with insurance cannot really be justified at all as part of the operation of this claim fund, if, in fact, over the years of its operation since its inception in 1962, it has operated at a substantial surplus each year. Perhaps the Minister could tell me what the accumulated excess of revenue over expenditure of this fund would be since its inception up to this time, which would be about four years.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Actually, the fund has been in operation since 1947. Its predecessor, the unsatisfied judgment fund, was accumulating and as of March 31, 1965 the balance was $13,243,000.

Mr. Renwick: So, there is a balance from that fund over the lifetime of that fund of some $13 million-odd. So in other words, sir, it would be quite possible in the province of Ontario to forego for the next one or two years, the $1 surcharge—if I may use that expression—which each driver is now required to pay, or does the Minister intend to go on accumulating and accumulating this fund and

not making any special use of it, but simply turning it over to the consolidated revenue fund?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would think, at this time in the light of experience, it is no great disadvantage to have a fund that is obviously solvent.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the scheme of the Act is that if there is a deficit in the fund, or if there is a current deficit or an operating deficit in the fund, there is authority in the statute for the fund to be subsidized out of the consolidated revenue. It would seem to me that that particular subsidy has never been required for the operation of this fund. It would seem to me that the department should give consideration to relating the past years' experiences to the charges which are made for every current year, so that we can get to some kind of a reasonable accounting basis for it.

If, in fact, experience shows that the $1 has to be reinstated, well that is fine. Then it can be explained in the light of the experience of the operation of the fund. But it appears to me to be quite contrary to the intention of that fund when it was first established that it should be used for the purpose of constantly accumulating an increasing surplus available to the consolidated revenue fund. I do not think that it was ever intended in making this provision for this kind of fund that we would be levying an additional tax on people over and above the needs of that fund, based on the experience of the operation of the fund.

If it is up to $13 million, what possible reason would the Minister have for levying in the year 1968, for example, the $1 charge against the drivers in the province? With an election coming up, perhaps they could rebate that one dollar to each person as a little election gimmick.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would not want to be guilty of that. I think the member's suggestion has sense to it. In the past I would not say that we have never had occasion to draw on the consolidated revenue any year, because I think there was an occasion when we had, and with the increased losses, I hope we will be able to kep the position that we have established. But whether there is need to extend that position of reserve, is one that might very well be—in fact has been looked at, I am sure.

We are collecting year by year at the present, in excess of the outgo, and the fund is operating and doing its job and doing it very well. It may be that we have reached a size of reserve that is adequate for the present at least.

Mr. Renwick: Well Mr. Chairman, on this vote, there are some other matters which concern me. A person's insurance, say he is insured in the normal way in the private market and his insurance does not coincide with the licence year, that is the calendar year for his motor vehicle licence—I should not say the calendar year, the period from February 28 in each year—after that date his insurance is cancelled, or it lapses. Under the statute, as I understand it, such a person is required to come in and pay his $20. Is there any way in which the Minister knows whether or not a person's insurance policy has been cancelled or lapsed?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, Mr. Chairman, that is the very situation that makes our motor vehicle accident claims fund a very good operation for the protection of our people. The very point the member raises is one that must occur here, and it occurs in every jurisdiction that has compulsory insurance. That very kind of thing can happen. When a person applies for his permit, he has insurance. It is his responsibility to keep the insurance, and if he drops the insurance, it is his responsibility to pay us the uninsured fee.

In this case, we have this fund to protect the public against the person who gets his licence as an insured and then either drops it or has it cancelled. That is the big area that is not covered in many other jurisdictions that have tried to get along without the equivalent of our motor vehicle accident claims fund.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister's department ever collected the $20 from a person whose policy of insurance has lapsed? Has the department found out, at any time, the name of any person whose insurance policy had lapsed, or whose insurance policy had been cancelled, and gone out to collect, in whatever the appropriate way would be, the $20 which the statute requires he pay?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This happens at times and the person must pay the uninsured fee in cases where he is convicted of driving without insurance or without—

Mr. Sargent: Is that $20 or $25?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It is $25 now. If he is convicted, for instance, of driving while uninsured, and without having paid the $25 fee, he has to pay the $25 fee first.

Mr. Renwick: In other words, the only time in which you collect this additional money is if, in fact, the person is picked up and is charged in a court and you get knowledge of it through that channel. But you do not really have any method of knowing whether or not an insurance policy is cancelled, or whether it has just lapsed?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is so. I would not say there were no cases we do not know about, but in the main, that is how we know of them. In other words, we do not have the insurance companies reporting cancellations and lapses to us.

Mr. Renwick: The strange gap, Mr. Chairman, as I see it, is that if, in fact, a person has had his licence suspended and has to come in and establish his financial responsibility, one of the ways in which he can do it is by giving proof of his insurance coverage. In other words, that, after his suspension has been lifted, he has been able to get an automobile insurance policy; by bringing in a certificate from the insurer that he has that policy, he can then establish his financial responsibility.

Under those circumstances, the Minister's department does require the insurance company to notify, in the case of cancellation or lapse of that particular kind of a policy. Why would the department not go the further step of requiring an insurer to advise the department of any cancellation or lapse of a person's insurance policy, so that you could be certain that you got, for what it is worth, the $20 or $25 from that person?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think there is a situation that has occurred in other jurisdictions, where there is a lag in the department, or the agency, learning of these cancellations and these lapses. There are a tremendous amount of policies that are cancelled and changed that come in to clutter it up; I think the whole matter of bookkeeping is a very significant one.

In the case of a person who has had to provide financial responsibility proof, I think we are justified in keeping a very close tab on them. It could make a very difficult administrative problem if we go the other direction.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, if I may intervene at this point. There are loopholes—

Mr. Sargent: I am on this point, too. I was up before you were before.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on this very point, there are loopholes in the government's Act and the Minister is fencing nicely now. But the thing has actually been in the courts and the department is under criticism and I do not think his answers are adequate. Now, just let me put a case before the House. I am quoting from a newspaper clipping of a case that came before the courts in Halton county:

> Halton county Crown attorney Peter McWilliams says that it is possible to evade Ontario's auto insurance regulations even though Department of Transport officials insist there are no loopholes. Mr. McWilliams said yesterday that several irresponsible persons are driving their cars without insurance and without paying the uninsured vehicle fee as required by law. A department spokesman said that if a person's car insurance is cancelled or expired he is required to pay the uninsured fee before taking his car on the road.
>
> However, Mr. McWilliams said in an interview there is no penalty for those who ignore the requirement. He said enforcement is possible only if the person is stopped while driving and fails to provide proof of insurance. In effect, enforcement is left to chance, said Mr. McWilliams. It may be that law-abiding, responsible motorists would not want to run the risk, but it is the irresponsible ones that the law must be concerned with. He said some motorists buy insurance to obtain their licence, then allow the policy either to expire or be cancelled for non-payment and continue to drive without paying the uninsured fee.

And one final paragraph from the news story:

> The coroner's jury and Mr. McWilliams both criticized The Department of Transport for permitting such loopholes.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that you have got obvious loopholes here which the Minister may say a responsible person should not be exploiting; but the problem in law enforcement is the irresponsible person who insists on exploiting the loopholes. They are there, you have been criticized for it; what are you going to do to plug them?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It is exactly the situation I outlined a moment ago, except this, the article is in error in this respect. I do not think that driver was charged for driving without insurance, or without having paid the $25 in lieu of insurance. He perhaps should have been. There is a penalty for

driving without insurance, or without having paid the $25, a penalty of $50; and then you have the $25 that he should have paid, before he can begin to get his financial responsibility established.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, one more paragraph, just to keep the record straight:

> Last week, at an inquest in the death of three women as the result of a car accident in Oakville, the driver admitted he had no insurance and had not paid the $25 fee in the provincial motor insurance fund.

So in this instance he had violated the law all down the line.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is right. That was not the cause of the fatality, though, that is the kind of irresponsible driver he was. It is exactly as I outlined, that he should have been charged for driving without insurance or having paid the $25 in lieu thereof. He should have been fined $50 for that, and required to pay the $25 before he could apply for financial responsibility and restoration.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, is the person injured in such circumstances entitled to claim against the fund?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Is who entitled to claim against the fund?

Mr. Renwick: Is the person injured in the exact set of circumstances which my leader—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Certainly. That is the benefit of the motor vehicle accident claims fund. It protects the claimant, who has a claim, in the case of a hit and run, unidentified driver; in the case of a driver whose insurance has been cancelled; in the case of a driver whose insurance has lapsed; in the case of a driver from outside the jurisdiction who has no insurance or inadequate insurance. These are areas that are covered by our motor vehicle accident claims fund that are not covered in other jurisdictions and that give our citizens in this province a protection that people in other places do not enjoy.

Mr. Renwick: So it does not matter whether or not the fee is paid by such a person or not, is that correct? Anyone injured has a claim against the fund whether or not the person has paid the fee?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Anyone who has a claim against an uninsured driver has a claim against the fund.

Mr. Sargent: The submission of the Ontario motor league on this accident claims fund is that many accident-prone drivers, who would have to pay substantial rates for insurance, are using this accident claims fund as a more economical alternative. Their end submission is that this should be increased from $25 to $100.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That proposition from the motor league that the member has just stated is not accurate.

Mr. Sargent: It is not? I am not any authority on that.

The hour is late, but the point is that in a letter to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the NDP from a Mr. Murray of Windsor, he boils down the position of the public today. He said that his insurance rates have increased 350 per cent. He has never had an accident, or a conviction, or inflicted one cent of damage to any other person's vehicle—

Mr. White: The member is out of order.

Mr. Renwick: The member is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon? I want to ask the Minister how long is this arrogance of the insurance companies going to be allowed to continue?

Mr. Chairman: Order! Is that part of the motor vehicles accident claim fund?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will not answer for the insurance companies, but the very point the member made in his opening remarks following the introduction of my estimates proves that this is the very fund that we need to fill in these areas where someone will not pay insurance at the high rates. Yet by paying the $25 into this motor vehicle accident claims fund, he provides protection for others but none for himself. He drives uninsured but the other users of the road are insured against him in the event he is the cause of injury.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, would someone know when you can talk about car insurance on this vote?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: At an appropriate time I would be delighted to deal with that subject.

Mr. Sargent: Well, is it under Transport then?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, tucked away in this statute is this provision that a police

officer can stop you and ask you to produce evidence of your insurance; that is, if he is a police officer in charge of the enforcement of The Highway Traffic Act.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, a rather odd place to insert a provision that a police officer can stop a person and ask him to produce evidence of the insurance on the vehicle. And I understand also that it is limited to persons who are owners and does not apply to drivers as such. It seems to me you are likely to run into confusion with any over-zealous police officer who stops you and asks for your insurance on your automobile if you happen to be the owner of the automobile.

Now, if the government decides that police officers should have the authority to require a person to produce his insurance coverage or his owner's licence or any other licence, should it not be in The Highway Traffic Act rather than tucked away in this motor accident claims fund Act?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to decide tonight whether it should be in one Act or the other, it is there. It is not over-zealous police officers, but it is police officers performing their duty in the interest of the public that they can demand of a driver to produce his driving licence. In this case, his evidence of insurance or, in lieu of that, evidence that he has paid the $25 fee into the fund.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, in other words the Minister does not consider that this is an unusual requirement; yet he exempts any non-resident drivers in the province from being subject to police officers stopping him and asking him whether he has insurance. Now, what is the purpose? Is this the Minister's solution to the problem I raised a little while ago; that it should be the police officer who has the right to inquire whether or not you are carrying insurance, rather than the simple expedient of requiring people who have insurance to have the insurer—if their insurance lapses or is cancelled—simply notify the department that this is so?

It seems to me to be an extraordinary remedy for a very simple problem, which can be solved more adequately in another way. We have the problem—perhaps the Minister does not realize it—of the powers of police officers to stop a person and require him to identify himself to the police officer. Now surreptitiously in a back-door way, because for reasons which defy us, the government will not require insurers who cancel, or where policies are lapsed, to notify the department of that simple fact. As the solution for the failure of the government to do that, they have the provision which permits a police officer in fact to stop a person and require him to identify himself to that police officer.

Now, it seems to me to be a totally unwarranted authority to a police officer for the purpose of achieving what the Act is intended to achieve. If, on the other hand, after public discussion there is some good reason why we should generalize the proposition that a police officer should be entitled to stop any person and have him identify himself, that is a different problem. But to use the method of allowing a police officer this kind of a power simply because this government is not prepared to require an insurer to notify of the lapse or cancellation of a policy is, to my mind, a ridiculous way to deal with the problem.

And you are allowing a substantial invasion of a traditional right of the citizen not to be required to identify himself, simply because this government continuously and constantly refuses to require insurance companies to give notice of cancellation or notice of lapse to the government accompanied by the reason for the cancellation or lapse. I would like the Minister, Mr. Chairman, to comment if he would.

Mr. MacDonald: That would get rid of your loophole.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, could I ask, does the hon. member not regard the operation of a motor vehicle and the holding of a driver's licence as a privilege?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I consider the question which the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs raises as a philosophical point. If I have to come down on one side of that line or another, I would come down on the proposition that it is a right in our day and age for a person to operate on the highways. The withdrawal of that right should only be done after he has been given an opportunity to state his case and, if necessary, to appeal any arbitrary or what he may consider to be an arbitrary decision.

But in the roundabout way in which this government wants to deal with this vexed problem of how to share the cost of accidents on the highways, we get into all sorts of strange inconsistencies, not the least of which is this question of a police officer being entitled to ask the owner of a car resident in the province of Ontario to produce evidence of his insurance coverage or

evidence that he has paid the fee. That is a very substantial infringement of a traditional right of a person not to be required to identify himself to every police officer who happens to want to stop him.

Now the other side—and I repeat again—why will the government not simply require under automobile insurance coverage that, if the automobile insurance lapses or is cancelled, notification be given the department of the cancellation or the lapse. Then the department can either collect the $25 fee and have complete knowledge of the state of the drivers of the province; that is, those who are covered by insurance and those who have paid the fee without having to use this extraordinary provision.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to become involved in any philosophical argument about the rights of driving and otherwise with the member. I will say this, that the police officer has the right to require a motorist to show he has a driving permit and a motor vehicle operating permit and the right to operate a vehicle depends on that vehicle having been insured or the owner of it, in lieu of that, having paid the $25 fee into the motor vehicle accident claims fund.

It seems a very natural and proper extension of the right of the police officer to inquire if that vehicle has a right to be on the road, and that is exactly what he is doing. He is asking: "Have you a permit and have you paid the insurance or in lieu of insurance, the $25 fee?"

That is exactly what the policeman is doing and the reason we do it this way instead of the other more cumbersome and difficult way is because this is a very practical way of doing it.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I agree that there is no point in pursuing this particular argument with the Minister. I was not aware—I may be completely ignorant of the problem—that if you drive your automobile within the law in the province of Ontario that a police officer can stop you and ask for your permit. If that is the law, then it is simply out of ignorance.

I can well understand that if the police officer sees you committing an infraction and you are charged with the enforcement of The Highway Traffic Act that that is quite a different situation. This provision in the motor vehicle accident claims fund is just one of the ridiculous inconsistencies that we get into by persisting with this particular version of how to deal with accidents on the highway, but I would like to—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There is nothing new about that section, Mr. Chairman. It has been in the Act since the hon. member has been in the House. This legislation and those particular sections requiring the carrying of a driver's licence and the obligation to produce it, plus evidence of insurance, is uniform legislation in the United States as well as in the other provinces of Canada.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, there is another area of this motor vehicle accident claims fund that I would like to pursue for a little while. It is undoubtedly an enlargement of the claims operation of this one which we will have to enlarge in order to put into effect a public automobile insurance scheme in the province.

Now is this operating as a self-contained fund? Does it have any of its own adjustors, or does it use entirely outside adjustors as the public accounts seem to indicate?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think the member knows that all the adjusting, except by a few of our inside personnel, is done by outside adjustors in all parts of the province.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would explain for my information just what are the procedures a person should follow step by step, if he is involved in an accident and, say, injured or his own vehicle damaged by a person who is not insured in the province of Ontario. What steps does he follow, and what steps are taken by the motor vehicle accident claims fund to establish what the loss is?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Following an accident involving an uninsured driver where it is believed that the uninsured driver is at fault, under section 5 of the Act, application is made on a form prescribed. Payment is made if the applicant executes a final release, provided the uninsured motorist executes a consent to the payment and an agreement to repay the fund or, having received notice of the claim by registered mail, does not dispute his liability for the damage or injury. The dispute can be recorded with the department by a personal visit or by a letter to the claims branch.

Under section 6 application is made on the form prescribed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. It is accompanied by the judgment, an assignment of the judgment in favour of the Minister, and an attached bill of costs.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, is there any booklet published by the Minister's depart-

ment that explains this particular procedure which has been hastily and sketchily outlined by the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, there is a very good folder on the matter and it has been widely advertised in the press. In fact, I think the leader of the Opposition notified me of a question he was going to ask respecting a piece of advertising we did the last week of March as to how much we spent in the daily and weekly press advertising the motor vehicle accident claims fund and its operation.

It has been widely advertised in the press and on the radio and this booklet has been available; it is the second edition.

Mr. Renwick: Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, that a simple form of explanation on a small slip could be made available to each person when he obtains the renewal of either his driver's licence or of his owner's permit, so that in all likelihood a great number of people in the province could be covered in a way that would remind them, at least once a year or once every two or three years so that they know the procedure that can be followed?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This booklet gives the procedure in very simple and easily understood language, and consideration has been given to putting a stuffer into the renewal applications.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, mention was made of the application for the fund. What happens when that application is made? It arrives in the motor vehicle accident claims fund office; what steps are then taken to determine the extent of the loss and to makes the adjustment? Is it at that point that the motor vehicle branch retains an outside adjustor to go and assess and adjust the loss, if that is possible?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, I think the procedure which has been outlined is what is followed in the normal case. Perhaps I can give the hon. member this copy—a very simple and easily understood booklet. It is written for the layman and anybody can understand it.

Mr. Renwick: Is there any intention, Mr. Chairman, that this motor vehicle accident claims fund will develop its own body of adjustors for the settlement and adjustment of claims, and that it will have its own legal staff which will deal with this matter? Or is it going to continue as a notice in the public accounts to retain outside adjustors and outside legal staff for this purpose?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think it is a very good practice that is being followed, and if we think the other would be an improvement we would consider it. In the meantime, I think it is operating on a very satisfactory basis.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on what basis do you think it is operating on a satisfactory basis so far as the adjustment of claims is concerned? Has the Minister any reason for saying so, or is that the usual government attitude toward the insurance industry—that the business would simply be farmed out?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It has nothing to do with the insurance industry. This is dealing with adjustors and legal people across the province for handling this business in the normal routine way this kind of thing is done. The people who make claims against the fund are satisfied today that it is exceedingly well run, and that adjustments are made fairly and promptly.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, how many claims were made against the fund in the last fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The number of claims paid was 2,571 in the fiscal year, 1966.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the Minister will undoubtedly recall the report that he tabled last year of the study which was done under his aegis about the possible increase in insurance rates in the province of Ontario. That report indicated that on January 1 of next year, with the introduction into Ontario of the Saskatchewan scheme under private auspices, that in all likelihood the increase in the premiums would be in the range of 15 to 20 per cent. That was the considered view of that committee.

I wonder if the Minister would care to comment, having regard to the statement of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, that his inquiries of the industry indicate that there will be no increases next year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will leave matters relating to the insurance industry to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2206 carried?

Mr. Worton: Hold on, Mr. Chairman, I would like to—

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just to finish this particular matter off, the Minister then

is now totally removed from any consideration of that report that he was responsible for tabling last year. Is that correct? You accept no further responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The member knows that the responsibility for the matter of this insurance lies with The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, and I think that is the proper place to make inquiry respecting that report and the anticipation that was in it, and the operation of insurance today.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, the only change that took place from last year to this year, was the transfer of the superintendent of insurance's operation from The Attorney General's Department to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Yet it was during the estimates of this department last year that that report was tabled as the government's answer, as I understand it, to this continuing insistance of permitting inadequate insurance coverage at an unecomonic cost to the drivers of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: We are on motor vehicle accident claims.

Mr. Renwick: I know I am. Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Minister about a report that he tabled under this vote last year. If the Minister is withdrawing from any responsibility for that report in telling me that it has nothing to do with this matter, then I just would like him to say so.

Mr. Chairman: He has already said so!

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, from what I read in our local papers, there seems to be an increase in the number of people that are being fined for not producing evidence of having insurance. Is this so?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This may be a case of better enforcement.

Mr. Worton: Whether it is better enforcement or not, either they have or they have not. Secondly, you mentioned that there were 2,571 claims against the fund. Now I would like to have—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That was the number we paid last year.

Mr. Worton: Paid? All right. Now I would like to know how many of those people would be charged, not have insurance, and would be in a position perhaps to pay it back? It might be a small claim, of say, $500 or $1,000 which they would be paying back at $20 a month? How many are we taking off the road that may, in the future, be wiped out altogether because of large damage claims, say of $30,000 or something like that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would like to give the member the amount of repayment last year into the fund by debtors to the fund. In most of these cases, an arrangement was worked out whereby they could have their driving privileges restored when they had made a suitable arrangement for repayment. I will have to find that number. I do not think it is in my compilation here.

Mr. Worton: I appreciate the ones that are able to pay it back, sir, but I would like to know the ones whose driving privileges, and possibly their livelihood, are wiped out forever because they have not got insurance, or cannot pay back this claim. These are the people that I think we have definitely got to protect.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It would be difficult to sort out. I will see if I can come up with a figure for the hon. member. The number of people who have lost their driving licences in consequence of a judgment—

Mr. Worton: Yes!

Hon. Mr. Haskett: —and are not able to make any arrangement for repayment. I can show the member we have been very generous in trying to find a basis on which a normal person, who can afford to drive a car, can afford to repay his indebtedness, even at an amount of $10 a month, or something.

Mr. Worton: I appreciate that, sir, but I am speaking of the truck driver who goes out on the weekend with his car and he has a $30,000 claim. He has not got insurance. Now that man's livelihood is wiped out. A person has not a hope in hades of ever paying that back at $30 a month. I quite agree you are lenient and go all the way, but there is no hope for that man. He has made one error and I just do not think he should be penalized forever, that is all.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would say there was hope for that man, if he were to pay it back at $10 or $15 a month.

Mr. Worton: Sir, a man with a family has not got a hope.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: At $10 a month?

Mr. Worton: No, I do not think you can pay it back at $10 a month. I think it is more than that, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have many of them, I think, at $10 a month.

Mr. Worton: Even at $10 a month—

Mr. MacDonald: For a $30,000 claim?

Mr. Sargent: Fifteen years and he still cannot drive a car.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: He will make a fair arrangement for repayment, within his ability to pay. I think they are usually looked at in that way. He can get his driving privileges restored.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the Minister suggesting that if there is a man with a claim of $30,000 against him and all he could repay was $10 or $15 a month, that would be a satisfactory arrangement?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It would depend on the individual case. It does seem pretty low, and it is a pretty large judgment he is taking as the instance.

Mr. MacDonald: He would need to have five or six lifetimes.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to establish—this man, that has not been able to drive for 15 years, he could arrange to pay $10 a month and get his licence back?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In many cases that is so.

Mr. Sargent: He has been persecuted then because this is a real hardship for this man. He has to get a ride down to Allendale every day for the last 15 years because he cannot drive a car. He has this judgment against him.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: He should make application for an arrangement to repay the fund within his ability.

Mr. Sargent: He could never pay it off.

Mr. Kerr: He does not have to.

Vote 2206 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Transport.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Friday, we will deal with bills for a short while and continue in the morning with Budget Debate.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.55 o'clock, p.m.

No. 80



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, April 28, 1967

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 28, 1967

Health insurance registration board, bill to establish, Mr. Dymond, first reading 2783

Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 2783

Hospital Services Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 2783

Question to Mr. Stewart re the Huron county federation of agriculture, Mr. Gaunt 2784

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the Don jail, Mr. Sargent 2784

Question to Mr. Wishart re fines, Mr. Sargent 2784

Question to Mr. Wishart re Zoltan Szoboszloi, Mr. Sargent 2784

Department of Tourism and Information Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Auld, second reading 2785

Ontario heritage foundation, bill to incorporate, Mr. Auld, second reading 2785

Public Lands Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, second reading 2785

Ontario human rights code, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported 2785

Pesticides Act, 1967, bill intituled, reported 2785

County Judges Act, bill to amend, reported 2785

Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, reported 2785

Mining Act, bill to amend, reported 2787

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Racine, Mr. Knox, Mr. MacDonald 2787

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Singer, agreed to 2806

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 2806

Appendix 2807

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1967

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the east and west galleries, eastern high school of commerce, Toronto and Wilson Heights junior high school.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HEALTH INSURANCE REGISTRATION BOARD

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the health insurance registration board.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE HOSPITAL SERVICES COMMISSION ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, since these three bills are all related, I have withheld comment on them until this time.

You will recall, sir, that the effective integration of medical and hospital insurance was discussed extensively at the last session. For some months, a steering committee has been at work, studying all aspects of the problem. This steering committee is composed of representatives of The Departments of Health, Treasury, Economics and Development, Ontario hospital services commission and other senior civil servants. Their recommendations have been received, and we are convinced that the following proposals are the best arrangements for Ontario at this time.

The Act to establish a health insurance registration board will set up the statutory authority to create a board which will be responsible for the operation of the Ontario health insurance registry. This registry will serve as the prime interface between government-sponsored health insurance plans and the Ontario public in matters such as registration, premium collection, eligibility certification and general enquiries.

It will permit a maximum integration of hospital and medical services insurance, and establish a mechanism which can be extended to other health insurance arrangements sponsored by government. At the same time it envisages the retention of the services and programme components in the Ontario hospital services commission and the medical services insurance division of The Department of Health.

A registrar will be appointed as the chief executive officer, and the board will be the board of management. The enrolment, general enquiry, cashiering and field services of the Ontario hospital services commission, and the enrolment, general enquiry and cashiering services of the medical services insurance division will be transferred to the Ontario health insurance registry and placed under the direction of the registrar for health insurance.

The establishment of these arrangements will necessitate the amendments to two existing Acts, namely The Hospital Services Commission Act and The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965 which I have just introduced.

The Ontario hospital services commission will continue to be responsible for payments to hospitals, the development and maintenance of a hospital system and the adjudication

of claims. Similarly, the medical services insurance division will handle and adjudicate claims for medical insurance and deal directly with the professions providing these services.

This organizational pattern creates a framework which can be utilized for all types of health insurance. It provides a single point of contact for the public for all aspects of registration and general inquiry. It allows for the development of a common premium structure with one system of billing. It embraces two cardinal principles—efficiency and economy.

It will take time to establish a health insurance registry, but we plan to have it in operation as soon as possible. Meanwhile, OHSC, and OMSIP will continue their present operations pending the development of the registry system.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food, notice of which has been given.

Has the Minister been informed of the resolutions of the Huron county federation of agriculture insofar as the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals is concerned, and if so has the Minister drawn this matter to the attention of the SPCA authorities?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, any information that I have concerning any discussions taking place between the Huron county federation of agriculture and the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals is purely that which I have read in the papers. My knowledge of the situation is that it has been very effectively drawn to the attention of the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, according to paper reports, and that is all I know about it.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions for the hon. Attorney General. I will give them all at once.

When will the Attorney General furnish the list he promised of the number of inmates held in the Don Jail awaiting trial, and how long they have been held in each case without an alleged proper hearing?

Will the Attorney General advise what steps are being taken to (1) allow fines to be paid on the instalment plan and (2) instruct judges and magistrates to levy fines on the ability of the accused to pay?

Finally, will the Attorney General investigate the charges made last night by Zoltan Szoboszloi that the prosecuting attorney for the Crown in Parry Sound tampered with the jury?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I have the report of The Department of Reform Institutions in answer to the hon. member's first question and the answer is as follows:

As of April 14, there were 580 inmates in the Don jail. The prisoners on remand with bail set were 66 male and 7 female. Prisoners on remand with no bail set were 40 male and 6 female prisoners. The prisoners committed for trial with bail set, 29 male and three female prisoners. And prisoners committed for trial with no bail set, 25 male and one female prisoner.

The answer to the second question, Mr. Speaker — will the Attorney General advise what steps are being taken to allow fines to be paid on the instalment plan? I would say at the present time there is no provision for instalment payment of fines in those terms actually, but there is provision to permit the court to allow postponement of the fine and to put payment on terms. I think this does prevent hardship in cases where hardship might otherwise be incurred. I would like to point out the criminal code, section 694, which is under the heading of "punishment" provides—and I read from the section:

> 694 (3) A summary conviction court may direct, subject to the provisions of this section, that any fine adjudged to be paid shall (a) be paid forthwith, or (b) be paid at such time and on such terms as the summary conviction court may fix.

That, I suggest, gives a very wide discretion to the court which is used commonly and frequently as hon. members, I think, are aware.

To the third question, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the matter of the Parry Sound inquest. I have just learned of this very recently, I am having that file reviewed. At the present time I do not have the necessary information to comment, but I shall pursue the matter.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister accept a supplementary question to each one of the questions?

The Minister did not answer my question properly: I asked "How long have they been held?" The question was not answered. How long are they held before they get to trail? That is why I asked the question in the first place.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Are you going to ask the three supplementary questions?

Mr. Sargent: I will do anything you say. The second thing is that the news this morning had a report that a man was given a $500 fine or three months in jail. You say that the magistrate has the discretion to give the time to pay. We have a lot of sadistic judges and magistrates in this province—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sargent: —and you can buy justice by the amount of money you have in your pocket.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The member is making statements; he is not asking supplementary questions.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister agree—

Mr. Speaker: Does the member have a supplementary question?

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister agree then, that you should be able to buy justice as you can anything else?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid that that is not a good supplementary question.

Mr. Sargent: You can buy your freedom, if you have the money, can you not?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The other member will go ahead with his question.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I perceive, Mr. Speaker, that I have received only one supplementary question: How long has each prisoner been held? I will take that as notice and get the details of it.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE DEPARTMENT OR TOURISM AND INFORMATION ACT, 1966

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information) moves second reading of Bill 96, An Act to amend The Department of Tourism and Information Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ONTARIO HERITAGE FOUNDATION

Hon. Mr. Auld moves second reading of Bill 99, An Act to incorporate the Ontario heritage foundation.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, may I ask if that bill is printed?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, it is.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC LANDS ACT

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves second reading of Bill 98, An Act to amend The Public Lands Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The sixth order: Committee of the whole House; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE, 1961-1962

House in committee on Bill 73, An Act to amend the Ontario human rights code, 1961-1962.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 73 reported.

THE PESTICIDES ACT, 1967

House in committee on Bill 76, The Pesticides Act, 1967.

Sections 1 to 17, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 76 reported.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

House in committee on Bill 84, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 84 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

Resolved:

That, where the judge or junior judge of a county or district court is also the judge or junior judge of a surrogate court, there shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

(a) where the judge is the chief judge of the county or district courts, an allowance at the rate of $7,000 per annum;

(b) where the judge is a judge of the county court of the county of York, an allowance at the rate of $4,500 per annum.

(c) where the judge is a judge or junior judge of any other county or district court or a judge for the county and district courts of the counties and districts of Ontario, an allowance at the rate of $3,500 per annum,

as provided in Bill 85, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE SURROGATE COURTS ACT

House in committee on Bill 85, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

On section 1:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, could the Attorney General tell us how many judges hold both offices in the province of Ontario?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): I take it that by both offices, the hon. member means as a surrogate court judge in the county. Well, the effect of this legislation would be officially to make all district and county court judges also surrogate court judges. The situation presently is that practically all of the judges do surrogate court work. However, not all of them are in this field, so this bill will be to qualify them all as surrogate court judges, which is generally their function now.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, what is the aggregate remuneration that a judge will receive, or a junior judge receive, as a result of this bill for performing the function of the two judicial offices?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the salary of the county or district judge, which is the same office, was until the federal legislation was passed some three or four weeks ago, $16,000, to which the province of Ontario for judges in this province added the sum of $3,500 which is the item shown in the latter part of this resolution and in section 1 (c) of this bill. So county and district judges in Ontario receive $16,000 federal salary on their appointment, and to that the province adds $3,500 for what we considered extrajudicial services they might be called upon to perform.

I would like to say that most of the duties they were called upon to perform were actually in the field of conciliation and arbitration in which they have rendered a very valuable and useful service. There is a great deal of this work and both labour and management groups, and persons interested in these areas look upon the judges as being most helpful and capable in this field.

By the federal legislation which was passed, it was provided that all judges, county and district judges and judges in that area, whatever their title might be, across Canada, in all the provinces, would receive an increase of $5,000, bringing their salaries to $21,000. And then the bill provided—I do not have the actual language of it, I am speaking of the federal legislation—that in those provinces where judges receive that extra remuneration or any remuneration for extrajudicial services, they would not receive $2,000 of the $5,000 increase which was provided for all these judges.

The effect of this, as far as Ontario is concerned, is that a county court judge in Ontario is reduced in salary below the salary of a judge in New Brunswick, Newfoundland, British Columbia or wherever. In other words he would get $19,000, whereas the New Brunswick judges would get $21,000.

There was a saving proviso that if that payment could be made under a bill which was in force, under an Act which was in force as of a date, I think, in 1920, this deduction of $2,000 would not apply.

So this legislation was designed—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have just been informed the PA system in the press gallery is not working.

An hon. member: That will only shorten the debate.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I hope I can make my voice heard anyway.

Mr. Chairman: From the standpoint of the record, it should be stated that the public address system is not functioning at the present time.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): In the press gallery.

Mr. Chairman: And in the Speaker's office, I understand.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The legislation here in this bill simply provides that the $3,500 which we have been paying will now be paid under The Surrogate Courts Act, which qualifies to meet that proviso in the federal legislation and now—to come finally to the answer to the hon. member's question—it will mean that an Ontario county or district court judge will receive the increase of $5,000 to his previous salary of $16,000, which will give him $21,000 as a federal salary. We will continue to pay, as we have been doing for some time past, $3,500 for these extrajudicial services which will raise his salary to $24,500.

Mr. Renwick: I take that to mean that the chief judge of the county or district court will

receive $21,000 plus the $7,000, $28,000. The judge in the county of York will receive $25,500, and the judge in counties or districts other than the county of York receive $24,500. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is right.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 85 reported.

THE MINING ACT

House in committee on Bill 87, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Sections 1 to 21, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 87 reported.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food) moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report a certain resolution and certain bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report a certain resolution and certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address to you the usual solicitations as to your fairness in occupying the chair of Speaker, and also to the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of the committee of the whole House, who has been extremely fair, like yourself, particularly to members of the Opposition.

I feel privileged in being given the opportunity to speak in the Budget debate today, just a few hours after the opening of Expo. I am confident that this tremendous organization, due to the foresight of a large number of Canadians of all origins, will have a tremendous impact on the development of this country and will do more to develop the *bonne entente* among all the citizens of this Canada of ours.

I am sure all members of this Legislature will join me in wishing the organizers of Expo all the success possible in this great undertaking.

I hope every member of this Legislature, and many hundreds of thousands of citizens of Ontario will make it a point to visit, not only Expo, but the entire province of Quebec in this Centennial year, and find out that they are not too far apart, as Canadians, from the Quebeckers, who are striving to make of Canada one of the outstanding countries of the world.

I think it is my duty, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words on the problem of municipal taxes, which have been increased in nearly every area of this province. I shall limit my remarks to the 7½-mill increase to the residential property owners of Ottawa.

The majority of the property owners in our city were quite disappointed when they heard of that substantial increase. This will have a very serous effect on the ability of a very large number of small penisoners to keep their homes; they may be forced to move into a subsidized project, if accomodation is available, or to a home for the aged, where the cost to the government will be considerably higher.

A number of other taxpayers were also disappointed by this large increase, which affects not only home-owners, but also small businessmen. I would like to quote some editorials appearing in the Ottawa newspapers. An editorial in the *Citizen* of March 30 of this year reads as follows:

Blame Queen's Park

Members of city council have a strong point when they maintain that provincial grants are inadequate. This is especially true in the field of education.

Consider these facts:

Over 60 per cent of the increased mill rate for 1967 can be attributed to higher cost of schooling.

More than half the city tax dollar will be spent on education. The next highest category is protection of persons and property, which takes 11 per cent.

Education is vital. Inevitably, it will cost more money. A few years ago, the federal government introduced a programme of youth allowances to encourage teenagers to stay in high school till they graduate. This programme added to the normal growth of the school population.

> But city council has no control over this part of the budget. Spending plans of school boards and collegiate institutes are approved by Queen's Park rather than city hall. Council then has to set a tax rate high enough to pay for them.
>
> This conflicts with the dictum that he who spends the money should also levy the taxes.
>
> Admittedly, the level of provincial grants has been increasing. But the time has come for the province to assume all responsibility for financing education. If the cities were relieved of this burden, they would be better able to pay for other services such as eliminating those potholes.

I do not think the members of this House need me to elaborate any more on the famous potholes of the city of Ottawa.

Another editorial from the same newspaper quotes the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) of this province and says:

> RIGHT AND WRONG
>
> Premier Robarts was quite right when he said at the week end that inequities in Canada's tax system are strangling the municipalities. But he was mistaken when he tried to blame the federal government.

I would like just to quote the last paragraph of this editorial.

> Property taxes should be used for services that benefit property—roads, water and sewer installations, police and fire services. If the provincial government assumed the burden of education and welfare costs, it could reduce grants for other services. The municipalities would then be in a better position to set their own priorities in accordance with their revenues and needs.

In today's *Globe and Mail*, an editorial, entitled:

> UNPOPULAR, TROUBLESOME

and this refers to the Minister of Finance who:

> at last admitted what every property owner in the country has known for years, that the property tax is onerous and unjust, and that something ought to be done.

Now, I think I should quote just the end of this editorial:

> The Finance Minister—like Ontario Cabinet Ministers anticipating the Smith report—may speak of tax reforms; but there is little comfort in all the talk, talk, talk for taxpayers who see nothing anywhere but rising tax bills.

Now Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the lower town east urban renewal project and the HOME programme announced by the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall).

The lower town urban renewal project covers a large part of my constituency, and there is much concern on the part of everyone involved because of the delays in implementing this project—particularly for the people whose property is scheduled for expropriation. The blame for the delay in proceeding to the expropriation has been put on the provincial government.

I hope no further delays take place.

For the information of the members of this Legislature, I would like to point out that only 25 per cent of people living in the area own their own house; the average income is in the neighbourhood of $4,000.

The original plan called for several hundred units of subsidized housing. This was quite acceptable because, according to the Jones report, one out of four families in the Ottawa area have incomes of $4,000 or less.

On the other hand, some of the choicest lots were to be sold to private developers for very exclusive high-rise apartments.

The plan did not take into consideration the needs of the middle income families with an income of $5,000 to $7,000 per year. These families are the backbone of a community of this type. They were totally ignored in the original plan. I understand, however, that the new plan will allow for single dwellings, duplexes, triplexes and perhaps six-unit apartments.

My only wish is that this government, together with CMHC and the authorities of the city of Ottawa, will move quickly in the implementation of this project.

On the subject of housing, I would like to say the people of the Ottawa area have been quite disappointed on hearing of the HOME plan as announced by the government early in the session. The big weakness of this plan is that it does not consider the needs of people who want to purchase a house. Not too many can afford to pay up to $193 per month for their homes. I do not believe this plan will relieve the situation for people with an income of from $4,000 to $7,000, of whom there are a number in our area.

Mr. Speaker, sometime ago, I asked the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) if he intended to give a subsidy to implement public transit in Ottawa. His answer was that he would have to see how the GO-

transit system would work out. I would like to repeat that, in Ottawa, this problem is urgent.

I hear with some disappointment the answer of the hon. Minister of Highways to a question by the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent).

The hon. member for Grey North asked the Minister of Highways a question regarding the amount that was spent for public transportation. The Minister replied that an amount of $175 million had been spent for highways and all types of roads for the province. But he did not answer the question asked by the member for Grey North, which was how much was paid to the municipalities outside of Toronto for public transit, and I think that his answer at that time would have been "nil".

I would not like to accuse the Minister of having given a false answer. But the statement he made was definitely not the answer to the question. As I said a while ago, the answer should have been that not one cent had been given to these areas for their transportation systems.

I hope the government will, in the near future, take steps to grant a substantial subsidy to the Ottawa transportation commission, and also to all municipalities in the province who are providing such an important service. As I said in the Throne Speech, a small subsidy for public transit would reduce the cost of construction of freeways or expressways.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), a very affable and honourable gentleman, came to Ottawa to speak to the Conservative association of Ottawa East. I am sure he made an impression on the few persons attending.

According to press reports, the hon. Minister is reported to have said that, in view of the certainty of the reelection of the Tory government in the next election, it would be wise for the electors of Ottawa East to elect a Tory candidiate. Mr. Speaker, I think I have the right to say that I have done more in the past three and a half years to bring to the attention of this House the problems of Ottawa East, and of the eastern Ontario region, than most of the Conservative members from that area who sit in this House. I should add that I firmly believe eastern Ontario would be in a much better position today if the majority of its members had been sitting on this side of the House.

I would like to say to the hon. Minister that we consider the role of the Opposition an important one. He may have to play that role after the next election.

Mr. Speaker, on another topic, I would like to call the attention of this House to the happenings in Toronto in the last week. As you probably are aware, there were many events organized by the French-speaking population of this city. These events were under the patronage of many influential people, including the Prime Minister.

I believe, as do a very large number of others, that what will keep this country independent—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I would draw to your attention that there are less than 20 members in their seats. We have no quorum.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Why do you not bring in some more of your members?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, surely you are going to observe the rules. You cannot carry on without a quorum.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a shame; I was enjoying that speech.

Mr. Singer: Here he comes; here he comes now.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): There is our 20th member—a quorum at least!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let the record show that there are three NDPs and five Liberals.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order; Carry on speaking.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, I was just saying that what will keep this country independent and prevent it from being absorbed by the great country to the south, is the development of the two great cultures of the founding races of Canada, and the development of the cultures of the many peoples who have come here during the past few decades.

Contrary to the opinion of a few people, the French people do not want to force the teaching of their language on the rest of the population of this province. It is my sincere desire, however, that, in the very near future, the leaders in this country, be they politicians, businessmen, professionals, or educators, become proficient in the two official languages of Canada.

I think it is significant that, at the official installation a few days ago of the new Governor-General, he was able to deliver his address in fluent English and French. He is one of the many people in this country who, because of their training, are able to understand this problem and, in his role as the Queen's representative, understands it and, I am sure, will be in a position to find a solution and will make this Confederation of ours a viable one.

The Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), on more than one occasion, has said that students in this province should take up French as a second language. Many people will agree with this suggestion and it is hoped that this policy will be implemented in the very near future.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to make some comments on a problem which was widely debated by many French-speaking associations during their annual meeting in Ottawa during Easter week.

One recurring theme of these assemblies dealt with the problem of high school education for French-speaking students. It is now evident that the Centennial project for many of these associations is to obtain French public high schools.

The Minister of Education has shown keen interest in the matter. He publicly stated, and I quote from *Le Droit*, March 21, 1967, that "the actual secondary school system does not serve adequately the population;" that he is "not satisfied with the present situation, but that in the last three years, there was an authentic effort of the government to remedy the situation."

I wonder how much study has been made by the government of a brief recently presented to the Minister of Education by l'association d'education de l'Ontario which, after a long study and a special general meeting of more than 600 responsible people in the French educational field, came up with a general consensus on a *modus vivendi*.

The elementary school systems for French-speaking students, which groups more than 100,000 students, is under the separate school board. Although these schools, in the past, have been hampered in their physical development by lack of sufficient funds, our population views with growing hope the steps this government is taking to improve the financial situation of these schools, hoping in the near future to obtain parity of grant and tax money at all levels. The French-speaking population is satisfied with the constructive and liberal approach The Department of Education has taken in dealing with the curriculum which respects fully the cultural and religious values of the students at the elementary levels. But this satisfaction stops after grade 8.

It is true that the bilingual schools have greatly helped to initiate a solution by fostering, in some large centres, the continuation of the elementary grade up to grade 10, thus keeping the students in an atmosphere where culturally they feel at home. They are maintaining the first two years of high school with grants destined for elementary education. With the very restricted grants, they have given to this province an excellent result for its money. I do not intend to comment, at this time, on the grants that grades 9 and 10 receive from the government, except to say that one cannot imagine why a government could still, in 1967, give elementary school grants to grades 9 and 10—even if these grades are under the jurisdiction of the separate school board—and still believe that the best investment it has for its public funds lies in the field of education.

In the North American concept of education where there is a growing tendency to have continuity from kindergarten to grade 13, in this province where the policy of The Department of Education is clearly bound in this direction, one is at a loss to see a French-speaking student study in a cultural environment from kindergarten to grade 8 or up to grade 10 and then be compelled to change course and be immersed or plunged into a totally different atmosphere. What is most surprising is the fact that at the university level, one could do all his studies in a truly bilingual set-up and in a French-speaking cultural environment. Why this four- or two-year gap? I would venture to say that this situation is unparallel in North America and yet we are proud to boast of our educational system. If this gap is legal, it is time one took a good look at this legislation.

Up to now, the French-speaking population has tried to meet an unsatisfactory public high school by maintaining a private high school system. But how can a private school system answer the needs of the whole of the population? And why should one pay double taxation: a tax for a system of high schools one does not use and another self-imposed tax for the respect of one's rights? The private French-speaking school system has not been truly private in the full sense of the word. It has catered to the whole of the population; it has been under the jurisdiction of The Department of Education and has even paid for inspection by the depart-

ment. It has developed, nevertheless, a programme more adapted to the needs of the French-speaking population. But on one point, they have been in a similar position with other private schools. They have always been deprived of public funds. Maybe it is time we ponder a bit on the following slogan: "Public funds for public services". The French-speaking school system has helped this province by saving millions of dollars for this government. It has been groping with the high school problem which the provincial government, whether Liberal or Conservative, should have solved many years ago.

The crux of the problem lies at the high school level. Private schools in their actual conditions are not a definite and total answer to a happy settlement for French-speaking students at the high school level. Actual public high schools, also are not a definite answer because the curriculum is not the logical continuity of the elementary level, and the cultural atmosphere of many of these schools is not conducive to a truly cultural French and bilingual education.

Some public high schools, so-called bilingual, have been in existence for the last 20 years, but they have not met with the total needs of the French-speaking population. If they had, we would not have a problem now and the Minister of Education would not have admitted himself that the actual secondary school system does not serve adequately the French-speaking population.

If the French-speaking youth of Ontario is to be prepared to take an active and honourable part in the life of their province and of their country, proper schooling at the high school level should:

(a) provide equality of opportunity in the pursuit of personal and professional proficiency; (b) enrich the linguistic and cultural values of its ethnic group; and (c) respect the religious beliefs and practices of the French-speaking Ontarians.

To provide equality of opportunity in the pursuit of personal and professional proficiency means that French-speaking students:

(a) Should have free access to schools adapted to them. At present, the only course really acceptable by them is a five-year arts and science course offered exclusively in private schools. However, since these private schools are not subsidized, tuition fees become an obstacle which deter many students from the course of their choice. On the other hand, tuition-free courses offered these students by the public school system are not adapted to their ethnical or cultural particular needs;

(b) They should have the same choice of courses and options as all other students. Each person has a right to an education adapted to his aptitudes and interests. Modern states have discovered that the security of the individuals and the progress of society are directly related to the kind of education provided for their citizens, and they do not hesitate to invest large sums of money in the field of education.

It appears that because of the language barrier, the French-speaking students of Ontario have not been able to benefit fully from the extraordinary expansion of the secondary school system of their province;

(c) They should be able to stay in school as long as needed by their vocational aspirations. No modern society can afford to waste any part of its human capital. We feel that Ontario is losing much of the talents and possibilities of its French-speaking student population, because of the lack of proper schooling facilities.

There is no adequate continuity in the school curriculum for French-speaking students at the high school level and on account of this, many leave school and become drop-outs.

A recent study by the Ontario curriculum institute reports that:

> It was brought to the attention of the committee that there was an unusually large number of drop-outs and of transfers to less demanding programmes among the French-speaking students in the public high schools. Compared to that of English-speaking students, the percentage was much higher. In grades 9 and 10, it was approximately as high. Most of the transfers and drop-outs were apparently due to problems encountered in a school not adapted to the particular needs and aspirations of French-speaking students—

report No. 4 of the modern language committee, Ontario curriculum institute, August 1965.

I would also like to indicate, very loosely, general means to achieve these three aims. As to the cultural aspect, I believe that to enrich the linguistic and cultural values of the French-speaking students, the secondary school system of Ontario should:

(a) See that these students be grouped homogenously, where their numbers warrant it, either in a particular school within a community, or, if this is not feasible, in particular classes within a school;

(b) See that they are exposed to an education structured and programmed according

to the requirements of their particular culture in all branches of secondary schools.

As to the religious aspect I believe that to respect the religious beliefs and practices of French-speaking Ontarians, the secondary school system:

(a) Should allow a well-structured religious instruction to be offered as an option within the school programme. (b) Should allow the Christian insight to be passed on to the students in all pertinent subjects of learning; and (c) should facilitate within the school religious experiences and activities through which a student will develop the ideals and the attitudes conducive to a Christian life.

The actual set-up of high schools does not entirely meet with the demands of the French-speaking parents for religious instruction. A pooling of opinions made by the French PTA among parents of the province received over 8,000 personal replies. Ninety-seven per cent of these parents requested from the government, French high schools in which religious values should be respected and even fostered.

I am fully aware of the giant task facing The Department of Education in Ontario in its efforts to meet the universal demand for increased education. I am also aware of the difficulty for a rapid solution.

It is my considered opinion that in its desire to satisfy the legitimate needs of the French-speaking students of Ontario, The Department of Education should draw on the resources and the experience of the French private secondary schools which have catered for so many years to this particular section of the school population.

The members of the executive of the French-speaking private schools are in a position to state that most of the French private secondary schools of Ontario are genuinely interested in working in close co-operation with The Department of Education in order to provide better educational facilities for the French-speaking students at the secondary school level.

Cooperation between private and public schools is a feature of all the countries of the western hemisphere, and we point, as examples, to England, France, Belgium and Holland, which have provided proper schooling to minority groups without interfering with the rights of the majority and without endangering public harmony.

What the French-speaking population of Ontario is asking at the very outset is the understanding of their needs, their problems and their aspirations, especially in the field of education. I do actually perceive that this sense of understanding is developing among the general public of this province. Equality of opportunity is being accepted by all groups, at least in principle. Even outside the field of education, public opinion is in favour of bilingualism. The forceful reaction that the press at large gave against my rebuttal for my speaking in French in this very House is proof that the general opinion has changed lately. New winds are blowing.

But sympathy and understanding about an unsatisfacory situation is not enough. Equality of opportunity must come down from its lofty idealism and be incarnated in actions. Our population is clamouring for action. It has always been traditional for French-speaking Ontarians to be very patient—much too patient on many occasions. I do not believe that a situation must cause a very high degree of irritation before one brings a remedy. Particularly in the field of education, a just and peaceful solution is preferable to drastic measures.

For the last three years, the French-speaking population has been studying very closely the educational problems at the high school level. A month ago, as I said at the beginning of this short intervention, the leaders of all the French-speaking associations of Ontario have met and offered a solution to the Minister of Education. This solution has been studied and accepted by the vast majority of the population. I am told that it has been given to the members of the Cabinet. If equality of opportunity in the field of education has any real significance, French-speaking Canadians request that their demands be met by this present government.

It may well happen that some older men have the patience to wait, and unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I am one of them, but our younger generation is in another mood. If we do not wish to settle a question in an atmosphere of nationalistic passion, time is of the essence. Angry young men are starting to become ultra nationalists, clamouring for their rights and they are ready to have recourse to violent solutions if French high schools are dallied with.

I would like to quote from a meeting that took place several weeks ago in the great city of Sudbury.

Whether one likes it or not, the population of the province of Quebec is keenly interested in the reaction of this present government to the brief presented by the association. A happy solution will show, *de facto*, to the

whole of this country the respect of the rights of the French-speaking by an English-speaking minority in Quebec held dear to their hearts, and that I wish they will be able to preserve.

If we believe in Confederation, of which I am a most ardent advocate, some concrete steps have to be taken. If we wish harmony and good will to continue to prevail among English- and French-speaking citizens in this province, serious, positive and concrete measures must be taken. It may well happen that a major contribution of this province to the preservation and promotion of Canadian unity might be a happy settlement of the problems the French-speaking population is encountering at the secondary level.

I would sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Centennial project that most of the French-speaking Ontarians have adopted will receive a favourable reaction in this House.

Mr. Speaker: We have some other students to welcome here today: In the west gallery, students from grades 7 and 8 from the Glencoe public school.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session, on February 6, to be exact, I introduced a resolution in this House, during our private members' hour, on the subject of air pollution control.

In that speech, I stated, and here I would like to quote:

> Later in this session I intend to speak at some length on air pollution generally and of the Sarnia area specifically. At that time, I hope to show that our government has been well on top of the pollution problem in the Sarnia area, through research and control, and that industry not only has been concerned but has acted in good faith as good corporate citizens always do, to prevent or control all possible sources of air pollution while expressing a continuing intention to cooperate fully with authorities in this field.

I also point out, as I did on second reading of The Air Pollution Control Act, the part economics must play in enforcing pollution control and the part the federal government must play in this.

I went on to speak of the necessities of criteria by which standards and guidelines could be laid down and the need for more medical research that can provide much vital data.

Initially these standards will have to be based upon our present knowledge of contamination, incomplete though that may be, so that reasonable and obtainable standards may be established immediately to serve us as guidelines until the more accurate and authentic criteria are available.

I went on, Mr. Speaker, to point out what I considered to be the government responsibility at both the federal and the provincial levels. I was very pleased to hear the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) state, on second reading of The Air Pollution Control Act, that he felt the time was not far distant when the federal government would respond to the urging of his department and set up a coordinating committee on air pollution and also seriously consider allowing tax incentives and short term write-offs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my remarks today I would like to deal with the control of air pollution, insofar as it affects the Sarnia area. I would like to indicate to the House what action has been taken at the local level by the industries located in that area and the results attained to show just what can be done. I intend to give the House some idea of the scope of the air sampling programme now in effect in the Sarnia area. I intend also, Mr. Speaker, to mention the comprehensive programme for air pollution control which was recently introduced into this House by the hon. Minister of Health, and to indicate how this programme will be applied to the Sarnia area.

I will mention briefly the responsibilities of the international joint commission and, finally, Mr. Speaker, to conclude my remarks by indicating what measures I still consider necessary if we are to have a truly effective programme for the control of air pollution in the Sarnia area in the future.

The industrial complex in the Sarnia area is, as you know, Mr. Speaker, built around the oil and petrochemical industry—with a few exceptions. The type of air pollution emissions are for the most part gaseous in nature. Some of these pollutants are odorless, while others have distinctive odours associated with this type of industry.

Because of the type of industry and the large quantities of fuel burned, sulphur-dioxide—unless properly controlled—can become a problem both from the health, the odour and the vegetation standpoint. Other emissions, such as oxides of nitrogen and hydrocarbons, could very well become problems also.

Claims have been made that the levels of air pollution currently found in the Sarnia

area are affecting human health to the extent that respiratory ailments have a higher incidence than in other areas in the country. These claims, Mr. Speaker, have never been documented. Medical science has not been able to ascertain a direct cause and effect relationship between any one air pollutant in the concentrations found in our ambient air and respiratory illness.

We are aware of the circumstantial and statistical relationship between high levels of air pollution and ill health but, to date, the medical profession has not been able to provide information upon which to base ambient air quality standards for human health; such as has been done for workers in factories, where much higher concentrations may be experienced. Of course, one of the great needs that we have today is for more medical research in this area.

The St. Clair River research committee was formed in March, 1952. It is a cooperative industrial organization engaged in the study of air and water pollution in the St. Clair River basin. Before its founding, the international joint commission had made an extensive investigation of the St. Clair River from 1944 to 1946. On the basis of these investigations, industry in the St. Clair River basin had undertaken pollution abatement programmes individually.

The original concept, proposed by the advisory committee on industrial wastes to the Ontario research council, was a cooperative research project to be conducted by the Ontario government and the interested industries. Time has changed the status of the committee to an industry-sponsored and industry-financed group. However, the basic concept of a cooperative approach to pollution control and abatement remains unchanged.

Three industries—Imperial Oil Limited, Polymer Corporation Limited and Dow Chemical of Canada—were originally represented on this committee. The membership now includes a total of 11 industries in the city of Sarnia. Three new industries in the St. Clair River basin—the Ontario Hydro, Canadian Industries Limited and Chinook Chemicals, although located some 15 miles south of this city—have established effective and active liaison with the research committee.

The functions of this committee can be summarized in four main areas: First, to study air and water pollution in the St. Clair River basin, specifically to measure contaminant levels and to establish source location; second, based on these studies, members will recommend to their company management corrective action where warranted; third, to assess the effectiveness of any remedial action; and fourth, to publicize all committee activities and thereby maintain good public relations for the benefit of the participating industries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might with your permission digress for just a moment. In the east gallery, the Hillcrest public school of Corunna, consisting of 64 students, their principal, Mr. Arnold Pole, grade 8 teacher, Mr. Peter Cassel, along with Mrs. Pole, Mrs. Cassel, Mrs. Kirk, and Mr. and Mrs. Vallinga, are now seated. These people have been on the go since four o'clock this morning; they have come some 200 miles —give or take a few—they have already visited Fort York and had their lunch before appearing here. I doubt if the lunch was adequate for those growing people, nevertheless it probably took the sting off at least.

It is just a coincidence that some of the very people who are sitting there now wrote me some two years ago wanting to know what I was going to do about the matter of air pollution. It just happens to be that they are gathered here—it has to be a coincidence—this morning, and were at least able to hear a portion of what I have to say.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Knox: When the pollution on my left—I mean, on my right subsides—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The member was right the first time.

Mr. Knox: Well, believe me, they are left. I might say that the mention of the word Corunna has a familiar ring in this House, because that is the home of the former Minister of the then department of travel and publicity, Mr. Bryan Cathcart. I wish you would join with me in welcoming them here.

Now, if I may continue where I left off. The Ontario research foundation, an independent, private research organization, has been retained by the committee since 1952 to conduct an air pollution survey in the Sarnia area. The Ontario research foundation is recognized as an efficient and reliable research and investigation body. The experience of the St. Clair River committee with the foundation has only added to the reputation enjoyed by the foundation.

In the early phases of the air pollution study, it was first necessary to determine the

major contaminants of the atmosphere. The first investigations were based on particulate contamination, then to a study of gaseous contaminants—particularly sulphur dioxide—coupled with a study of the meteorology of the area.

A permanent station was established in a residential area of Sarnia. This station has operated continuously for 15 years at this time. As the study advanced, mobile sampling stations were added, meteorological towers established; and the measures now include dust fall, aerosols, hydrogen sulphide, sulphur dioxode, hydrocarbons, oxidants, and meteorological data from the tower and from the fixed sampling station and from the three mobile sampling stations.

Now in operation are four sulphur dioxide analyzers, four hydrogen sulphide analyzers, two hydrocarbon analyzers, two oxidant analyzers on a continuous basis, plus five tape samplers for suspended particulates, and one dustfall station. Besides this, the Ontario Hydro has in operation 12 sulphur dioxide candles and two continuous sulphur dioxide samplers; CIL has 36 sulphur dioxide candles and 36 fluoride candles, one continuous sulphur dioxide measure and 36 dustfall measures.

Time does not permit me to dwell in detail on the work of this committee. However, I would like to point out some of the results which the committee has achieved to date. In terms of air pollution, dustfall in the Sarnia area was reduced from 50 tons per square mile per month in 1952 to 32 tons per square mile per month in 1966. Of course, this is a significant reduction—not good enough yet—but going in the right direction.

Sulphur dioxide has been maintained at an annual average of two parts per 100 million, or lower, for the past five years in spite of increased industrial production. From these results and the levels found for the other air contaminants measured continually, it has been concluded that the Sarnia atmosphere is relatively clean compared to other industrial areas. But I must emphasize that these industries are not satisfied with these results, but intend to do everything in their power to reduce the contaminants further still.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Knox: Mr. Speaker, if the member who keeps interjecting would only listen and quit talking to the people around him when I say it, I would not have to repeat it for him.

Capital expenditures on air pollution abatement and control over the 10 years from 1956 to 1966 have been in excess of $7 million.

The Ontario research foundation staff now employed on the project in Sarnia consists of two full-time technicians, a part-time technician in Toronto, and the project supervisor, also on a part-time basis.

Mr. Speaker, time does not allow me to give you complete details on what each of the 11 industries has been doing to assist with the control of air pollution. However, I would like to give you a few specific examples to indicate the serious manner in which this problem has been tackled; and I would like to begin with company A, one of our oldest and largest industries.

Except for minor loss of hydrocarbons, company A's main releases to the atmosphere are the products of combustion from its coal-burning steam and power plant. The undesirable effluents from the operation are mainly fly ash and sulphur dioxide. Present control methods for these materials comprise electrostatic precipitators for fly ash, which are highly effective, and tall stacks for dispersion of sulphur dioxide, which are only partially effective. The tall stacks act to decrease ground-level concentration of sulphur dioxide under normal atmospheric conditions, but do nothing to prevent its discharge. During stagnant conditions brought about by temparature inversions, high stacks are no more effective in controlling this contaminate than low stacks. No method of removing sulphur dioxide from stack gases has yet been devised which is effective and economically feasible.

Company A has seriously considered the purchase of the newest type of precipitators to replace those which were installed soon after the war ended. It has also considered the installation of tall stacks. Together these changes would cost several million dollars and would not effectively deal with the sulphur dioxide problem. A change of fuel is probably the most appropriate solution, but company A's annual fuel bill runs close to $5 million now. Unit cost of fuel to producers in the United States, with whom company A competes on a world-wide basis, is only 50 to 60 per cent that of company A's, thus putting company A at a decided competitive disadvantage.

Converting company A's power house to the use of low sulphur oil would increase the company's fuel bill by some 75 per cent and markedly increase this disadvantage. An adequate supply of sulphur-free coal or of gas is not available.

Company A's continuing programme of eliminating or reducing effluents to both the atmosphere and the river is projected to cost some $2.5 million to $3 million over the next five-year period. From this, Mr. Speaker, I think you can see that this company is striving to be a good corporate citizen in every sense of the word. The example also serves to illustrate the point I made in my speech of February 6, of the economic problems which face industries in this matter of air pollution control.

The design of the company B refinery incorporates essentially all the modern technological innovations directed towards the abatement and control of atmospheric emissions. In 1956, a waste heat boiler was installed to combust fairly large quantities of carbon monoxide to harmless carbon dioxide. With this installation, the emission of carbon monoxide from the refinery was reduced to negligible levels. In 1965, a 35-ton oblique day sulphur plant to minimize the emission of sulphur oxides produced during the combustion of the refinery fuel gas was installed. This plant has been in operation for the past eight months and has significantly reduced the total level of the sulphur dioxide discharged to the atmosphere.

At present, this company has an extensive programme to develop information on soot production at the refinery boiler plant in process heaters. Extensive surveys have been conducted to determine the causes of soot formation and to measure particle-sized distribution. As a result of these studies, the company is now revising the steam plant oil burner and fire box design to improve combustion efficiency and minimize soot emissions. The company has also set up a system for monitoring dust fall in the areas surrounding the refinery and has under development plans for continuous monitoring of sulphur dioxide concentrations at the ground level.

Company C was constructed in 1953 with the most modern automated equipment available at that time. Subsequently some of the projects which have been undertaken and completed at the refinery and which have made a significant contribution to reduction of air pollutants are as follows: In 1960—automatic combusion controls were applied to one of the major refinery furnaces to optimize furnace efficiency and stack effluent components. Later in 1961 and 1962, on experience gained from the installation of this heater, analyzers for stack control were provided for three other heaters and for the cat cracker stack. Also in this period, revisions were made to the brine flair system to minimize the smoke on the occasions where it is necessary to burn off refinery waste gas.

In 1963, major revisions were made to one of the refinery steam boilers to convert it for the purpose of operating as a CO boiler so that the stack gases from the cat-cracking operation—containing carbon monoxide and minor quantities of oil vapour—could be fully oxidized and thus reduce emission of carbon monoxide in minor oil vapour to the atmosphere.

In 1964, major improvements were made to the refinery gas flair facilities to improve dependability and to minimize smoke nuisance in the atmosphere.

This company has engaged in a continuous series of surveys on air pollution and contamination in order to maintain a check on the emissions and refinery conditions re air pollution over the years and has been an active participant in the activities of the St. Clair River research committee.

Within the past year company D has replaced three of its operating bag filters with more efficient type collectors to reduce smoke emission. The company has also brought into operation a new unit, which is completely equipped with the newest type collectors, and a new 200-foot boiler stack has just been put into service to emit boiler flue gases at a higher level for better dispersion.

Planning is going ahead to replace another filter with the new type early in this year, and for alterations to the flue gas gathering system to enable the flairing of these waste gases. This should be in operation in 1967 as well.

All of these will amount to something in excess of $650,000 in new capital outlay.

Company E began construction of its Lambton works in the spring of 1965. Its principal product is ammonia, and from ammonia they produce chemical fertilizers, ammonium nitrate, urea and ammonium phosphates. Phosphoric acid is also produced to provide the source of phosphate fertilizer.

Historically, the fertilizer industries have had problems controlling effluents from their plants, primarily from dust, but also from air borne fluorides and oxides. Technology is now much improved and problems from these sources can be greatly reduced.

Company E's approach to effluent control at the Lambton works was to include in its plant design the latest techniques for cleaning its effluent streams. The dust problem is virtually eliminated in its operations, partly

because fertilizers are now marketed in granular rather than counter form, and also through the use of large improved water scrubbers which remove practically all of the dust from the plant stacks. Fluoride effluent will also be effectively curbed by water scrubbing and a catalytic combustion unit has been added to the nitric acid plant to curtail the evolution of nitrogen oxides. The cost of these installations is approximately $250,000.

Its own air sampling stations have already been operating for more than a year and have given company E a measurement of the background levels of contaminates in the atmosphere. With the beginning of their operations, changes in these readings from the background levels can be detected and will indicate any malfunction of its units.

The air sampling information which company E records is not kept only within the company but arrangements have been made for an interchange of the data with the Ontario research foundation. It also provides information from its surveys to the Ontario and Michigan Departments of Health.

In 1953 company F undertook a thorough review of its procedures for control of emissions to both air and water. All major corrective steps were completed by 1960 with total capital expenditures of approximately $850,000.

The programme continues with emphasis on new plant design and correction of minor in-plant nuisances. An additional capital expenditure of $300,000 has been made since 1960 on this phase of the programme. Annual operating costs of all air pollution control facilities is in excess of $100,000.

With the construction of a coal-fired steam generating plant in 1959-60, company F became involved with another type of atmospheric emission. Careful study was given in the design stage of the need for adequate control of dispersion of dust and sulphur dioxide. The type of boiler selected recovers 93 per cent of the fly ash dust. A stack height of 300 feet was chosen which was nearly double the height of most existing stacks in the area at that time.

The result has been a reduction of over 75 per cent in the ground-level concentrations of emitted dust. The plant is fully equipped with combustion controls and smoke recorders —giving better-than-normal control of smoke emissions. It can be operated on oil or gas if future developments should dictate use of alternate fuels during periods of extremely poor atmospheric dispersion.

Approximately $250,000 of the above-mentioned capital expenditures have been incurred for the air pollution control in this one unit.

And finally, measures taken by company G are very comprehensive and include:

1. A course of instructions given regularly to operating personnel to minimize the emissions of contaminates.

2. Maintenance of all control devices in good operating condition.

3. Full support of the St. Clair River research committee.

4. Installation of improvements on existing equipment as necessary.

5. Design of new processes in equipment to take full advantage of the latest techniques for the control of emissions.

6. Designs are approved and checked while they are in operation by the air pollution control service of The Ontario Department of Health. Where feasible, the equipment is given sufficient capacity to meet foreseeable air quality requirements as well.

In the period 1960-65, the capital expenditures at this plant to improve air quality by reducing concentration of hydrocarbons, lowering emissions of sulphur oxides and incinerating objectionable materials, totalled some $2,300,000.

Equipment is now being installed to further reduce hydrocarbon emissions and to improve the dispersion of sulphur oxides at an additional estimated cost of $2,454,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other industries involved in other measures which could be mentioned. But I think that the foregoing will provide substantial evidence of the wholehearted cooperation of industries in this great oil and petrochemical complex.

Of interest here is a seminar that I attended on Saturday, April 15, which was also attended by members of industry, elected councils of the area, the medical officer of health and others. We listened to a very instructive address by Dr. E. R. Morton, chairman of the St. Clair River research committee, who gave a very comprehensive review of the work of the committee and an up-to-date analysis of the air pollution situation as it exists in Sarnia. He dealt specifically with the contaminants—sulphur dioxide, hydrogen sulphide, oxidants, hydrocarbons, aerosols, dustfall and airborne particulates—and used charts on a large screen to illustrate his talk and show us comparisons.

I have already commented on the dustfall decrease, and he dealt broadly with it.

I would like to explain about sulphur dioxide for a few moments if I may, since it is the main pollutant that we have. Because it is technical, I want to read from Dr. Morton's report. He says:

> Because of the type of industry located in this area, the most prevalent impurity we have to deal with is sulphur dioxide. It results from the burning or heating of fossil fuels such as coals, gasolines and oils, and is a constituent of air in all areas where the automobile is used or where fuel oil is consumed. Sulphur dioxide is of interest for two reasons: First, under certain conditions, it will damage plant life; second, its detected presence is an excellent way for industries to monitor their emissions and process controls.
>
> During 1960, the annual average sulphur dioxide level measured 1.4 pphm. In 1963 the level was 1.3 pphm. In 1964, it increased to 2.0 and in 1965 to 2.1 pphm. In 1966, the average level had reached 2.3 pphm.
>
> In spite of the nominal increase, sulphur dioxide levels in Chemical Valley have been stable over the years, even in the face of increased industrial activity. Comparative data for major North American cities, particularly in Canada, are sketchy. Available average levels for United States communities are derived from CAMP (continuous air monitoring programme) stations operated by the United States public health service to provide continuous concurrent data on air pollutants in large United States cities. Over a two-year period the CAMP levels were as follows: Chicago 13.5 pphm; Philadelphia 7.6 pphm; Washington 5.1 pphm; Cincinnati 2.9 pphm; New Orleans 1.0 pphm; San Francisco 0.8 pphm.

Now a Department of Mines standard is 25 pphm for 8 hours, or 35 pphm for 4 hours. California sets its adverse level at 30 pphm for 8 hours.

> Standards in Europe and in other North American cities are varied.
>
> In the Soviet Union, an ambient air standard based on a 24-hour day is employed, and is established at 5 pphm for 24 hours.

So our level of 2.3 is well below that.

> The standard for West Germany is set at a half hour at 20 pphm. The New York-New Jersey pollution watch action level is one hour at 50 pphm. Manitoba's standard is similar to California's, and is set at eight hours at 30 pphm.

But as nearly as could be found out, in any of these places when that level is reached, nothing is ever done about it.

> These standards are all higher than Sarnia's levels and, with the exception of the Soviet Union's, are all based on damage to plant life. Based on these criteria, the St. Clair River research committee has set two types of standards in Chemical Valley. The first relates to plant damage in the rural growth season, which is defined as rapid spring growth in maximum sunlight and moisture. Under these conditions we believe that sulphur dioxide emissions should not exceed 15 pphm for eight hours, or 20 pphm for four hours, or 35 pphm for two hours.
>
> The second standard is for normal city activity and has been set by the committee at 30 pphm for eight hours, or 40 pphm for four hours. These are called the "Sarnia control levels".
>
> Considering its high concentration of industrial activity, Sarnia has maintained its average sulphur dioxide levels favourably in comparison with standards established by authorities in North America and other parts of the world. However, the law of averages is not conclusive. To be specific, Sarnia is in the 0-2 pphm level approximately 70 per cent of the time, a standard well within the limits imposed anywhere in North America. We are in the 0-5 pphm level almost 90 per cent of the year, a standard acceptable anywhere. We are in the 5-14 pphm level 9.5 per cent of the time, an acceptable level provided it does not occur for more than eight consecutive hours during the spring growing season when plant life might be affected.
>
> We are in 15-24 pphm levels three per cent of the time, also acceptable provided it exists for no longer than four hours at a time.
>
> All standards and specifications established in North America to date are based on damage to plant life. No concerted effort seems to have been made to investigate the level tolerable to humans. In November 1966, however, a new specification controlling emissions by government installations in large cities was issued by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The new standard is set at ten parts per 100 million for 24 hours and must not be exceeded 99 per cent of the time. The St. Clair River research committee has had little time to study this standard, which is still at the experimental stage. However, preliminary comparison made through our four monitoring stations shows that the Sarnia downtown residential area meets the specification 98.6 per cent of the time. The city dock meets it 91.5 per cent of the time, and this is a station which gathers all the river traffic emissions as well, and also gets those which may or may not come across from the United States. Churchill Road meets the specification 95.9 per cent, and Corunna, 97.5 per cent of the time.

Thus you see the Sarnia area does not completely meet this specification, but we believe that this can and will be accomplished in the near future. In the United States only three cities have, as yet, applied the new standards. Philadelphia conforms to it 75 per cent of the time, Chicago 50 per cent and New York 35 per cent of the time.

Based on these findings, we believe that the average sulphur dioxide emissions in Chemical Valley are under control and compare favourably with any standards in the world. Although we have experienced individual incidents of our own making, visible efforts are being made to eliminate the sources of sulphur dioxide pollution. These efforts also will help to meet new, stringent standards such as those proposed by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It is also noteworthy that, in accumulating its data, the St. Clair River research committee has conducted the most comprehensive fact-gathering programme of all anti-pollution groups in North America.

The subject of hydrocarbons is an interesting one since this is where smog comes from. It must be remembered that a smog condition may exist when oxidants combine with unsaturated hydrocarbons, particularly on hot, mid-summer days. Our comparisons for hydrocarbons are made against the six CAMP cities, as very little data from other sources are available. However, Sarnia's average levels were 1.8 parts per million in 1964; dropping to 1.0 in 1966. The CAMP cities record averages between 1.8 in New Orleans to 3.2 in Cincinnati.

Standards for hydrocarbon levels have not been established anywhere in North America. At Sarnia, we use an observation level, which means that when the hydrocarbons reach a predetermined level of ten parts per million a large sample of air is taken for constituent analysis. There were five such incidents during 1965 and a similar number during 1966. The average hydrocarbon levels in 1965 were 0.9 parts per million; in 1966 they were 1.0. In Los Angeles, authorities say that levels between five and 30 parts per million are sufficient to cause smog under certain conditions. And at no time, of course, were we near that.

With regard to the incidents recorded during 1965 and 1966, the peak levels occurred—without exception—during late evening or early morning. At this time atmospheric inversion is at maximum and is invariably accompanied by a calm, stagnant and stable air condition. The conclusion is that hydrocarbons, being light, are confined to ground level by strong weather inversions. If this occurs when oxidants are present, a smog condition can develop. The St. Clair River research committee intends to study this phenomenon further this summer.

And that is the end of the quote from that address.

I would like to say that, at that meeting, the formation of the Lambton industrial society was announced and is incorporated in the province of Ontario under terms of The Ontario Corporations Act. Letters patent were issued on March 16, 1967. Its objectives are to promote joint and individual effort by member industries in fields of education and research to achieve control of industrial pollution of air, soil and water consistent with government regulations and good corporate citizenship.

Its member companies include: Allied Chemical Canada Limited, Cabot Carbon of Canada Limited, Canadian Industries Limited, Chinook Chemicals, Corporation Limited, Dow Chemical of Canada Limited, Dupont of Canada Limited, Ethyl Corporation of Canada Limited, Fiberglass Canada Limited, Imperial Oil Enterprises Limited, Polymer Corporation Limited, Shell Canada Limited and the Sun Oil Company Limited. It has decided to seek the services of a manager or executive director to manage the affairs of the society, and you will see by that they are putting their business on a pretty professional and ongoing level.

I will not take the time of the House to detail the procedures and results with the other contaminants we must control in our

area. The one I gave, however, on sulphur dioxide should suffice to show the nature and quality of the work being done there.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to make reference to The Air Pollution Control Act of 1967 which was introduced very recently into this House by our Minister of Health.

One of the first and most important points made by the Minister was the need to establish some criteria on which to base control measures. Although we do not have specific information as to the concentration of contaminants in the ambient air, which will cause injury to humans exposed for long periods, information is available on the concentration of contaminants which will cause injurious effects on normal healthy people exposed for eight hours in their places of work. Our Minister therefore proposes, I understand, to take these concentrations—known as threshold limit values—and to pro-rate these values to provide for a 24-hour exposure seven days a week and to make allowance for the population as a whole on this basis.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, our government is going to establish the interim criteria which I called for in my resolution on February 6 last.

Our Minister's new legislation will also provide for centralized control of air pollution in the province of Ontario in one agency. However, because of local effects of air pollution, district and regional offices will be set up so that contact will be maintained with the public through those agencies. Furthermore, existing municipal air pollution control agencies will be absorbed into the new structure on an orderly basis to provide for a continuation and expansion of existing programmes.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from the Minister's statement that he has developed a sound progressive programme for proceeding step by step and allowing for an orderly transition from municipal to provincial control.

I am glad to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Sarnia area will be associated with the second phase of the Minister's programme. In the meantime the programme for the control of industrial emissions will proceed on an industry basis from the very outset.

I would like to add at this stage, Mr. Speaker, that the equipment for the new meteorological tower to be established in the city of Sarnia by The Department of Health in 1967 and for the permanent sampling station is now under test with our Department of Health, and will be installed in the Sarnia area just as soon as it has been checked out and the experts are satisfied that all the equipment is working efficiently.

It is my understanding that the study by the international joint commission, of the Detroit-Windsor-Sarnia area, will begin in July this year. It will involve supplementing the sampling already taking place in the Sarnia and Port Huron area, coupled with a survey of emissions, a meteorology study and —of vital importance—a study of the effects of these emissions on the health of the citizens of these areas. Our federal government in this study is primarily concerned in determining the chance boundary flow of pollutants into Canada and the effects on the health of our people.

To summarize the situation, Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Minister of Health for the new Air Pollution Control Act which was introduced into this Legislature and which I am convinced will produce a much more effective programme for the control of air pollution than we have ever had before.

Mr. Singer: Why was the bill delayed if you think it is so great?

Mr. Knox: Well if the member wants to know why the bill was delayed, it was delayed in order to give some people who were extremely interested, and planned to study it further—

Mr. Singer: Yes, the best thing you fellows do is study.

Mr. Knox: —and give their considered opinion at a later date; and I think this is important—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South):You have been following their considered opinion for ten years—

Mr. Singer: —all in Sarnia too.

Mr. Knox: Now mind you, there are additional measures—

Mr. Singer: Great bill, but we have got to study it again.

Mr. Knox: Mr. Speaker, could I ask you to close off the fog horn? There are additional measures which, sooner or later, must be taken if we are to have an effective control of air pollution on a country-wide basis. These measures were mentioned in my speech of February 6 when I called upon

the federal government to recognize the seriousness—

Mr. Singer: Oh now come, the federal government must do it right away.

Mr. Knox: —and to take action which can be taken only by the federal government.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Take it as read.

Mr. Knox: I am referring to monetary incentives to industry with installation of air control equipment, similar to those now in effect for the purchase of water pollution control equipment. To produce the long-range accurate criteria on which to base our air pollution control, there is an urgent and immediate requirement for the establishment of a coordinating agency at the federal level.

I was interested in an article in the April 12 edition of *The Christian Science Monitor,* which is headed: "Lack of control-cost data slows clean-air drive." Of course it is referring to the situation in the United States, but it points up one problem very clearly that will engage the serious consideration of our governments. It emphasizes the need for standards, for guidelines and for guarantees that approved equipment—when installed—will not have to be updated, except over a reasonable length of time, and for tax incentives and write-offs. In the light of all the time and money and cooperation of industry in the ambient air pollution field, we must recognize that industries—being economically minded, as they must be—will require guarantees from the rest of us; and these will establish vital details of their cost picture, so that they may plan and build with reasonable security.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, one of my greatest regrets with regard to the debates in this Legislature arises from our failure to give continuing consideration to the broader problems of Confederation.

This year I had hoped that we were off to a different pattern. The Throne Speech indicated the government's intention to convene a Confederation of tomorrow conference and surely that proposal, particularly with the controversy it provoked, should have provided a vehicle for continuing debate. And yet, in fact, no such debate has taken place in this House. It is to be hived off, so to speak, in a one-, two- or three-day period—one does not know—when the Prime Minister's (Mr. Robarts') resolution standing on the order paper for quite some time is eventually called.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been my intention to enter the debates in the hope of encouraging something of a continuing debate on this topic. I had hoped to do it some time in March, when the Prime Minister's estimates were called but—for reasons that we are all aware—they were delayed.

I had hoped to get into the Budget debate earlier, but for reasons that I will not detail, I did not. But now there is an opportunity in the Budget debate.

The only thing that has happened in the interval, Mr. Speaker, is that we now are getting a flow of material from the advisory committee on Confederation. I wondered whether or not I would dip into that, but came to the conclusion that I would leave it for the debate which the Prime Minister has indicated is scheduled on the order paper. I will stick to the comments that I had prepared, quite literally, some six weeks ago.

Now Mr. Speaker, one of the encouraging features of this Centennial year is the emergence among Canadians of a greater feeling of pride and purpose in their country. I do not think that can be exaggerated too much as yet but, on the other hand, I do not think we should fail to acknowledge the emergence of that feeling. As the opening date of Expo '67 drew near, there was a growing realization that the project—Man and His World—is exciting, even breathtaking in its conception and in its execution.

We have reason to hope that as millions of Canadians deepen their appreciation of our history through local Centennial functions, they will then go on to Expo to catch a glimpse of what this nation can do if we unite to achieve our common destiny. It is within this context, Mr. Speaker, that I want to discuss Ontario's proposal for a Confederation of tomorrow conference and make some suggestions as to how it can deepen the sense of destiny.

Unfortunately, the announcement of this conference in the Throne Speech was so fraught with political implications, that public consideration of it became very confused.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Not at all. No politics in it.

Mr. MacDonald: Further, though Ottawa's initial reaction may have arisen out of a general misunderstanding, it is now clear that the federal government is opposed to its taking place. They maintain that Ottawa

alone should convene federal-provincial meetings of this kind.

It is worth noting here, Mr. Speaker, that while such an attitude has been traditional, there is no legal basis in Ottawa's case. Our constitution is silent on this point. The calling of conferences, whether they be federal-provincial or inter-provincial, has developed as an informal practice superimposed on The BNA Act. But surely what is more important here is not legal prerogative of calling such a conference, but whether it can serve a useful purpose at this imporant juncture in our history. In my view it can, and I want to discuss my reasons for this.

The tragic fact is that Ottawa has failed to give effective leadership on the paramount issue of reshaping Confederation in these last critical years. In my view this is not a partisan comment, it is an historical fact. As a result, a vacuum has been created in which the provinces have tended to move. Too often they have moved not in a coordinated way, but in ten different ways. Not only has Quebec tended to go on its own, but the nine so-called English-speaking provinces have tended in varying degrees to go their separate directions.

Moreover, in recent months when Ottawa has taken a firmer stand, it has been on an assumption so historically fallacious as to compound our future problems. Ottawa's policy is now being built on the assumption that Quebec has not a particular status in Confederation and that unity can be achieved by treating all provinces in precisely the same manner. All this may have merit as a political slogan or tactic, but it flies in the face of historical reality. To achieve it, the federal government is now opting out of many aspects of an effective 20th century reshaping of Confederation. The evidence lies in recent policies in regard to technical and university education.

At the same time, it has refused to direct sufficient of our overall taxation revenues to the provinces and the municipalities; yet it is these two jurisdictions which have been left with the responsibility for services in those areas which are most vital to the development of the modern society.

The net result is that instead of achieving greater Canadian unity by treating all the provinces the same, Ottawa's current approach will make it more difficult to cope with the unique challenge of Quebec's role in Confederation. At the same time it will place new obstacles in the way of an effective challenge to the economic and social problems of the next 100 years. I fear, by following this path, the federal government will render itself less of a unifying force in the nation as a whole and increasingly irrelevant as an instrument for meeting the needs of our people.

The alternative path, I suggest, is frankly to acknowledge the particular status of Quebec in Confederation. Ottawa should give leadership first, in achieving a greater common purpose among the nine provinces which comprise what we call English Canada, and then we should coordinate the approach of French- and English-speaking Canada in our bi-national structure.

As I have said many times in this Legislature, Ontario has a vitally important role to play in this critically important development. Geographically, we are neighbours of Quebec; historically, we have been partners in building this nation, partners to the point of sharing a common Parliament of the united Canadas prior to Confederation. We therefore have a greater understanding of French-Canadian thinking and aspirations.

Fortunately, the Prime Minister of this province today, unlike some of his predecessors, has reflected this deeper understanding. Finally, because of her size and historic role in Confederation, Ontario can be the natural leader of the provinces of English Canada, if that role is handled with sensitivity. But having created an atmosphere of understanding with French Canada, Ontario has not until now moved to play her role to its full potential. My hope is that the calling of the Confederation of tomorrow conference will, in itself, be some evidence that Ontario is now willing to play that role and that developments flowing from the conference will provide the basis for continuing creative leadership. My hopes for what the conference might achieve are based on the limited, but important evidence, that it has received the editorial support of most newspapers in Ontario, that it has evoked a quick and warm response from Premier Daniel Johnson of Quebec—and I might add, Mr. Speaker, the determination of the government to pursue the matter must be predicated on some sort of assurance—verbal, formal or otherwise—that most, if not all of the provinces have indicated a willingness to participate.

In my view, this is encouraging testimony to our mutual willingness to tackle anew, under the particular circumstances that such a conference might offer, our common problems as Canadians, in spite of the disruptive tensions of recent years.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the reaction to the idea of such a conference being called by the province of Ontario is another reminder that all roads to Canadian unity do not necessarily lead through Ottawa, that the initiative for re-shaping Confederation, particularly since Ottawa has failed to give leadership on the issue—at least, adequate leadership—may well come most effectively from the provinces.

For this reason, it is unfortunate that Ottawa's response has been grudging and negative. I hope that it will change and that the federal government will participate fully and enthusiastically. Otherwise, I fear Ottawa's increasing inability to deal with the fundamental problems and needs of Canadians, will be underlined. That such a trend should continue, is disturbing to contemplate.

However, there are even more persuasive reasons why a Confederation of tomorrow conference at this particular time can serve a very constructive purpose. There are subtle but significant changes in attitude on the part of the opposing tendencies within Confederation, which give rise to hope for their reconciliation. Some of the louder distractions of Quebec's none-too-quiet "revolution" no longer preoccupy the public mind and a greater common purpose is emerging among all Canadians.

Dr. Edward McWhinney, professor of law at McGill University and visiting professor at Laval University, has put the change succinctly, and I quote:

> In a broader sense, the whole nature and character of the revolution in Quebec is changing. It has never been a simple and uncomplicated revolution, but rather a series of different, sometimes distinct, and sometimes overlapping, revolutions.
>
> One revolution is the revolt of the generation that sets the young against the old. It has its counterpart in English-speaking Canada in that ever-widening credibility gap that tends to make the older governing elites of the federal Liberal and Conservative parties seem like people of another century.
>
> Another revolution was the nationalist revolution in an old-fashioned sense of a quest for political symbols and for the forms of political power in the state. This was expressed most fully in the bombs in the letter boxes and the blowing up of statues, in the debates about the national flag and though it is difficult to discover more than a polite interest in it today, the talk of a distinctly national anthem.
>
> However, issues such as these have given way to matters of substance and not of form—of social and economic substance at that. There is reason to believe that it is this third revolution that holds the key to the development of Quebec, and indeed of Canada. In any case, the emphasis of Quebec thinking, in governing and intellectual circles at least, seems to be shifting to social and economic issues. Quebec is also discovering that this is the preoccupation of political leaders in other provinces.

That is the end of the quotation, Mr. Speaker.

In brief, all provinces have discovered common ground in the urgent necessity of developing social and economic policies to cope with the technological society. Each is confronted with a burgeoning demand for capital development and is concerned to attract capital, domestic and foreign; without I would hope at the same time drifting irrevocably within the economic orbit of the United States. Each is concerned with gaining a share of Canada's total revenue resources sufficient to implement the programme so urgently required by its population.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member always interjects with that characteristically Tory parochial view of the revenues of Ontario.

Mr. White: Aw, listen! You don't mean that.

Mr. MacDonald: The ground is common to Quebec as it is to English-speaking provinces. Increasingly, each recognizes that the similarity of the gigantic tasks far out-distance the diversity of background and approach within individual provinces.

In another important area, a Confederation of tomorrow conference can be timely and very useful. The greatest obstacle to a successful dialogue between English and French Canada in recent years has been that while English Canada is generally satisfied with the results of Confederation, French Canada is profoundly dissatisfied. This satisfaction gap has been so wide that it has been difficult to communicate. Claude Ryan, one of the most responsible and perceptive observers of the Quebec as well as the broader Canadian scene, has noted an important change in this connection, and I quote from Mr. Ryan:

> After years of assiduously maintaining contact with English Canada, I have the impression that we have been too general in our presentation of the French Canadian

position. We have vociferously declared our discontent, we have pointed out the relative inferiority of our position after a whole century of Confederation. We have conscientiously tried to define the new aspirations of Quebec of 1967.

These arguments have not succeeded in convincing our partners of the irrefutable logic of our position. The time has come for us to be far more exact, far more concrete in our criticisms of the existing system. At a recent meeting between well known spokesmen for the two groups discussion seemed to lead nowhere.

After a while, some of Quebec's representatives began to outline precise criticisms of the present constitution. They demonstrated the illogicality of having social security divided between two jurisdictions as it is now. They asked why family allowances should necessarily be the domain of the central power while retirement pensions could fall within the provincial domain.

They pointed out numerous instances of overlapping as well as the waste and inefficiency resulting from the present confusion of authority in such sectors as encouraging of arts and letters and legislation on corporations and financial institutions. They detailed the extreme complexity of the manpower policy. They noted the contradictory nature of a situation where the only government theoretically competent in international matters is at the same time a government with a constitution which actually states its incompetence to deal with a large number of questions that nowadays form the subject of international relations.

Subsequent reactions enabled me to see that this type of argument gets far more attention than the vague statements about the right to auto-determination. It is up to us to prepare a definite list of things which are not working in the present constitutional system. As long as we have not done this, we must be resigned to partial misunderstanding by our partners.

The English Canadian is wary of generalized ideas and abstract statements. If we believe in our historical diagnosis, we should be able to state it in exact terms that force more detailed discussion.

That is the end of the comment from Mr. Ryan.

Mr. Claude Ryan then expressed the view that the Confederation for tomorrow conference:

could be most important in this respect. Opinion in English Canada is not prepared for the extensive constitutional operation of which we are so fond of speaking in Quebec but the exploratory meeting which Mr. Robarts is proposing could be a major step in that direction.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): What are your views on it?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would listen and perceive he would have caught my views.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, even on the wide gap that has separated French and English Canada on the basic issue of constitutional reform, the situation has developed to the point where in a way which Mr. Ryan spells out with considerable precision, spokesmen for French and English Canada might work their way toward common ground. This is progress, and what is more important it holds out the prospect of further progress in the kind of relaxed family gathering with no need for formal decision making which the Confederation of tomorrow conference could provide.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have said enough to indicate why I think that a Confederation of tomorrow conference would serve a useful purpose. I want to turn now to the conference itself.

The Prime Minister has indicated that he plans to call a conference for autumn of this year—all of which is predicated on the hope that he is still there—however, we will let that partisan comment lie and get on with the subject.

The fall is a highly appropriate time, provided the preparatory work is undertaken immediately. It will provide an opportunity to capitalize on the growing sense of pride and purpose engendered by the national birthday party and focus those constructive sentiments on the important job of restructuring Confederation to meet the challenge of the years ahead. It will be a fitting climax for the Centennial year.

It would be my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government will attend. By doing so, it will be demonstrating its willingness to break away from those precedents of the last 100 years, which in themselves are sterile, and help develop a new pattern for national consultation.

It will be my hope that all political parties, not just those who happen to be in power, would be represented and at a family gather-

ing called to discuss the family's future; all members of the family should be included.

If the Confederation of tomorrow conference is truly to shape a renewed sense of national purpose and direction, the whole people of Canada must be involved, not just their leaders from all parties. They must be given an opportunity to participate in a way in which the normal day to day operation of our institutions does not provide.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the conference should be the central focus of nation-wide participation and discussion on Confederation. The people of this country will learn from it and, more important, they will also contribute to it. To this end, let us make imaginative use of the electronic media of communication. Let us, in shaping the second century of Confederation, take full advantage of the technology which was unknown to the original fathers of Confederation.

In short, Mr. Speaker, what I am proposing is a nation-wide teach-in on Confederation. Specifically, I propose that we add meaning to the central focus of the conference by convening with it a series—or having convened with it through cooperation from other provinces—a series of regional meetings across Canada linked together in a two-way network by television with the people of our country taking part.

For example, regional conferences called to discuss Confederation might be held in a number of Canadian cities.

They should be timed to coincide with the Confederation of tomorrow conference. They could discuss, from their own distinctive point of view, the same basic issues affecting Canada's Confederation.

If we assume that the Confederation of tomorrow conference will last a week, then the regional conferences might be timed to coincide with the last two or three days. They might be opened, for example, by a two-hour telecast from the Confederation of tomorrow conference, where the national and provincial leaders would set forth the problems for the discussion and solicit the views of the participating regional meetings at a later point in the agenda.

These regional meetings would then proceed on their own, involving outside speakers and personalities where they feel it would be appropriate. The regional sessions could wind up, say, on a Sunday afternoon, with a special four-hour, all-network, bilingual, dialogue between them and the Confederation for tomorrow conference. Spokesmen for the regional sessions would report their views and their assessment of any consensus. There would then be a question and answer period, where, for example, a person in Vancouver could put a question to, say, Daniel Johnson, and get an answer.

Mr. Sargent: It is a lot of nonsense.

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, a teach-in technique by television. This would be participatory democracy in its best sense.

Now, although the dialogue would be limited to those actually in the national and regional teach-in buildings, the whole affair would be watched by the nation, in an all-network hook-up. This two-way teach-in wind-up should be preceded earlier in the week by other televised sessions of the national conference, which could be carried partly on the networks and partly by closed circuits to schools, universities and town meetings, in any community where they could be organized. In this way all the Canadian people would get a sense of build-up and involvement, leading up to the last two days.

In the months leading up to the conference, special debate on Confederation in this gramming could be undertaken to present various sides of the issues that could be discussed. In this way, finally, the people of Canada would have a meaningful sense of participation in the reshaping of their country for its second century.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are also certain things which we of the province of Ontario should be doing to prepare ourselves for this conference. I propose that we should have a special debate on Confederation in this session of the Legislature, or a special one later this year. I would hope—and that hope is now in the process of being realized—that reports from the Ontario advisory committee on Confederation will be made available and that these reports would then become the focus of a special debate.

We would not only give leadership to this debate, but through televising a substantial portion of the legislative debate on the Ontario stations and through closed circuits to schools, universities and community centres, give the people of Ontario an opportunity to participate.

I would propose further, Mr. Speaker, that a special all-party committee of this Legislature should be set up to plan the details of Ontario's own public discussion of Confederation and of our province's contribution to the national conference. Such a committee should concern itself with the working out of a

precise timetable, with discussions with television and other media experts. Hopefully, comparable committees of sister Legislatures will also begin to consider preliminary work leading up to the national conference, its terms of reference and its coverage.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, the details are less important than agreement on a broad principle implicit in the proposals which I have enunciated, that all the people of Canada should be involved in a meaningful way by means of modern media in the critically important discussions which the Confederation of tomorrow conference will highlight. There can be no Centennial project more valuable to the united future of our country. There can be no objective more worthy of the imagination and goodwill of this country's political leaders, notwithstanding the hon. member for Grey North.

Mr. Singer moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we would like to get on with the estimates of The Department of Health. There will be a private members' hour on Monday afternoon. Apart from our desire to get on with The Department of Health estimates, we have some difficulties and may not be able to continue on Monday evening with them; in that case, we will go on with The Department of Labour on Monday night.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Any bills?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We could have bills, if you would take it as notice.

Mr. Bryden: I always like precise answers.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, the bill part of the day, in dealing with those items, I always find very pleasant.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, can the Minister tell us when the debate on Confederation is going to take place?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, I cannot; the Prime Minister may have something to say on that on Monday.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:00 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

(105 members)

Fifth Session — Twenty-Seventh Parliament

Speaker: Hon. Donald H. Morrow, B.A. **Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.**

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Allan, Hon. James N.	P.C.	Haldimand-Norfolk	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Apps, Syl	P.C.	Kingston	50 Roden St., Kingston
Auld, Hon. James A. C.	P.C.	Leeds	Parliament Bldgs, Toronto
Bales, Hon. Dalton	P.C.	York Mills	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Beckett, Hollis E.	P.C.	York East	66 Tranmer Ave., Toronto 7
Ben, George	L.	Bracondale	1134 Dundas St. W., Toronto 3
Bernier, Leo	P.C.	Kenora	Hudson
Boyer, Robert J.	P.C.	Muskoka	620 University Ave., Toronto 2
Braithwaite, Leonard A.	L.	Etobicoke	Suite E, 1500 Royal York Rd., Weston
Brown, Keith	P.C.	Peterborough	807 Armour Rd., Peterborough
Brunelle, Hon. Rene	P.C.	Cochrane North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bryden, Kenneth	N.D.	Woodbine	65A Claxton Blvd., Toronto 10
Bukator, George	L.	Niagara Falls	Box 280, Chippawa
Butler, K. E.	P.C.	Waterloo North	907 Frederick St., Kitchener
Carruthers, Alex	P.C.	Durham	Garden Hill
Carton, Gordon R.	P.C.	Armourdale	217 Sandringham Dr., Downsview
Cass, F. M.	P.C.	Grenville-Dundas	Chesterville
Connell, Hon. T. Ray	P.C.	Hamilton-Wentworth	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Cowling, Alfred H.	P.C.	High Park	21 Evans Ave., Toronto 9
Davis, Hon. William G.	P.C.	Peel	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Davison, Norman	N.D.	Hamilton East	100 Delaware Ave., Hamilton
Demers, J. C. G.	P.C.	Nickel Belt	Chelmsford
Downer, Rev. A. W.	P.C.	Dufferin-Simcoe	Box 239, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Dunlop, Edward A.	P.C.	Forest Hill	45 Charles St. E., Toronto 5
Dymond, Hon. Matthew B.	P.C.	Ontario	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Eagleson, R. Alan	P.C.	Lakeshore	30 Kings Lynn Rd., Toronto 18
Edwards, J. Fred	P.C.	Perth	Palmerston
Evans, D. Arthur	P.C.	Simcoe Centre	Box 87, Bradford
Ewen, Donald W.	P.C.	Wentworth	160 Orchard Dr., Ancaster
Farquhar, Stan	L.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Box 421, Elliot Lake
Freeman, E. G.	N.D.	Fort William	625 Catherine St., Fort William
Gaunt, Murray	L.	Huron-Bruce	Wingham
Gisborn, Reg.	N.D.	Wentworth East	26 Martin Rd., Hamilton
Gomme, Hon. George E.	P.C.	Lanark	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Gordon, George T.	L.	Brantford	4 Ontario St., Brantford
Grossman, Hon. Allan	P.C.	St. Andrew	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Guindon, Fernand	P.C.	Stormont	7-13th St. W., Cornwall

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Hamilton, Maurice	P.C.	Renfrew North	R.R. #5, Pembroke
Harris, R. Jack	P.C.	Beaches	58 Pine Crescent, Toronto 13
Haskett, Hon. Irwin	P.C.	Ottawa South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Henderson, Lorne C.	P.C.	Lambton East	R.R. #3, Oil Springs
Hodgson, Louis M.	P.C.	Scarborough East	1036 Military Trail, R.R. #1, West Hill
Hodgson, R. Glen	P.C.	Victoria	Haliburton
Johnston, Allister	P.C.	Parry Sound	South River
Johnston, W. Erskine	P.C.	Carleton	Carp
Kerr, George A.	P.C.	Halton	377 Brant St., Burlington
Knox, J. Ralph	P.C.	Lambton West	55 Grey Crescent, Sarnia
Lawrence, A. B. R.	P.C.	Russell	90 Sparks St., Ottawa
Lawrence, Allan F.	P.C.	St. George	35 N. Sherbourne St., Toronto 5
Letherby, Lloyd	P.C.	Simcoe East	Box 165, Coldwater
Lewis, Stephen	N.D.	Scarborough West	3025 Queen St. E., Apt. #5, Scarborough
Lewis, W. Bev.	P.C.	Humber	15 Ridgegate Cres., Toronto 18
MacDonald, Donald C.	N.D.	York South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Mackenzie, A. Alexander	P.C.	York North	Box 35, Woodbridge
MacNaughton, Hon. C. S.	P.C.	Huron	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Morningstar, Ellis P.	P.C.	Welland	97 Alberta St., Welland
Morrow, Hon. Donald H.	P.C.	Ottawa West	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
McKeough, Hon. W. Darcy	P.C.	Kent West	Box 940, Chatham
McNeil, R. K.	P.C.	Elgin	R.R. #2, Springfield
Newman, Bernard	L.	Windsor-Walkerville	1290 Ypres Blvd., Windsor
Nixon, R. F. Leader of the Opposition	L.	Brant	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Noden, William G.	P.C.	Rainy River	517 Armit Ave., Fort Frances
Olde, Neil L.	P.C.	Middlesex South	Melbourne
Oliver, Farquhar R.	L.	Grey South	Priceville
Paterson, Donald A.	L.	Essex South	1 Georgia Ave., Leamington
Peck, George H.	P.C.	Scarborough Centre	36 Lyme Regis Cres., Scarborough
Pittock, Gord W.	P.C.	Oxford	Box 104, Ingersoll
Price, Henry J.	P.C.	St. David	27 Bloor St. E., Toronto 5
Pritchard, Mrs. Ada	P.C.	Hamilton Centre	93 Bold Street, Suite 904, Hamilton
Racine, H. S.	L.	Ottawa East	270 Besserer St., Ottawa 2
Randall, Hon. Stanley J.	P.C.	Don Mills	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Reaume, Arthur J.	L.	Essex North	1209 Canada Bldg., Windsor
Reilly, Leonard M.	P.C.	Eglinton	639 Yonge St., Toronto 5
Renwick, James	N.D.	Riverdale	20 St. Denis Dr., Suite #15, Don Mills
Reuter, Allan E.	P.C.	Waterloo South	45 Main St., Galt
Robarts, Hon. John P.	P.C.	London North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Rollins, Clarke T.	P.C.	Hastings East	R.R. #1, Bancroft
Root, John	P.C.	Wellington-Dufferin	Orton
Rowe, Russell D.	P.C.	Northumberland	546 Lakeshore Rd., Cobourg
Rowntree, Hon. H. Leslie	P.C.	York West	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Sandercock, W. E.	P.C.	Hastings West	226 William St., Belleville
Sargent, Eddie	L.	Grey North	868-2nd Ave. E., Owen Sound
Simonett, Hon. J. R.	P.C.	Frontenac-Addington	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Singer, Vernon M.	L.	Downsview	111 Richmond St. W., Suite 603, Toronto
Smith, Richard	L.	Nipissing	671 Ann Street, North Bay
Sopha, Elmer W.	L.	Sudbury	Box 1206, Sudbury
Spence, John P.	L.	Kent East	Muirkirk
Spooner, Hon. J. W.	P.C.	Cochrane South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Stewart, Hon. William A.	P.C.	Middlesex North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Taylor, R. A. H.	L.	Timiskaming	Box 235, New Liskeard
Thrasher, Ivan W.	P.C.	Windsor-Sandwich	1110 Ouellette Ave., Windsor
Trotter, James B.	L.	Parkdale	227 Riverside Dr., Toronto 3
Villeneuve, Osie F.	P.C.	Glengarry	Box 27, Maxville
Walker, Albert V.	P.C.	Oshawa	1184 Northridge St., Oshawa
Wardrope, Hon. George C.	P.C.	Port Arthur	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Welch, Hon. Robert	P.C.	Lincoln	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Wells, Hon. Thomas L.	P.C.	Scarborough North	14 Robintide Court, Agincourt
Whicher, Ross M.	L.	Bruce	Wiarton
White, John H.	P.C.	London South	119 Base Line Rd., London
Whitney, Norris	P.C.	Prince Edward-Lennox	R.R. #1, Consecon
Wishart, Hon. A. A.	P.C.	Sault Ste. Marie	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Worton, Harry	L.	Wellington South	15 Queen St., Guelph
Yakabuski, Paul J.	P.C.	Renfrew South	Box 219, Barrys Bay
Yaremko, Hon. John	P.C.	Bellwoods	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Young, Fred	N.D.	Yorkview	717 Woburn Ave., Toronto 12

Legislature of Ontario
Debates

No. 81

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 1, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 1, 1967

Question to Mr. Gomme re Highway 17, Mr. Newman 2813

Questions to Mr. Bales re Ontario Hydro strike, Mr. Nixon 2813

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued 2814

On notice of motion No. 23, Mr. Reuter, Mr. Bukator, Mr. Young 2843

Recess, 6 o'clock 2848

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 1, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, Holy Name separate school, Toronto, and in the west gallery, eastern high school of commerce, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions of the Ministry. I do not see the appropriate Ministers in the House, but if you will permit me I will put them on the record and they can answer when it is convenient.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): They will be taken as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: The first one is to the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). In view of the fact that the Legislature was not allowed to discuss the allegations made by former Metro coroner Dr. Morton Shulman, does the Prime Minister feel that the statements attributed by the press to J. F. Cauley, vice-chairman of the workmen's compensation board are *sub judice,* since they refer to another of Dr. Shulman's specific charges which are now part of the terms of reference of the judicial inquiry?

Second, to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales): Would the Minister report on the state of negotiations with the allied construction council concerning the strike against Ontario Hydro?

The last one to the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall): What were recent increases in rentals in the rent-geared-to-income project in Brantford, and how does the Minister justify these increases?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Highways. A copy of the question has been submitted to him. Would the Minister advise the House what are the immediate plans for the reconstruction of Highway 17 between Renfrew and Arnprior?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, I would say that a study covering Highway 17 is nearing completion. This study will determine the location and classification of highways required to fulfil both the present and long-term needs. On completion of the study the highway will be located and construction is anticipated in the near future. In the meantime, every effort will be expended to maintain the existing roads in a reasonable driving condition.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Labour has just come in. Perhaps he could answer my question now?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the question as I received it was: Would the Minister report on the state of negotiations with the allied construction council concerning the strike against the Ontario Hydro. Is that correct?

I would advise the hon. member that I think there is a generally recognized and accepted principle that the mediation of a dispute cannot be carried out successfully in public. Consequently, I am sure the leader of the Opposition would appreciate why I cannot properly go into detail about the issues, or about the moves that are being made to resolve them.

I can advise the House, however, that meetings are now under way and they will continue with a view to the settlement of the strike.

Mr. Nixon: If I might ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Labour and his staff involved in this mediation, or is it being handled entirely by Ontario Hydro at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, we are involved in the meetings that are taking place

at the present time. They were arranged by our office for this morning.

Mr. Nixon: In the absence of the hon. member for Kent East (Mr. Spence), I would ask the following question on his behalf to the Minister of Economics and Development: Would the Minister advise the House from whom the Ontario housing corporation purchased 32.12 acres of land in the town of Renfrew for housing development purposes, the purchase price, and what plans have been made for development of the property? Why was the property not listed among recent land purchases tabled in the House this year?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 15th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
(Continued)

On vote 807:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister if any recent changes have taken place at the Aurora hospital for adult males, that is for adult retardates.

Mr. Chairman, last year I dwelled on this particular hospital at some length, pointing out that I considered the place a firetrap. As far as I know, no changes have taken place since that time. There was a discussion in the estimates last year that an expanded building programme may take place—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Would the member repeat the question?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! It is difficult for the Minister to hear the member.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order I just again want to ask exactly how we are proceeding. I think when we left we were on vote 806, the professional services branch, and that the situation at Aurora would logically follow in vote 807.

Mr. Chairman: I thought vote 806 had carried.

Mr. S. Lewis: No, we were still on it.

Mr. Chairman: Is there some discussion on any section under the professional services branch under 806?

Mr. S. Lewis: Yes, we had not completed that discussion.

Mr. Chairman: Is there some discussion at this time?

Mr. S. Lewis: The Minister said that was the appropriate place to raise certain policy matters.

Mr. Chairman: All right. The member for Scarborough West.

On vote 806:

Mr. S. Lewis: Right!

Mr. Chairman, first I want to go back to the question of numbers of professional staff, and ask the Minister whether he could give us an idea of what, in the overall Ontario hospital system has been the state in the diminution of profesional staff at the psychiatric and psychological level, and where he stands in the year 1966-1967 as opposed to the two years preceding?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Of full-time staff psychologists there are 81, that is 30 psychologists, 51 psychometrists. What was the next thing the hon. member asked, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. S. Lewis: Psychiatrists!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Psychiatrists!

Physicians, certified specialists, 113; others 63; a total of 176 physicians.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the records show for the Ontario hospital system in the years 1964 and 1965 a drop each year of 20 per cent in the professional staff, the psychiatric and the psychological staff across the entire Ontario hospital system. I wondered how far this drop has continued and what concern he has about the depletion of staff through the Ontario hospitals. Obviously their patient load has not altered at all, in many instances it has increased.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, during the year there was a drop in staff again. There was a thorough-going review of salary levels, working conditions and now in the last three months we are picking up. I do not have the exact figures although I can undertake to get them for the hon. member. I do not have them here, but we are improving our situation. However, I would point out that while we are apparently losing some staff, they are not being lost to the service and with the coming into operation of psychiatric units in general hospitals, the staff is really transferring rather than being lost from service to the

population. We do not like to lose them from our hospitals but so long as they stay in the field, we cannot feel so badly about it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Perhaps they are staying in the field but they are being seduced by the psychiatric wings of general hospitals and by some of the new community mental health facilities. Might I ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, what happens in the Ontario hospital system? The patient load, as I gather, is increasing, and it is increasing in a significant way. As the chronic older patients in the Ontario hospital system move into the homes for special care, then the new patients who arrive in the Ontario hospitals are obviously acute treatment patients and require an intensity of care which was not previously the case. So the patient load is increasing. In places like Hamilton it is over 2,000 cases a year, I gather, while the professional help, the professional therapeutic body, is continually on the decrease. What has happened in the standards of the Ontario hospital system and what are the prospects for that aspect of the system?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not think it is right, Mr. Chairman, to conclude or infer as the hon. member has done that the quality of care is dropping, nor is it right to believe that all of the patients coming to us are in need of acute care. A great number of them are, of course, but I think we should recognize that with the appearance or the establishment of psychiatric units in general hospitals, those patients who require long-term care are oftentimes transferred to our hospitals. I think the record for last year is something in the order of between 500 and 600 transferred from psychiatric units of general hospitals to our hospitals because of the need for long-term or continuing care. The quality of care in our hospitals still is at a very high level. I think this is evidenced by the results that are being met in our hospitals.

This matter of staff shortages, of course, again is a matter that is plaguing the whole of the world, it is not only in Ontario. None of us has yet been able to devise a way of persuading people to go into these professions. I think there are more people going into psychology, but more and more of them seem to be directing their attention to the field of industrial and commercial psychology. Many of them are going into education, and I suppose they are doing probably a very great deal of work of a preventive nature. It may well be that their work there is going to flow over, or the benefits of the work will flow over into our experience in our mental hospitals.

The number of vacancies in our institution has been cut in half during the past 12 months. I now have this report, and it is still showing a steady decline. During the past two months, the total number of vacancies of all our staff in hospitals, has been reduced by about 200. The most recent review of the salaries certainly had a very excellent effect and we are attracting more people than we have been able to do for some time.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, there are other branches that are more appropriate to raise related factors. I would like to go back to a policy issue, or to talk a little with the Minister, about the while paper which he tabled earlier this session on services for children with mental and emotional disorders.

I would like to ask him if he would offer some precise details on the eight regional centres of which he talked. What is happening, how many beds are available, what is the likelihood in the very near future and what, for instance, is occurring—and I gather there are developments — at the Lakeshore psychiatric hospital? I understand there are developments in store at Toronto Ontario hospital and at Whitby.

Mr. Chairman: Is it later on in the same vote, in 806?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, this is all right.

Mr. S. Lewis: I think the Minister indicated previously that this is the branch under which he would like to discuss it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: All of the departments involved in this matter are proceeding with the implementation of the programme for children suffering from mental disorders. The coordinating committee is meeting regularly to continually review progress, to re-assess priorities and collaborate the efforts being made to deal with these problems.

They are proceeding with the arrangements for accreditation of facilities identified with this programme. An accreditation board of seven members prominent in the fields of pediatrics, psychiatry, social work, psychology, education, psychiatric nursing and administration is now being formed.

This will be under the chairmanship of Professor John Rathbun, professor of paediatrics at the University of Western Ontario. This board will arrange for inspections to assess the adequacy of the treatment programme in all its dimensions.

We have been assured of the full co-operation and assistance of those whom we have asked to serve on this board. It would not be appropriate to name all of them other than the chairman, but the appointments have been made by order-in-council.

In the report, eight regional centres are identified:

Ottawa. The community psychiatric hospital, sir, has been given approval to proceed with the work required to add an 18-bed, in-patient unit, to the outpatient and day-care programme, by July of this year.

Plans are proceeding for the establishment of a larger children's centre of approximately 65 beds, to be operative by 1970.

Kingston. A 16-bed unit in a separate building of the Ontario hospital has been prepared for emotionally disturbed children. Plans are being made to expand this service.

A programme is now provided for adolescents in the hospital and this programme will be strengthened with particular emphasis given to the young adolescents.

Toronto. The new outpatient building at the Thistletown hospital was officially opened March 1 and arrangements are proceeding to make full use of the Thistletown-Warrendale complex. An outpatient, day-care and small investigation unit for children is now operating at the Clarke institute.

The mental retardation centre, which was opened last July, is now providing both in-patient, as well as outpatient, services for the assessment and care of the retarded. That centre is at the old Toronto psychiatric hospital, behind the Treasury building.

A unit for adolescent girls has been established at the Lakeshore psychiatric hospital and provision has been made in our present estimates to expand this programme.

Plans are also being made to establish a unit for younger children at this same Lakeshore psychiatric hospital.

Hamilton. The plans for the establishment of a children's centre at the Chedoke hospital are proceeding with the collaboration of the department of psychiatry at McMaster University. The outpatients service will become operative very shortly. The possibility of opening an inpatient unit in a temporary location is being explored.

Plans are now being made to provide a unit for adolescents in a separate building at the Ontario hospital, Hamilton.

London. Additional beds have been made available for emotionally disturbed children at CPRI in London. Provision has been made in our present estimates for further expansion of this programme.

Windsor. An outpatients' service is now operating at the community psychiatric hospital. The hospital is proceeding with a new construction programme which will make space available for a children's centre with approximately 40 beds.

Sudbury. The community psychiatric hospital in Sudbury is making plans to establish a regional centre at this location.

Port Arthur. A diagnostic unit for the retarded is in operation. This will be expanded to include services for the emotionally disturbed.

In addition to the units which I have identified, we are proceeding with the establishment of other special facilities and programmes for adolescents at strategic locations throughout the province. Plans are being made to establish such facilities at Whitby and London as quickly as possible.

In order to meet our requirements for specially trained staff, we have expanded the training programme for child-care workers at Thistletown, to capacity—approximately 150—and are renovating additional space to be used for this purpose as quickly as we can.

A course has been established at CPRI, with enrolment of 19. The enrolment at this centre will also be increased this year.

Additional training centres are being planned at Ottawa, Kingston and the Lakeshore psychiatric hospital. These plans relate to the provision of beds for the assessment and treatment of the emotionally disturbed children. While it is important and necessary to provide inpatient units for these children, we are placing even greater emphasis on the programmes for identification, outpatient and day-care services.

Increased assistance has been given to the department of health in Hamilton, in the borough of York and in Oshawa, in support of their services for children.

We have been endeavouring to assist local agencies in London and Ottawa in the further development of the local services for children.

A departmental committee is giving particular attention to the education and training of those who can assist with the identification of children in need of assistance, and in the furtherance of services in helping the child and his family. All this is to the end that referrals can be made readily, quickly and from every source whence they are most likely to come.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one or two observations. First, the promise in the white paper was, as I understand it, 1,000 beds over the next five years for younger and for adolescent children. Although I listened very carefully to the Minister, I fail to see where those beds will come from, or for that matter, some of the other particulars relating to the programme, which I want to get to in a moment.

But what I wanted to convey to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, was that for whatever reason, and I must admit the reasons are at times difficult to fathom, we seem to have come to another crisis point in the provision of adequate resources. I cannot impress too strongly upon the Minister that the crisis point is again overwhelming the societies and the children's agencies involved. We have reached the point in time where traditional services provided for youngsters, particularly in an area like Metropolitan Toronto, are being catapulted into work for which they were not designed.

The traditional services are entirely breaking down because of the pressure on existing facilities, and the need for new facilities, and one still has the sense that while the intentions are good, there is some hold-up either at the Treasury board level, or in the interdepartmental committee, which does not permit the required expansion.

One of the agencies which, for instance, is most involved in referring such children, is the Metro children's aid society in Toronto. I think its experience is rather an interesting one and I would like to give some indication of that to the Minister. What has happened is that the Metro children's aid society has a receiving centre of 28 beds.

Normally a receiving centre is meant to be an intermediate transfer centre from the referral of a child, either for purposes of neglect, or from the courts, to the children's aid society—and from there to a more appropriate facility.

In a service receiving centre, no child should remain more than three months in time because it is not designed for anything else. But what has happened to the receiving centre in Metropolitan Toronto over the last year, is that some children have remained in the receiving centre for as long as a year.

More than half the children have remained in excess of three months—between three months and a year—and the receiving centre principle has been entirely destroyed as the children's aid society tries desperately to cope with aggressive, acting-out, disturbed children for whom there are no facilities whatsoever in Metropolitan Toronto, particularly in the adolescent area.

Further complicating and compounding this matter, and I am sure the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) will know it as well or better than I, further compounding it is the referrals from the courts to the children's aid society.

The pattern of referral has altered fundamentally and the courts are now giving the children's aid society fully two-thirds of the youngsters who end up in the receiving centre, whereas before there was only the isolated case. This is because the court's detention home cannot possibly cope with the youngsters involved.

So for the last year, the children's aid society receiving centre has been operating at full capacity the year round. Children have been remaining in that environment, which is no place for them in terms of their particular problem, and the society has had to second staff to the receiving centre who are, I may say, much harried and harassed by the situation.

They have been taken out of their fundamental duty, which is preventive work, so there is no longer, to all intents and purposes, a receiving centre in Metropolitan Toronto.

Another commentary, Mr. Chairman, is that of course, this kind of centre is very poorly adapted for doing any constructive work with these youngsters, because many of them are chronic runaways or truants.

It is obviously not the place for a child with an emotional disturbance, or a mental illness, and you have a back-and-forth parade from the juvenile court which is debilitating to the children, demoralizing to the staff and unquestionably a deterrent to adequate treatment.

I think it is fair to say that reports have been sent by the society—desperate reports—to all the agencies of government, particularly to The Department of Social and Family Services, but without any adequate response. Certainly the child-serving agencies in Metropolitan Toronto have again reached the point comparable to that which existed almost a year ago or more, where they are occupying the place of a holding station of last resort, and indeed, the traditional slogan about climbing the walls becomes quite relevant.

In its recent meeting, the children's aid society has filed certain reports. I want to read from one of them which was given by the president to a meeting of the society, and

he put it this way about the children in the receiving centre:

> These are children who cannot be cared for in a normal foster home, who have a harmful effect upon other children if placed in one of our residences, and who need to be placed in some kind of control setting until they are able to conform to the normal rules of behaviour. The society is not in a position to provide this type of care. By far the largest group of children requiring specialized care, however, are those that can best be described as emotionally disturbed. The society has been concerned for many years over the lack of resources for these children, particularly institutional care. It has done what it could to bring the plight of these children to the attention of those who can do something about it.

The great pity of all of this, Mr. Chairman, is that the traditional role of child-serving agencies, namely, preventive work in the community, is totally undermined by the lack of resources. Their entire focus thereby becomes acute treatment in residential setting, and when none of the facilities is available, as is presently the case, you reach a total impasse, and the agency is in many ways defeating its own purposes and the children are obviously harmed and damaged in the process.

I cannot put too strongly to the Minister—and I hope he will agree with me—that there is no room to be sanguine. Something remains profoundly wrong, either about the training programme or the speed with which he is developing his diagnostic and treatment centres, because the pressures have built up again. The pressures are at the explosive point again and any conversation, I suggest to you, with some of the child-serving agencies will only corroborate that fact. They have made the submission endlessly and it is now up to government to respond, and I use this opportunity at this moment in the estimates to put it to the Minister that way. For whatever reason, be it better case-finding or a change in the society, we are identifying increasing numbers of disturbed children and we are bringing them into care rather more rapidly. The acceleration in that rate of case-finding must be matched by a departmental response.

Part of the departmental response, Mr. Chairman—because perhaps there is for the department no alternative—is to incarcerate these youngsters in Ontario hospitals; that is where many of them have ended up, in adult wards of Ontario hospitals. And the Minister has changed his stance on this question from time to time. Two years ago he was very forthcoming; recently he has been most uncommunicative on the question of children in Ontario hospitals even when asking about the length of stay. But I want to say to him, Mr. Chairman—so that one understands it is a question of social philosophy and it has nothing to do with medical philosophy either, it is a question of social philosophy—that he should provide resources for children and he should not put himself in the position as a government of consigning them to adult institutions.

I was interested, Mr. Chairman, when Dr. Rabinovitch, who runs the Hawthorne centre in Michigan which many people would agree is the finest children's centre on the North American continent, came to the Toronto children's aid society and addressed that society in March. He said as follows, and I want to put it on the record because I think it is important:

> All communities simply have to ask themselves how many emergency beds they have, especially for emotionally disturbed adolescents. This is, in any large city, an absolute essential.

And I drive this next sentence home to the Minister:

> You cannot take children and adolescents and put them in emergency adult wards which are often the most troubled and the saddest of all with many addicts, alcoholics and some very, very acutely disturbed adults. I hope the day is past when we put children in adult wards. It is not good for the children and it is very bad for the adults as well.

Mr. Chairman, one could invoke all kinds of professional opinion to give substance to that argument, and I say to the Minister that whereas he has been driven in the past to this unacceptable extremity, he should not allow himself to be driven there hereafter. He must, in fact, construct special units for adolescents; he must, in fact, construct special units for children, and he has to move at it with a herculean energy because nothing less will suffice.

There are certain other questions arising from the white paper which should be raised. They are fundamental but they are not major in the sense that we have reached yet another emergency and government must respond. I have to admit, Mr. Chairman, that there has been some show of response and I think I

mentioned to the Minister some time ago that the moment this government indicated a willingness to move, then we in the Opposition would join with them in what it was endeavouring to accomplish. But the resolve must not be lacking and the year 1967 cannot be allowed to pass without the construction of several hundred beds for adolescents and children in this province for acute psychiatric treatment, and the crash training programme for the personnel involved. One hundred and fifty child care workers at Thistletown and 19 child care workers at CPRI is not what anyone would call a crash programme, and a week ago the Minister himself revealed that things are very difficult indeed at the university level and some of the professions in order to facilitate training for these professionals.

I make those observations, Mr. Chairman, in a spirit which is less critical than in the past, but which is equally as urgent, because we have again reached a crisis point and it will overwhelm the Minister and the agencies unless he responds within the next two to three months.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I recognize the validity of what the hon. member has said, and I can assure him that we are not sanguine about it. I would point out our actions so far in going ahead and doing things without the approval of this House, because you have not voted me the money to do the things that have been done. Perhaps I am sticking my neck out quite a little bit here when I tell you that I have spent a good deal of the money that I have not even got to spend yet, so if you want to cut my neck off now, it is the best time. However, I think this is evidence of the fact that we appreciate the situation and we are doing something about it. There is no room to be sanguine, the hon. member states, and we agree with him, and there is no intention nor is there any desire on the part of the department or its staff to be sanguine in any way.

I can think of few programmes we have become involved in that have moved forward with such dramatic rapidity as this one has. Although much of it may not be visible yet, a very great deal of groundwork has been done. In the matter of training alone, which the hon. member rightly emphasizes; I am rather glad to note that he is putting a very great deal more emphasis than I have been inclined to feel he did in the past, however I might have been misjudging him. The training programme itself has been stepped up tremendously. I think we were graduating an average of around 30 child care workers a year. Now our enrolment in the first school is up to 150, we have two other schools started and three more are organizing for a start. This in itself is a tremendous undertaking, in less than 12 months' time.

On the 1,000 beds that we spoke about, I think perhaps we may have led you astray on this somewhat. They are not all hospital beds. Included in this are group residential beds as well. I think this should be made clear that we have no intention of departments of government taking over sole responsibility for the operation of these facilities; that is, the actual day-to-day operation of them. We are supporting them and we will continue to support them financially, by consultation, by professional assistance, in every way we can, but we want to continue to encourage the communities to become involved.

This is in keeping with a long-enunciated philosophy—and a philosophy on which all three parties in this House have been in agreement—that boards at the local level should operate many of these facilities. Here, I think, is an outstanding opportunity for communities, for society at large, to become involved in this very worthwhile programme. Indeed, we have very active and interested approaches from two well-known organizations, which I am not at liberty yet to name because we are still in the process of discussion with them. I have almost certainty that one organization will get into it and I can assure you if this organization does get into it, it will make a success of it. We have a very great deal of interested comments and the very interested desire for further information from another very well-known voluntary organization. If we can get these people at the community level deeply involved in matters of this kind, then I am quite certain that the programme will go forward.

On page 12 of the white paper we pointed out the capital costs for new construction of 500 beds, then we mentioned the maintenance cost for 1,000 beds, and this is the initial period of development. Apparently we have about 500 beds altogether now. Quite a number of those have been added in the last few months, and as I say, added with money that I have not really officially got yet. So I think it is evident that we are moving forward and we are very much aware of the critical period through which this service is going and we are very much aware of the critical need.

We have set up—I think it is to be on May 11—a workshop with children's aid societies

to advise them of the services that are available now, where they are located, what they will provide and what procedures are required to seek services for the children.

I am somewhat concerned about what the hon. member says about children being held in the receiving centre for as much as a year. We have no knowledge of this directly, I can assure you of that, and we have been working with the children's aid societies since the tabling of the white paper, in order that we help them insofar as is possible to dispose of their critical case loads to the best of our ability. This is, I think, the most fertile seed for the success of the movement, that there is very close liaison and consultation, continuing discussion, with the agencies and the coordinating arm of the government in this field.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, maybe then it is a very good measure of how the crisis has accelerated over the last two or three months, but despite the efforts of the Minister's department of providing adequate disposition, the number of children in the receiving centre has tripled in the past year—particularly the referrals from the court, let me put it that way to be more accurate. The referrals from the court have at least tripled, possibly quadrupled, in the last year and these are all very acute, very severe cases of emotional disturbance.

I am sure the Minister of Social and Family Services, because of his contact with the children's aid society will know that the receiving centre is no longer a receiving centre, but it is a holding centre for some three months to a year for most of the children involved. I feel confident of my facts because I was in contact with the society this morning in order to make certain that what I would be saying was valid and their contentions can be demonstrated by the evidence they have at hand. Needless to say, they feel desperate, and needless to say, they will continue to apply pressure to government until the breakthrough is achieved. They will be most interested when the Minister meets with them on May 11 to find out the new resources that have become available.

But the Minister raises something else in his response, which strikes me as equally relevant, and a slightly new but related field. That is the place of voluntary agencies and non-medical facilities, which I assume is what they will tend to construct. In the white paper, on page seven, and in the accompanying statement, the Minister said, and I am quoting:

> The basic services required by children suffering from mental and emotional disorders will be available to all residents of the province without charge.

Mr. Chairman, that promise has not been met.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have not got the money yet.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has not had the money to undertake certain facets of the expansion programme which has been—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I can only go so far, you know.

Mr. S. Lewis: We can play that game, I am sure, very easily. I am quite sure that just as he felt certain the Legislature would not censure him for advance spending, so I can assure him, or I can feel confident, that the Legislature would not censure him for facilitating payment.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is a fundamental part of the white paper and of the Minister's statement and it has not been adhered to. The fact remains, and I want to put this on record, that the only place in Ontario where parents can find services for their children without charge is in one of the two existing agencies for children with emotional disturbances or mental disorders, Thistletown or CPRI. Otherwise, they have to undergo the humiliation and the distaste of a family being calculatedly severed before the courts so that children can be taken into wardship and children's aid societies can pay. Alternatively, it remains absolutely impossible for any private referral to be made; except if the family is enormously affluent, there simply cannot be private referrals.

Mr. Chairman, this flies in the face of the promise of the Minister and again I want to say to him that if we are to take this white paper seriously, then children with emotional and mental disorders must be provided for free of cost in all the agencies which provide such services and are adequately recognized by government, be they any of the children's institutions under the Minister of Social and Family Services or be they under the Minister of Health.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that this raises an interesting problem and the Minister has alluded to it in his statement about voluntary agencies. One of the basic difficulties in this field—and the Minister will forgive my putting it this way, I know he will disagree—is the contest between the medical profession

and all the related disciplines. There is a very unpleasant contest which was driven home to those of us who sat on the select committee on youth. It would appear that the medical profession is not happy about the related disciplines being in the field of child care and directly compensated by government in precisely the same way that the medical profession is compensated by government. So all the agencies that fall in other government departments or that do not conform to the medical model, are discriminated against by The Department of Health and by the government of Ontario.

If you send your child anywhere in Ontario to an agency other than Thistletown or CPRI, you cannot expect to have the government pay for that service, even though the quality of service may be equally as high. If the Minister is going to bring voluntary agencies into his ambit, it becomes obvious we are entering into a distinct difference of philosophy.

The Minister may perhaps be prepared to make the leap and recognize that there are all kinds of agencies in groups, equally competent to treat children, which do not require conformity with the medical model. Really, what is at issue here, Mr. Chairman, is the insistence, on the part of this government, that society, and all the families, are penalized financially unless they can place their child in a medical environment, and that no other environment will be acceptable.

I would point out to the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that this would rule out all the treatment centres that have been developed across the United States with such excellent effect.

It would rule out Hagersville, for instance, if it was a voluntary agency project; it would rule out, as it does, the 42 children's institutions under The Children's Institutions Act; it rules out everyone, except for the privileged agencies which fall within the medical model, within The Department of Health.

If this white paper is to be taken seriously, the same financial privilege should be extended to all those that are approved by this department. I am told, all members of the House have been told in the Throne speech, and some of us reminded, that a new mental health Act is about to be promulgated in this Legislature, perhaps this week, perhaps next week.

I would only hope that the new mental health Act which is coming, will depart from this artificial, arbitrary and discriminatory distinction, which has been made in the past, between medical models providing treatment, and all other agencies in the province.

I hope that the Minister will finally overcome that medical predisposition and recognize that there are all kinds of professionals in the field and also non-professionals, who, with proper consultative services, can provide adequately for these youngsters. He will never solve the problem until he makes that jump in attitude and persuades his government to do likewise.

As it now stands, we not only discriminate against families and kids—we discriminate between government departments and we force judicial separation before family court judges in family and juvenile court settings.

My main question to the Minister is: When does he believe that the basic services, required by children suffering from mental and emotional disorders, will be available to all residents of the province without charge? When will that promise, that flat assertion in the white paper, become a reality?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, to answer the hon. member's question first before I forget it—as soon as the services are available they will be provided. But I want to make it very clear; the hon. member has talked a great deal about various services.

First of all, he has read the paper but he only believes certain parts of it, Mr. Chairman. He only believes that we mean we will support children in the so-called medical model centres. This, of course, is not a true reading of the white paper at all.

I think he leaves the impression that it is his belief that a child must automatically be supported, no matter who refers it to a centre and no matter what kind of centre.

There will be two basic criteria: first of all, a child undertaken as a responsibility of the state will be admitted to a centre after thorough assessment by an assessment team. It will only be supported if it is referred to a centre which is accredited.

There has been much doubt in the minds of many of us, about the quality of service, about the preparation of staff and about the ability of the staff in various places to deal with the problems. There is no sense in my setting up a service, or giving the people of Ontario to believe that we are establishing a service to help the children, if we are not sure ourselves that those charged with the responsibility are capable of carrying it out. Therefore, basic to our whole programme, is accreditation of the facility and of those who are operating it—and secondly, of course, the assessment of the child.

But I can assure you, sir, that the paper means exactly what it says, that the government of Ontario has undertaken to provide this care and treatment, in accredited centres, for children properly referred to them, just as is stated in the paper—at no cost to the parents, and without the family going through any indignity, or any separation of the family through the courts.

The hon. member makes a good deal about the medical model. This is probably natural when he is dealing with the estimates of The Department of Health because, heretofore, we have only had authority to deal in service facilities, or to deal with service facilities which were providing a service that was medically oriented. That is all that my departmental authority would allow me to do.

Now, because of the government policy, that The Department of Health will be the coordinating department for this whole programme, it gives us the right to spread our wings into other departments, but each department will be continuing to take responsibility for its unique share of the task.

All my department has to do, is coordinate the activities. But the hon. member, in spite of all that, would leave the impression with you that all of our patients come to us, or we insist that all of them come to us, through medical channels. This is not right.

In 1965, our annual statistical summary of community mental health services shows referrals from family doctors to be less than 50 per cent, indeed 43 per cent of the total. This may not be surprising, yet, to me, it is rather surprising, because I expect people, in time of trouble, particularly when it seems to be the health that is affected, would turn to the family doctor.

We have been officially encouraging family doctors to assume increasing responsibility for the care and treatment of the mentally and emotionally sick. This statistical report indicates a considerable number of self-referrals, people going to the facilities on their own, and I think this is to be encouraged, although my staff tell me that it does take up a good deal of their time, and that some of the time is wasted, in quite frivolous fashion, this way.

However, I recall my professor of surgery once saying to us when we were getting a lecture on appendicitis: "It is far better to take out 99 normal appendices than to miss one abnormal one" and perhaps the same kind of broad philosophy applies in this matter.

Within our facilities, doctors do play a key role in the care of patients and I think the doctor has an ongoing, and an important role, on the team. This is essential if our patients are going to have a thorough examination.

First of all, you have to be assured there is no physical or organic disease affecting the patient. The patient must have the benefit of special investigation, where needed, in order that a proper diagnosis be made and that, if necessary, the appropriate medications can be prescribed.

But this does not mean, and never has meant, that other professional knowledge and skills are not employed. Many programmes within our own hospitals are carried on under the direction and supervision of psychologists, social workers, occupational therapists and others.

Similarly, in the outpatient clinic, once a proper assessment has been made, the professional staff works as a team in planning the treatment programme in providing the care and attention which the patient and his family require.

These programmes, and the staff associated with them, are extending out into the community more and more, and the community is responding by assuming more and more responsibility in providing services and volunteers, to support the efforts being made to care for the mentally ill and the retarded.

In our own special centre at Thistletown, as I look at it, and I have not asked my staff this question specifically, it seems to me that education plays a very important role. Indeed, I think it is one of the main types of our total programme, and the doctors have not anything to do with this at all. This is the responsibility of the teachers. The doctors have an over-riding supervision over the children to ensure that their health is good, just as a doctor would in a community, and in the normal flow of society.

This is the doctor's role, to see that the child's health is good; if not, to see that whatever is necessary is done to make it, or to keep it good; to see that the programmes that are being prescribed for the child, and the therapies being carried out for the child, are not having any deleterious effect on him; and also to assist, insofar as his skills are capable of doing this, to assess the value of the therapeutic programmes that have been prescribed for the child.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, either I am not making myself clear, and that may well be, because I feel rather disjointed this afternoon, or we are not communicating, but I want to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that I

was not talking about the pattern of referrals. I am quite aware that referrals come from a lot of sources, be they educational, courts or family physician.

I am not talking about the treatment which is given at a place like Thistletown, because I recognize that the other disciplines have a role to play, and play that role. What I am talking about, Mr. Chairman, is the truth that the government will only pay the full cost of a child with a mental or emotional disorder if that child is referred to Thistletown or the children's psychiatric research institute. I suppose they will pay for it if the child ends up in the adolescent wing at Kingston or in one or two of the facilities which fall within The Department of Health.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman. The programme is outlined in the white paper. For any centre that is accredited, no matter who is running it, no matter what the type of programme, if it has passed the accreditation criteria and a child is referred to that centre, then the child will be supported under this programme.

All centres are not going to be medically oriented. Really, some of our own, as I tried to point out, are not actually medically oriented. They may be medically directed and the doctor seems to be the captain of the team. I personally believe that this is his proper role, so long as he remembers that the captain cannot do the whole job. He must call on the members of his team and in many cases, the captain is left with very little to do after he has passed on a child's general health and has participated in the prescription of the programme best suited to meet the needs of the child.

I hope I have made this absolutely clear. I think we are communicating. I want to emphasize that when any facility has passed the accreditation criteria, children will be sent to it, so long as it meets their particular need.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right!

Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the only ones to pass the accrediting criteria are those within The Department of Health.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: As yet, but we are only starting the accreditation.

Mr. S. Lewis: All right. Now we are getting down to it. There are 42 children's institutions serving disturbed children in the province of Ontario, under The Children's Institutions Act, many of them with a quality of care equal to that at Thistletown and the children's psychiatric research institute, and the government will not pay and we exclude from all those agencies any child who comes via a private referral. The only way a child can get into any of those agencies is by being forced to become a ward of the children's aid society at the juvenile court. That is what I am getting to, Mr. Chairman. The two traditional centres in The Department of Health, and Thistletown and CPRI are still the dominant centres. I do not know how many beds CPRI has; how many beds does it have, Mr. Chairman, roughly?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: One hundred and fifty.

Mr. S. Lewis: And how many of those are for disturbed children?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Half.

Mr. S. Lewis: Half. All right. Seventy-five beds at CPRI and 64 beds at Thistletown. I think it comes to 139 beds. But in the children's institutions, against which this government regularly discriminates, there are between 400 and 500 active psychiatric beds for youngsters in the province and they cannot receive government subsidy, except by way of the children's aid society. Mr. Chairman, this is the point that I am trying to make, that they are not accredited because they are not medically oriented. You see, if you have a parent—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no, Mr. Chairman, I think I have to interject here. I think the hon. member now is building a straw man to knock him down. First of all, these beds are not psychiatric beds. Let us get this clear. However, as I pointed out, that has nothing to do with it. Now the hon. member says we have not accredited them. I have just finished telling him that we have not set up our accreditation officially yet.

He did remind me, of course, that I had told you and confessed that I spent money that this House has not voted me yet. I can do that within my own system, sir, but if I provide grants for other organizations I must go to Treasury board, rightly so, and get authority for it, and Treasury board then rightly has to tell me that I do not have the authority to spend that money because this Legislature has not given it. As soon as these estimates are passed, Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that we will start to spend the money.

I want to make it absolutely clear again, so that there will be no doubt in anybody's

mind, that any facility, no matter whether it is medically oriented, educationally oriented, social work oriented, or psychologically oriented, so long as it is supplying a need which these emotionally disturbed children require, and it passes the accreditation standards, or reaches the accreditation standards, will have children sent there and they will be maintained just as the government has stated they would be.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, let me put it this way, and I do not know how much more explicit I can be. If you have a family, let us assume on an average income of $6,000 or $7,000 a year—let us make it below the modest income that the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) espouses, but let us suppose the family has between $6,000 and $7,000 a year—and it has gone for diagnosis or assessment of a disturbed child to either the Clarke institute or the Toronto mental health clinic, or any one of the diagnostic agencies, and the assessment has been that this is a severely disturbed child who requires two years of institutional placement. If that family then goes to Sacred Heart children's village, to Sunnyside children's centre in Kingston, to Maryvale in Windsor, to Ottawa Protestant children's village, to Fontbonne Hall in London—you name it—any one of 40 agencies designed for emotionally disturbed children—and if perchance there was a bed available, as there occasionally is, that family cannot place the child in that agency, because there will be no one to pay for it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am not getting across now. I will have to write it out for the hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: Okay. We will sort it out.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It cannot be paid today, but when these estimates are passed, it not only can be, but it will be paid.

Mr. S. Lewis: All right.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: And there will be no question. But I want to make clear that it is not going to be paid for if the parents are determined to send the child to a place of their choosing. If that place of their choosing is capable of providing service which the assessment believes is necessary for the child, okay, but one of the great problems we have faced and still do face, and I get letters almost every week about this—

Mr. S. Lewis: And I get copies of the letters too.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I know you do, and some of them come to me from you too. That is all right; that is your job. But if the parents insist on choosing what they believe to be the proper place, and which in the view of the assessment team—who are, I would hope, capable of looking objectively and deciding objectively what is in the child's best interests—this is not the right place, then it would be folly for me to maintain the child in this sort of a setting.

This is the point that I want to get across, and again I repeat sir, as my estimates pass, as soon as they pass, then I can go to Treasury board, ask for the money and I can say this comes out of vote 806, or whatever it may be. But I hope that this is absolutely clear now. We are not going to ask what the family income is. It is none of our business.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have stated as government policy that we shall pay for this.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We are only concerned that the facility can reach the standards laid down for accreditation and that the child has been sent there through an assessment committee.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right!

Mr. Chairman, I want to narrow it down, because I am really very interested in what is emerging, because it has never emerged before and I think we are finally meeting the problem. As it now stands, I want the Minister to understand that I fully recognize that all the children who are presently in those agencies are there because they are receiving indirect government payment through children's aid societies, and I know that that is true, so let the Minister be under no illusions. I understand why they are there now. But you would have an entirely different kind of child population if the government, rather than the children's aid societies or a given department under a specific Act were prepared to pay the whole cost, because now the difference between what the government does pay and the actual cost is prohibitive for any private referrals at all.

This is a minor revolution in services that we are talking about, and I think it is sufficiently important that we do understand each other conclusively. If the Minister will in fact accredit many of these agencies, not even all of them but many of these agencies under The Children's Institutions Act, and pay 100

per cent of the cost then we will have come a very long way, a significant way, in the financing of costs for children with mental and emotional disorders. I am prepared to concede that. I want to assure him that I would be the first to accept the fact that the referral by the assessment team should be the criteria. I would be the first to accept that and I appreciate that is the case. The problem, of course, now is that assessment teams make these referrals and they cannot be acted upon because the parents cannot afford the per diem cost, and therefore what the Minister is talking about is removing a very serious inequity in the procedures which have been followed.

It also means in a sense the implementation of one of the areas of the youth committee report, because I think it is fair to say again that what all of us on the youth committee felt was that there were many educationally and social-work oriented agencies rather than medically oriented agencies which were providing a service of equal standard, and it was wrong for them to be isolated in another department or to be discriminated against financially. What the Minister is suggesting is that he will remove an area of great discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, I assume that when these estimates pass, the Minister will be so excited about the prospects of finding money for the tens of thousands of families who have been assessed and are waiting for places and who can move with government support, that he will literally run from the chamber to the Treasury board and put his case. I assume he will do it within 24 hours. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to him that 48 hours after these estimates are through I shall rise before the orders of the day and ask him if the money is now available for the children for these centres. I am going to hold him to this commitment, and I expect, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister will say that the commitment has now been lived up to, that the government is providing the money for these centres which have now been accredited. There is no reason why it should not be handled that way.

Let me put it this way, I assume that the Minister of Health realizes that his colleague, the Minister of Social and Family Services, is running legitimate agencies serving emotionally disturbed children in this province. He is not running 42 fraudulent agencies. He inspects them every year, he knows their treatment processes, he is in touch with them, they have to be approved by the child welfare branch, most of them have consultative psychiatric services. It is a very simple matter, Mr. Chairman, to accredit those agencies and to bring them into the spectrum of public financing.

The Minister is always given to such rapid movement, he is given to such an accelerated pace of implementing his programmes, that I feel certain that this 48-hour challenge will be laughed off by the Minister as something which he will meet in the normal striving through the halls of the Legislature. It is the kind of decision that he would make with great facility and ease and we shall try to hold him to that, Mr. Chairman. I am most pleased by what we have heard from the Minister, I want to tell him that—he may be surprised, but I am most pleased to think that we have finally broken down the barriers to treatment in this province at least in one significant area.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I appreciate the very kind remarks the hon. member has made, but I want to warn him, and I might just as well tell every hon. member in this House, there is not much use him standing up in his place 48 hours after these estimates are passed. I have a deeply rooted sense of responsibility. We sit on this side and have to answer for how the money is spent, and while we are not going to drag our heels in any way, we are going to put this programme forward in an orderly fashion. I can assure the hon. member the white paper means exactly what it says, but do give us reasonable time to put it into operation.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): How about 72 hours; it might be a Sunday?

Mr. Lewis: Seventy-two hours; if it is a Sunday I shall wait until Monday, Mr. Chairman, and I will ask the question.

At the moment, the white paper—which was brought down some time in early February or late March; or late January or early February—does not mean what it says. At the moment the white paper is misleading. It does not provide these services free of charge, and what we are asking, Mr. Chairman, is that the white paper be adhered to. I want to say to the Minister that to accredit the child serving agencies presently in other government departments would be a fairly easy matter. It can be done with great rapidity because they have been serving children with emotional disturbances for years, and if the Minister is genuine about it then even the 48-hour challenge is not to

be scoffed at. It could be done quickly because the other departments have an equal register of what these agencies are doing and whether or not they should be accredited by the Minister or under the new Mental Health Act.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not carry it further. I am most pleased to have achieved this modest end, and I want to assure the Minister that since it now appears that the session will go on for some little time, we shall be at him from time to time about these referrals. There are countless numbers of parents who will be writing to him the moment the estimates are finished to find out when they can refer the child to such-and-such an agency at government expense, which of course is precisely as it should be since government has already accepted that principle in its own agencies within The Department of Health.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 806 carried?

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I think this comes under this vote; I would like to ask the Minister this: Last evening I got called to the home of a Guelph resident concerning a young man who has been in Orillia. He is blind as well as retarded, and the parents got called there over the weekend and they brought him home in an ambulance with a broken leg. These parents are concerned as to whether there is going to be some separate accommodation set aside for young people who have frailties other than retardation. I would like to know whether this is under this vote or not. Could the Minister express an opinion on this?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have not heard of this particular one, but we are unitizing our hospitals now. In Cedar Springs we have already set up a separate programme for children who are handicapped, particularly blind and retarded, and then of course the homes for special care look after in very large measure those who have multiple physical handicaps as well as mental retardation.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, this young man has been a patient for three years. He has been home on numerous occasions. As I understand from the parents, he had been in this ward and some other youngster had gone a little bit berserk and had knocked him over because he could not get out of the way. I think they have had considerable problems with him and they asked me to bring it to the Minister's attention to see if there could be something done in the way of having this young man moved to Palmerston. He is home for 18 weeks, which time I think the cast will be on his leg. But they were wondering if some facilities could be made available at Palmerston.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If the hon. member would let me have the particulars of this I will tell him definitely what will be done about it.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few remarks on this vote, at the end of it, and ask the Minister two or three questions. It involves both general policy regarding the administration of the mental hospitals branch and also the administration of the mental retardation branch.

I observe, Mr. Chairman, after being in a number of these hospitals, that there has been poor classification of the patients in many cases. For example, in Cobourg, which is supposed to be a hospital for retarded female adults, there are in that particular hospital people who are just mentally ill, who are not retarded, and there are girls who are in Cobourg who are emotionally disturbed; in fact I believe one of the patients I know of is from Warrendale. Even using that one hospital as an example shows that there could be little in the way of classification in the system as a whole; regardless of it being just the Cobourg hospital, I am using that as an example of the system as a whole.

When do you decide when someone is mentally ill and when they are retarded? Time and time again crossing Ontario I have asked this question, and being in mental institutions or in homes for the aged it is very difficult to tell how or why even an elderly citizen ends up in a home for the aged, even though in other instances under the same conditions, they would be in a mental institution.

I know in the white paper that has been produced there is evidently going to be a great expansion in the care of these particular ills, at least we hope it is going to be so. Again, after we have been around for a while we are justified in being sceptical of what is going to be done, but I am going to be optimistic in the belief that the Minister will take steps forward. But even if the department takes considerable steps in treating and in classifying the new patients that the department is called upon to serve, I believe there are still many hundreds of patients who are in institutions where they should not be. It is just a matter that over the years people have been placed in an institution that hap-

pens to be convenient, or there has been no other place to keep them.

This involves The Department of Social and Family Services as well, because when you deal with the homes for the aged or the 40 institutions the member for Scarborough West mentioned in dealing with younger people, this will involve The Department of Social and Family Services.

So there needs to be a greater liaison between the various branches of The Department of Health, as well as with The Department of Social and Family Services. I would like to know from the Minister—again I use Cobourg as an example—how a mentally disturbed girl and mentally-ill women, can be placed in a place like Cobourg, which is supposed to be for retarded adults, for retarded female adults. Could the Minister answer that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, there are a few mentally-disturbed women admitted to Cobourg, for convenience for themselves. They are from the district, or area, in which the hospital is located, and it is more for their convenience than anything else. In the main, they are short-term cases and they are, therefore, not likely to stay in hospital very long.

Mental retardation and emotional disturbance in combination are not at all uncommon. I am advised, and it is quite possible that the mentally retarded person may, on occasion, be emotionally disturbed, that there is really no place else to put her, and she would not profit any more by being moved to another setting.

You cannot change the fact that she is mentally retarded, and, other than to help her emotional disturbance while it is troubling her, there is not very much one can do about it.

I think the hon. member said something about safety—fire safety?

Mr. Trotter: That was when I started to speak on the Aurora hospital.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I think in the member's opening remarks, he mentioned that. This is rather disturbing but I asked for a report by my staff. It is pointed out that some years ago, the department set up rather elaborate fire inspection services within the department—indeed, I think we were condemned on one or two occasions in this House, for doing that and not leaving it to the fire marshal's branch.

But the fire marshal trains our people, accredits them and they actually are, in a sense, although not directly, answerable to him for the work they carry on. There is so much continuing work going on, that we felt it was better to have our own fire safety officers within the department.

This continuing concern in the department for fire prevention and fire control goes on in each of the facilities under our jurisdiction, with the two fire safety inspectors within the hospital management service branch of the mental health division, visiting the hospitals to inspect them three times yearly, at which time a spot check of all equipment is made.

There are regular tests of the fire alarm systems made by the hospital staff and by the inspectors. Inspectors provide comprehensive fire safety lectures to all our staff. New staff are given, within three months of employment, a two-hour indoctrination lecture, and practical demonstration of the equipment available for their use.

They are given one-hour refresher courses yearly and monthly fire drills are held in each hospital where either horizontal, or complete, evacuation procedures are carried out for all patients.

In Aurora, the building is of fire-resistant construction as was stated last year. There is a complete automatic fire detection system, triggered by a temperature of 135 degrees of heat, which sounds an alarm in the powerhouse and in every area of the hospital. We have attempted to make arrangements to make this alarm sound directly in the Aurora firehouse but the council of the town have not yet given us permission. There is adequate egress to all ward areas.

In Cobourg, the situation is somewhat different because we recognize that part of this facility is of a combustible material. We have been asking, for some time now, to have Cobourg rebuilt and it seems rather unwise or shortsighted to continue to spend unnecessary money on it.

The fire alarm system there is the same type as in all of our facilities, but, because of the combustible nature of the building, special precautions are taken. The fire alarm is connected to all areas of the hospital, but also to the telephone answering service where a 24-hour staff would notify the fire department of the town of Cobourg.

Monthly drills in the hospital consist of complete evacuation of all patients and the entire hospital can be, and has been, emptied in 4.5 minutes. Any one ward can be emptied in less than three minutes.

Sixty-one patients in this hospital are specially trained as fire monitors to give leadership to other patients. Just a few days ago—that is April 19—the fire inspector carried out lectures to this group of patients. It is rather interesting to note that they have taken the responsibility in far better fashion than one might sometimes expect normal people to do.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, seeing the Minister has brought up this fire matter, I simply cannot accept those statements at all. I do not know who they come from.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They come from the fire safety officer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Trotter: Well, they certainly must have some pretty poor standards. Just observe Aurora—and I admit that it is a fairly good building in itself—but even in a good building, you cannot cram people indefinitely into one room—even if the thing did not burn down, they could certainly suffocate from smoke.

But to pack the number of people into dormitories at Aurora, under the conditions that are still existing—I assume there has been no change—is a disgrace and the whole administration of this department should look into that type of building. No matter how fire resistant a building is, even the paint on the walls can still produce enough smoke to suffocate the people.

Mr. Chairman: Would it be agreeable to the member if we discuss this under the next vote, No. 807?

Mr. Trotter: No, he is answering one part of my question. This could literally come under general administration; it will either come up under the Cobourg—

Mr. Chairman: As long as the member does not bring it up twice.

Mr. Trotter: I will not bring it up twice, I will be quite happy to deal with it now.

Again, on the Cobourg matter, that is an ancient hospital. Admittedly, it is spotlessly clean, one of the cleanest public buildings I have been in, and when you think of the difficulty the staff must have, with about 36 girls in one dormitory, it must be very hard to keep clean—but it is spotless.

It is still a firetrap. Even the fire inspector's report says the building is of combustible material. And that building could become a major disaster, no matter how neat it is kept, if a fire were to start. And if it were to start in the evening, particularly with girls who are retarded—if it started at night with 36 in some dormitories—you are going to end up with a major disaster if a change is not made in the near future.

You are just playing with fate, taking too many risks to let this go on, year in and year out. In Aurora, where the retardeds are certainly of a much lower IQ than in Cobourg, they simply would not know how to handle themselves, because they are under much more crowded conditions than they are in Cobourg.

I cannot press too emphatically to the Minister that the Treasury board should do something for him, in order to alleviate the situation, again these two examples, Aurora and Cobourg.

I know in Cobourg that they have been hearing for a number of years that the buildings are going to be torn down, particularly the dormitories they have, and new buildings constructed. They have been hearing it and hoping for it, for years. They were talking about changes at Aurora, just like there were going to be improvements down at 999 Queen West.

But they do not happen. Maybe they are coming, but these changes simply have not been taking place, although they have been hoped for, and there were rumours that something was going to be done, for some considerable time.

The Minister, when I asked him a question about why a mentally-ill person did end up in the retarded hospital, he said, in some cases, it is for convenience. But in his answer he used about five words that really give the answer, and it is this "there is no place else to put her."

Now I cannot understand, even as a matter of convenience, that this situation could, or should, happen, because we are told that there is a great difference between a mentally ill person and a person who is retarded. I would assume that the whole programme for teaching, again for an example, at Cobourg, would be to teach and help people who are retarded, not those who are mentally ill—so that it would be like putting someone who had an appendicitis problem with the surgeon operating on people who have kidney trouble. This is about how the situation is in many—in fact, in all of our institutions.

I think that, under this particular vote, Mr. Chairman, what is needed is an overall programme. Despite the white paper, we still do not have an overall programme for our people who are mentally ill and who are retarded.

This department needs to have certain goals. Admittedly it has now got 57 good men. You have certainly got the top echelon lined up, but unless you have an overall goal, unless there is a certainty that the Treasury board is going to vote the necessary funds, this department, and this particular phase of the department's work, is not going to go very far, very fast—despite the white paper.

There is one thing that I would like to see, Mr. Chairman—I have suggested it before, but no matter who forms the next administration after an election—I would like to see this Legislature appoint a select committee that looks into the problems of the mentally ill and those that are retarded.

I know there are many weaknesses of select committees. Often they bring in reports which are filed away to gather dust. But one thing that a select committee does do, and could do, in this particular case, is that the various hearings which are held, and the briefs that are presented, would get a great deal of publicity in the press.

I think that once the public knew of the serious situation of the lack of treatment, and of the lack of facilities for those that are mentally ill and are retarded, that governments would be forced by the public, no matter what political party that government was, to vote the necessary funds to see that the facilities and the personnel were provided.

This is one of the major problems that the Minister is labouring under. He simply does not have the funds and, therefore, he cannot do what he should do, and I hope, what he really wants to do. He is in a position always of being embarrassed and having to cover up for Aurora, and Cobourg, and Orillia, and 999 Queen Street, and Whitby—all these ancient places.

He is in a position, because he is the Minister, of having to cover up and make the best of a bad job. If the funds were made available by governments, then many of these problems could be solved, or at least, we could go a long way to providing the facilities and the personnel that are needed.

So in this particular vote, which involves a broad picture of administration, I would like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that once again, it seems, year in and year out, that very little is actually being done in relation to the problem that we have on hand.

There is one final question I would like to ask the Minister on this vote and it is this: the fact that residences have been established for retarded children, particularly in the Metropolitan Toronto area, has taken off a lot of the pressure from Orillia and Smiths Falls.

I think that nearly 1,000 applications which would have gone to Orillia or Smiths Falls, are now taken care of by the residences and the schools established by the Metropolitan Toronto retarded association. They still need two schools for retarded children in Metro Toronto, and I was wondering if there was any progress made in that respect.

I know the Minister can say to me, "Well, this comes under The Department of Education, and that is the Minister of Education," but the truth of it is, that unless these schools are established, the children, or their parents, are going to be banging on the doors of an overcrowded Orillia. I would like to know if there is any immediate hope of schools—the new needed schools—being established in the Metro area.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we have no knowledge of an application actually having been made yet, for authority to establish more schools in Metro Toronto, but I have not cleared this point specifically with the coordinator for mental retardation.

I can say this to the hon. member, sir, that if the facility is needed, and the normal application is made, it will be processed just as quickly as it is possible for the coordinating committee to pass it. There has been no holdup to the best of my knowledge in approvals for any facilities for which application has been made. I cannot speak with authority about the schools, but I do know after talking to my colleague, the Minister of Family and Social Services, that applications for residential facilities are being processed steadily, with I think something of the order of 30 to 35 in the hopper at the present time and moving forward. Unfortunately I am not in a position to talk about the schools.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I think, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: One moment, please, before the hon. leader of the Opposition speaks. I take it the member meant community schools, not hospital schools?

Mr. Trotter: No, community schools.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the Minister could tell me if this mental health division has jurisdiction over the psychiatric wards in general hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Indirectly, yes.

Mr. Nixon: I know the Minister would agree that the establishment and expansion of these wards has been of tremendous service to the communities where they are going. No longer is it necessary for a person who is suffering from mental illness to be sent to an Ontario hospital immediately, and there is, in many communities now, very good treatment available on a short-term basis. I wonder if the Minister could give me any information as to how this type of treatment is expanding and what effect it is having, if anything, on the numbers that are being sent on to the Ontario hospitals that are directly under this division?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is no doubt that it is expanding quite rapidly. I think by the end of 1967 we will have over 1,000 beds in general hospitals in the province. The average per-patient stay is now 21 days. Last year I think there were almost 10,000 patients submitted to the psychiatric units of general hospitals. Of those, I think something of the order of 559 were transferred to Ontario hospitals for long care. I may say that the readmission rates in psychiatric units of general hospitals is greater than that of the Ontario hospitals, which I think bears out the philosophy to which I have given voice on occasion. There is not a doubt in the world that they are performing a very useful function. In this regard the department does have a good deal to do with it because we have to give approval for the establishment of these facilities in meeting the psychiatric needs of the region, and we have encouraged this in very large measure.

Mr. Nixon: I have heard the Minister say on several occasions how important it is in the long view to have these facilities established at a community level. I was wondering if in the policy that he has in mind at the present time as established by his recent pronouncement there would be any additional assistance or encouragement for the establishment and enlargement of these psychiatric wards. It is not possible economically to abandon our large centralized hospitals for the care of the mentally ill, but in the long run we all agree that if we can have facilities at the community level, although the readmission rate is high as he says, the average stay itself is low, and this means surely that the family and the community are brought more into the treatment and the assistance of the victims of mental illness. It appears to me that it should be a cornerstone of the long-range planning of the department in this particular area to see that these psychiatric facilities at the community level, associated with the general hospital, would be strengthened and improved.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is very definitely in our immediate as well as long-range planning. I gave the member wrong figures. By the end of 1967 there will be 1,400 psychiatric beds in general hospitals; 210 in the eastern region, that is the Kingston, Ottawa area; there are 66 in the Lake Ontario region, or Peterborough, Belleville; in the metropolitan region, 594; in the Niagara region, 164; Lake Erie region, 90; Lake St. Clair region, 141; none in the upper Grand River region; 34 in the Georgian Bay region at one hospital; 91 in northeastern Ontario region; and 24 in the Lakehead region; for a total of 1,414. These figures include the Clarke institute, of course, and the community psychiatric hospitals which are scattered across the province. The assistance available for them is two thirds of the total capital construction cost plus basic equipment and furnishings, just the same as we now provide for all general hospitals.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said there would be 594 psychiatric beds for Metro. I understand there have been no psychiatric beds built in downtown Toronto in the last five years and this is where the great pressure is for psychiatric beds. How many of these 594 beds for Metro are in downtown Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, during the last year we just added 204 beds in the Clarke institute. That is downtown Toronto, and they are all psychiatric beds established under The Public Hospitals Act. Toronto, Queensway, 33; Toronto, St. Joseph's, 25; Toronto, St. Michael's, 30; Toronto, Wellesley, 29; Toronto, Western, 39; Toronto, Women's College, 20; Toronto, Clarke institute, 204. The others are in the other municipalities. North York, Branson, 24; North York, General, to open this year, 83; Scarborough, Centennial, to open this year, 44; Scarborough, General, 20.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, are any of these psychiatric beds which the Minister refers to contemplated for the new Etobicoke General hospital?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I believe the unit in the new Etobicoke General is 40 to 45 beds. I think I should add, as my director has pointed out, that psychiatric beds being established in outside hospitals, of course, take the load off the central area. This is part of the

plan to get away from this centralization into the great big hospital; this is part of our plan to cut down the size of the active treatment units in present Ontario hospitals so they will continue to serve a regional need but there will not be the need to bring patients from the large catchment areas which they have served in the past.

Mr. Trotter: I was wondering about that. Even despite the fact that the homes for special care have taken a number of patients from 999 Queen Street, there are only 100 less patients at 999 Queen than there were a year ago. I think about 300 to 400 patients went from Queen Street to homes for special care, but because there are still that many more patients going to Queen Street, being in a centrally located area in Toronto, they are still under extremely heavy pressure to accommodate all their patients.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister for a little elaboration on the 40 beds that he has mentioned would be added in the city of Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: These are not to be added, they are there now, but the present building is to be demolished and a new one is to be established where the Braid building is. You know the old Braid building is coming down.

Mr. Newman: That is the IODE?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, at the IODE where they have the community psychiatric hospital. They have got 40 beds now being used for children—52 beds now being used for general, and 40 will be built in the new tower for children alone. The new hospital is 52 beds and the new tower will have 40 beds for children and 28 for adults. I am sorry, the children's hospital is not to be in the tower, it is to be a separate building.

Mr. Newman: The additional beds in the community would only be approximately 20-some, then, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not the total beds in the community, I am referring to beds at IODE. It was 37, it is going up to 120.

Mr. Newman: It is going up to 120?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: A total of 120.

Mr. Newman: With the additions that the Minister has mentioned here this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not know that I specifically mentioned yours, I only spoke about the 40 children's beds.

Mr. Newman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: But the total will go up to 120 from the original 37—there are now 37. In Windsor Hotel Dieu 35; Windsor Metropolitan 30; Windsor IODE 52, and this 52 goes up to 120.

Mr. Newman: The 62 will go up to 120 in the IODE?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Fifty-two will go up to 120.

Mr. Newman: Right. Thank you.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, before this vote carries I find myself impelled regretfully to lodge a protest against a statement attributed in the press to the director of mental health in this department, Dr. H. W. Henderson. I am well aware that it is possible that people can be inaccurately quoted in the press, and if the quotations which I will refer to in a moment are inaccurate I would merely ask to be advised of that fact and I will have nothing more to say. If, however, they reasonably represent what was said, then I do plan to make a few comments.

To get the sequence of events, as I understand it the member for Scarborough West wrote a letter to the Minister back in January which he made public, protesting the committal of a young boy, who I think at the time was at St. John's training school, to an Ontario hospital. In the course of his letter he referred to the fact that the consulting psychiatrist was Dr. John Rich. The press thereupon contacted Dr. Rich who, in effect, without going into the details, said that this was really only one instance of a much larger problem. He went on to say that there were 40 boys in St. John's training school, or about 25 per cent of the total, who had no business being there, but because of the inadequacy of facilities for treating emotionally disturbed children, there was nowhere else to send them.

That is the background, as briefly as I can make it.

In relation to that statement, Dr. Henderson was quoted in the press and I have two different newspapers here; on January 21, 1967, along the following lines. In the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of that date it is stated:

> New Democratic Party charges that 40 emotionally disturbed boys are being neglected in an Ontario training school do not carry much weight because they emanate from a political source, Dr. H. W. Henderson, the government's director of mental health, said yesterday. Dr. Henderson, executive director of the mental health branch of The Health Department, said that considering the source he was not willing to accept the charges at face value.

The Toronto *Telegram* reported the same incident as follows—the *Telegram* for the same date, I may say:

> Charges that 40 emotionally disturbed boys are being neglected in an Uxbridge training school are "primarily a political issue", Ontario's director of mental health services said today. Dr. H. William Henderson said the charges made by New Democratic members do not carry much weight because of their political source. He is unwilling to accept them at face value, he said.

And so on. The story then goes on to summarize some of the previous statements. Mr. Chairman, I take exception to this type of statement from civil servants on two grounds.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: May I say, Mr. Chairman, the member wanted to know if this quote were accurate or not. I state that I discussed this with Dr. Henderson and he assures me that he was very much misquoted. I think Dr. Henderson tried to point out that he did not have accurate information at hand but he definitely assures me that he was misquoted, that he did not use the statements that are attributed to him in the press.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am naturally willing to accept the Minister's assurance, and I am very happy to hear it. I would just like to make one addition of my own which does not involve Dr. Henderson. Since it seemed to me that the reputation of Dr. Rich was brought into question by what now turns out to be inaccurate reporting of Dr. Henderson's statement, I merely want to say, in this House, that Dr. Rich's qualifications, I think, are well known and beyond dispute.

I was particularly unhappy about the stories as they appeared, because they seemed to suggest that Dr. Rich would subordinate his professional judgment to political considerations. This is what concerned me.

I am happy that Dr. Rich is a member of the New Democratic Party—and I do not think he has ever made any bones about it—but I doubt if anyone would suggest that he would let that influence his professional judgment.

As to his professional qualifications, I will not go into those in any detail. I am not familiar with all the details, and in any case it would take too long to list them, but I merely say this—that he was, at one time, a director of Thistletown. He is at present, as I understand it, associate professor of psychiatry at the University of Toronto.

He is used as a consultant in a great many different capacities, and indeed, The Department of Education, in the recent past, engaged him to do a study on sex education in the schools. I understand that his report has now been submitted to the department, and I have no doubt the department will consider it, and take such action at the appropriate time as appears to it to be reasonable.

I would like that to be on the record along with the press reports, which seemed to suggest that he was anything other than a psychiatrist with the highest possible qualifications.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 806 carried?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, before it goes through, I should like, under the hospital management services branch, to elicit once, and for the purposes of the record, the per diem cost at the various Ontario hospitals across Ontario—Ontario hospitals and Ontario hospital schools. If the Minister could read them at a leisurely pace, I would appreciate it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I want to point out, of course, that our per diem rate unfortunately is not costed as I would like to have it costed. There is not a separate costing for the various phases—the active treatment hospital, the convalescent, the chronic care and the residential. Rather it is all lumped together. The figures are not comparable of course, when related to the average per diem cost in general hospitals.

I would have to admit that the per diem cost in most of our hospitals is lower than in the general hospital, but I also point out, that it is considerably higher than the figure quoted for the general hospitals in several of our institutions. The figures are not calculated on the same basis.

The general hospital figure is based on the cost of operating active treatment hospitals. The overall figure quoted by the hon. member, for Ontario hospitals, refers as I stated, to all provincial institutions for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded.

Our facilities provide a range of services which extend from intensive active treatment of an acute disorder, to long term treatment of a chronic illness, to nursing care and domiciliary care. As stated, we do not have cost figures for the various functions. We are now undertaking to make a distinction between the non-hospital function of our institutions in terms of facilities, services, adminstration, staffing and costs.

This identification of hospital, and non-hospital units, has recently been made in several of our institutions. I do not, as I have stated, have cost figures reflecting the division at the time:

Aurora, $6.21; Cedar Springs, $8.62; Cobourg, $6.22; Edgar, $24.19; CPRI, $44.45; Orillia, $6.93; Palmerston, $29.47; Smiths Falls, $7.22; Brockville, $7.79; Goderich, $16.63; Hamilton, $9.32; Kingston, $11.08; London, $12.12; Lakeshore, $10.95; North Bay, $8.89; Owen Sound, $14.93; Penetanguishene, $9.68; Port Arthur, $8.40; St. Thomas, $8.57; Thistletown, $54.23; Toronto, $10.43; Whitby, $9.40; Woodstock, $8.91.

It might be very interesting, because I saw our figures, or heard someone relate our figures, to the per diem costs in the United Kingdom, *vis-a-vis* general hospitals. I just have the figures checked through one of the British offices. The office of Home Economics in 1965 for the United Kingdom showed a comparison of £10.55, I believe it is—£10.55 per patient per week, for hospitals for the mentally disordered, and £39.79 for acute hospitals.

Converting these figures to a per diem rate it would be approximately £1.5 for mental hospitals and £4.7 for acute hospitals. By comparison, of course, our figures fall very much on all fours with this.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister an average of those figures? You normally, in the cost sheets, have an average per diem amount.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, we have. The average for hospitals, $9.86; for hospital schools, $7.94. The overall average, $9.27.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am quite ready to admit, Mr. Chairman, that these figures admit of different interpretations and within them, there is custodial care, auxiliary service, and acute treatment. I think it is important to put on the record again, that an average of $9.27 a day is what we are spending on our mental hospital branch within the department, and we are spending easily three and a half times that much—almost four times that much—for the average general hospital.

I simply cannot accept, however favourable a construction, that this does not show a pernicious discrimination between physical illness and mental illness in the province. It is simply a fact of life which we have to live with and, at some point, we get an appropriate amount of money voted for our mental hospitals.

I am quite sure if the superintendents could be gathered together on this floor for one afternoon, they would ask for double, or triple, the amount of money they have, in order to do appropriate treatment.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that not only is this three or four times less, as it were, than the cost of general hospitals, but it is half the cost of chronic and convalescent care. It is below the cost of many good nursing homes, it is below the cost of many of our reform institutions, be they training schools, industrial farms or adult institutions. In other words, it is below the per diem cost of almost every other agency of government. The figure of $9.27 is roughly an increase of $2 over the figure elicited two to three years ago.

The final point that is worthy of making, Mr. Chairman, and I want to make it because if the earlier debate this afternoon, and because of what the Minister's subsequent accreditation will show, is that the cost of serving children at CPRI is $44.45 a day, and at Thistletown, it is $54.23 a day.

That is easily twice as much as any other children's agency in this province. The government is spending twice as much. Indeed, the Thistletown costs do not even include the hidden costs, which are provided by The Department of Public Works, in servicing some of the grounds, and so on. That $54.23 is, in fact, slightly lower than the actual cost.

I am not making any objection, Mr. Chairman, to the amount of money which the government is prepared to pay for adequately assisting children with emotional disorders, or anyone with a mental disorder in this province, but there will come a point in this House, and in this province, where it is important for the public to realize just how excellent a quality of service is provided at some of our private volunteer agencies, by some of those agencies at literally half the cost of government. Let no one ever suggest that $25 or $30 or $35 a day for treatment is excessively high when London pays $44.45 and Thistletown pays $54.23. I think these

figures are most illuminating and rather distressing in what they show on the overall. We seem to be inching ahead but I suppose that is better than the position two years ago when we were advancing at 10 cents per year rather than $1 per diem per year.

Vote 806 agreed to.

On vote 807:

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I just want to go down hospital by hospital.

Mr. Chairman: Depending on what the members would like to do, we have overlapped a little in this vote. Shall we deal with page 66? Would this be convenient to the members, if we deal with page 66?

Mr. Trotter: All right. I would like to ask the Minister if there is any immediate concrete hope of a building or more buildings being provided at Aurora, or if he is going to keep the present building and remove some of the patients who are there now at the Aurora hospital in order to avoid the overcrowding?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is an activity building approved by the Treasury board. The sketches have been approved by our department and are now ready to go back to The Department of Public Works for definitive planning. I am told Public Works wants to get it built this summer. It is an auditorium and gymnasium to hold 180 students.

Mr. Trotter: That is just for activities, that is not—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: To get them off the ward.

Mr. Trotter: Will it take them off the wards? In other words, there will not be so many crammed into one ward in the evenings?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The space that is now being used for activity in the hospital will be returned to its original function, to provide sleeping accommodation for the patients.

Mr. Trotter: And is it the intention of the department then to have no more than 250 patients there or is there a danger of cramming another 100 in after you get the new space?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Two hundred and twenty is the rated capacity.

Mr. Trotter: Two hundred and twenty?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. Trotter: And The Department of Public Works tells the Minister it hopes to complete it this year?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is what my staff have been told.

Mr. Trotter: I find at Cedar Springs, Mr. Chairman, they have been advertising for help of almost all kinds in the local paper. What are the staff shortages at Cedar Springs in (a) psychiatrists, (b) registered nurses and (c) maintenance? That is, general maintenance staff—there are shortages; they vary, but just how bad I am not sure at the moment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Business administrator, group 3, one; three physicians; one psychologist; 33 nurses; six social workers.

Mr. Trotter: Is this what you are short?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes. This is out of a total staff of 614.

Mr. Trotter: Even so, if you take a total staff of 614, in some cases you break that down to three eight-hour shifts, and it shows when you have a shortage of three physicians and 33 nurses that you have a pretty serious shortage. After all, on Queen Street they are short 19 nurses and they have about 1,100 patients down at that hospital and they consider that bad enough. I know this is a crisis throughout the world, but it is worse at Cedar Springs—and I think the Minister is probably aware of this—simply because of the location of that hospital. It must be a pretty tragic situation to carry on a proper administration of a hospital with a vacancy of 33 on your nursing staff alone.

I do not know how bad the maintenance staff is, just the general workers, but I understand they are very short there. Any hospital that has difficulty getting a superintendent, is obviously going to have difficulty getting staff of any kind.

I was wondering, has the Minister any particular plan, or any recruiting plan under way, either in Ontario or overseas, in order to overcome this pretty frightful shortage that we have at Cedar Springs?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think we have just about exhausted any possibility of recruiting professional people, particularly overseas. As I said the other day, every time we send our mission overseas we are met with the same story, "What are you doing here taking away our professional people? We need them our-

selves, we are thinking of going to Ontario to attract them."

So this is "mission impossible". There is not much sense wasting any more money sending to other countries in the hope of attracting people.

The hon. member, I think, has touched on this hospital problem, it is not in the best location. However, I am afraid I cannot take responsibility for that, the hole was dug and the building was started before I became Minister and I can hardly justify tearing it down now.

I think this question of 33 nurses seems to me, to be a little out of order, and, in a hospital school, I do not know why we would need such a large number of trained nurses. After all, the majority of these kids are perfectly healthy, they have some disability but it is not a disability that can be helped by trained nurses.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, it is a well known fact that retarded children are more susceptible to disease than the normal child, that they are more apt to be ill, and certainly that they require far greater care than most patients do. So there is a shortage of nurses, and evidently, according to your complement, it was felt that they needed 33, and obviously they just were not there.

I think in most of these cases, you go down this list, Mr. Chairman, a lot of them, in relation to the problem they have to deal with, are in a pretty sorry state.

I wonder if the Minister could tell us if The Department of Public Works has given you any indication at all, as to when they will be taking down the building that is so subject to fire—and even the Minister's department is aware of this—at Cobourg, and when they are going to improve the building, particularly the dormitories, at Cobourg? Have you any idea?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I have not, at the present time.

Mr. Trotter: Again, you are frank about it. It shows the difficulty that this department has in raising the funds from the Treasury board. I am sure that the Minister of Health would improve the buildings if he had the opportunity. But I do not think that the general public is aware of the serious situation which could develop in some of these overcrowded hospitals. Of course, the people who are going to get the blame, if a serious situation does happen, as a result of fire, is the government.

We often complain about these hospital schools. Instead of teaching, they are merely places to keep people in custody, to keep them out of sight from the general public. They are certainly falling down as far as being schools.

Some of these places that are called hospital schools hardly justify the term "school". But even from a custodial viewpoint, many of these buildings are highly dangerous, as well as being terrible places to have to live in.

Even worse, for the people that have to work in them, they can be a real danger, and unless something is done in the near future, we are more or less trying to shoot craps with lady luck, as far as danger goes to these patients.

In the hospital at Edgar, Mr. Chairman, I believe there are empty beds there. What is the total bed space, and how many are empty?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member should, in fairness, make it very clear to the public of Ontario that the rather dramatic statements he is making about the fire hazard in our hospitals, are not really factual.

Mr. Trotter: It sure is.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We do not recall a fire in Cobourg. There has not been a fire in Cobourg to my knowledge, since I became Minister—not even a minor fire.

Mr. Trotter: Oh, I know there has not been a fire, but it is obvious, you admitted yourself that the building was combustible.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: My friend, a fire can break out anywhere. Of course it is possible.

Mr. Trotter: Yes, but you have got conditions there that really—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I have the floor?

Mr. Trotter: I am not going to sit back and take that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I sat back and took it from you. Mr. Chairman, this constant crying of "Wolf, wolf, wolf," when the wolf is not here, only puts the parents and the relatives of our patients in a state of concern for which there are no grounds.

Mr. Trotter: There certainly are.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is not, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Trotter: How you can slough off Aurora, I do not know how you can do that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not sloughing off. I am simply taking the advice of people who are knowledgeable, far more knowledgeable—

Mr. Trotter: Well, it is poor advice—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —than the hon. member or myself. Mr. Chairman, may I have an opportunity to let the House know what is going on?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am very pleased that the fire record in our hospital system is an excellent one, and I can assure you, sir, that there is not a day of my life, since I became responsible for these same places, that I have not worried about this, because of the nature of the patients we are dealing with.

But fortunately, we have not had trouble and I think this is due to the care that has been taken, the precautions that have been instituted to make the buildings as fireproof as is possible. It is quite true that certain of our buildings are still not fireproof, and Cobourg, I think, is the worst of all, but wherever possible, we have changed the construction to be fireproof and instituted a very excellent programme of fire safety and fire prevention.

I want to correct the statistics I gave you a few moments ago, sir. The last statistics were not up to date. Here are the statistics completely up to date.

A total of 22 vacancies at Cedar Springs, and of these only one is a nurse. One business administration assistant, three physicians, one psychologist, one social worker, one nurse, six hospital aides, six hospital attendants, two craft instructors and one maintenance man.

Mr. Trotter: There is certainly quite a turnover at that hospital.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is not a large turnover—only 22 out of 600 staff—

Mr. Trotter: But you get a record, and you see quite a turnover in your hospitals.

You mentioned the fires. It is not a matter of crying wolf, because only two weeks ago there was a fire at the London mental hospital and I can remember a few years ago, the big dome down at Queen Street was quite black because of a fire that had been there.

I am not trying to cry wolf, but I know that these things could happen and they have happened. As these buildings get older, and understaffed, undermanned and crowded, this danger continues to increase. Only two weeks ago, there was a fire in one of the hospitals, not that I am asking for it, but I am simply saying that you have to be careful with regard to overcrowding and have strict fire regulations, which you simply do not have.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We do.

Mr. Trotter: Now, how many beds do you have at Edgar, and how many are empty?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Two hundred and sixty is the rated bed capacity and 111 are occupied. Edgar is not a hospital but an occupational centre.

Mr. Trotter: What would the reason be for the 111—I know this is a new school, but the other schools are so crowded, I would assume that there are people who would be qualified to go to Edgar.

My understanding is that in Edgar they hope to have, more or less, a patient with a higher IQ than would be the average of the other schools and, if possible, to raise standards and make it a little bit of a showplace. I may be wrong on this, but I am making an assumption there.

There are 111 empty beds and with the pressure from other schools, what would be the reason for the 111 empty beds?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Because the programme is being built up and we are not going to use this as a holding centre. This is an active occupational training centre. It is not necessarily going to be a showplace, but rather a functional place where persons are trained to support themselves, or partially support themselves, in the outside world.

The up-to-date figure, at Edgar is, 131 out of 260, so there are 129 vacancies. Students are steadily being moved in as a unit can be opened.

I just received a report that a check was made on this reported fire at London, and there was no fire last week. I do not know where this report arose, at all. I read it myself in the newspapers. My staff just sent me a note that there was no fire at London OH.

Mr. Trotter: It came on the radio.

This question really includes the hospitals for the retarded in general, that is Orillia and Smiths Falls, which are on page 66. What does the government say the waiting list is

now for children getting into the retarded hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is not very accurate, because as I stated a little while ago, no patient is admitted to our hospital schools unless they pass through the assessment centres. But the waiting list for which we have records, was approximately—at the hospital school in Orillia—assessed last year at 322, and with increased services now available, this has been reduced to 150 active cases.

A number of other names are on the list, where families wish to be recorded, but at the present time are not interested in obtaining admission. Here, again, I would like to emphasize that these admissions are asked for on the basis of either the family doctor or the parents, and in neither case do we accept that as the true criterion for admission to the hospital.

At Rideau regional, there are approximately 90 patients less in the hospital, and 50 patients have been placed in accommodation in the nurses' section. I am afraid I do not have the waiting list figures but I did say, in my opening remarks, that it has been cut to less than half what it was last year, and I believe the total was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 600, if memory serves me right.

Again, I point out that this is the recorded waiting list and not the waiting list as delineated by the assessment centres.

Mr. Trotter: I know that with the establishment of residences for the retarded children and the schools that have been expanded, this has helped the government and the government has helped that scheme. Of course, I for one—and I think most of us on this side—would rather see the residences established. Still, no matter what criterion you want to use for assessment, whether it is going by the parents or the doctors, or this assessment centre you now have, it is pretty obvious that there is a dire need for more space for these children.

Any cases that I have seen where parents have attempted to place their children in retarded hospitals have almost exclusively, been very extreme cases where people have been literally banging on the doors of Orillia or Smiths Falls, because of a retarded child in the family—the mother was cracking up or it was affecting other children in the family.

Now these are the cases that you see time, and time again, and the government has helped the pressure somewhat as a result of many of the private agencies which have taken an interest in this problem. But I do not think that the government is allowing for the expanding population, and for that type of case that is inevitably going to end up in an institution. After you have analyzed the situation and the plight of the retarded population, there is always going to be probably 10 per cent of them in an institution. We, as a government, and as a province, are simply not making the allowance in this situation that we should be.

You hear estimates of the waiting list for Orillia anywhere from 150 to 10 times that number. Probably both of those are extreme, but there is not, I believe, any accurate assessment of what facilities we do require. We do know this, that we simply do not have enough hospitals such as Orillia or Smiths Falls and Cedar Springs, and those we do have are too large. From listening to the Minister, there is no indication that these facilities are going to be expanded or improved upon, and I say improved upon with the idea that they be made into smaller schools. Is there any possibility within the next two or three years that this department plans to build any hospital schools for retarded children?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, we have no plans for further hospital schools. There is some estimate of the need for institutional places for children or for the retarded, and it is something of the order of 1.55 places per thousand population. This would be just in excess at the present time of 10,000. If you add up all of the places we now have for retarded children, we have this number of beds and the idea is not to continue to build institutions.

We believe that a great many of the retarded can be maintained in the community and it is for that reason that we have changed our thinking and changed our policy and will support by capital construction grants and also by operating grants the establishment of community residences. We believe, I repeat, that the great need is to redistribute our facilities across the province and for this reason we are trying to emphasize the community resources such as the hon. member has spoken about on many occasions—the establishment of community schools, community workshops, probably the establishment of more sheltered workshops and community residences, of course, so that the retarded can stay more closely to those with whom they have been brought up.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, on vote 807, I would like to bring

to the Minister's attention the situation in Hamilton as far as the hospital schools are concerned. We, of course, in Hamilton must take the people to London and when we take them to London and they have their examination, they are sent home on the basis that there is just no room at Cedar Springs for them. I know of children in Hamilton who have been on the waiting list for Cedar Springs for over four years and it is just impossible to get them in. I would like to know from the Minister when we are going to have a school in Hamilton for these children.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is being built on a community basis—Chedoke general and children's hospital. This is part of the Centennial project of the Canadian association for the mentally retarded. The government indicated its support of this and I think this is to be the first centre which is to be established and operated by an independent organization outside of government, but which will be supported by the government.

I am not sure, but it seems to me that the first service is to be established this year but I would only be guessing at that. However, my staff has no knowledge of this waiting period of four years. I think we need to have these specific instances and we certainly will look into them.

Mr. Davison: The Minister for two years has been given the one case. I wrote to the Minister; he has on file the girl's name. It is over four years since I started this case and she has been to London quite often. The only concession I have is that I can take her to London for a couple of months but we must bring her back home and put her in her home for two or three months, until we can take her back again. When I go to London the doctor says, "I wish to heaven you would do something about this, we just have no place to put these people."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would think if this is the case, and I cannot recall the specific case, but I would take it it is the view of the people in the assessment centre that the child should not be permanently admitted at the present time. This is just what I have been trying to point out, that the idea now is that the interests of the child shall be of paramount importance and if in the view of the people who examine the child—it has nothing to do with government policy at all—it should not be admitted, then it will not be admitted, it cannot be because we are not doing the thing that is best for the child. I can think of many cases of that kind; indeed I just had, I think, about the twenty-fifth appeal on behalf of one certain child and I think 20 of the appeals have come through different members of this Legislature for the same child. In each case I have given exactly the same answer: We will give supportive help to the parents if, as and when they need it, and if in the view of the doctors examining the child, it should not be admitted to an institution.

Unfortunately, there are still family physicians and there are still parents who believe that a retarded child should just automatically go into an institution. Nobody knowledgeable in this area believes this any more. The association for mentally retarded is very much opposed to this thinking. I met with them just last weekend and they are still very strong in their view that the child should remain within the home environment, within the community environment, as long and as much as possible, recognizing that supportive help can be provided from time to time as we have done for this case, and I cannot remember the specific case. But the member telling me what we told him to do reminds me that this is the kind of thing that we are trying to do for the people—give them periodic supportive care in order that the family may have a rest from the problem.

Mr. Davison: Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the Minister is trying to mislead us a little here. This case is a case that has been to London; the people in London admit she should be in Cedar Springs; there is just no place there for her, she has been on the waiting list for four years now and I can bring the file down. I suppose I have 25 letters on it. I have had her to London about four times and she is still living at home in Hamilton. The last time I was in London, last fall, I went in and had an interview with the superintendent and he said, "We would definitely like to get her into Cedar Springs but we have just no place to put her at this time." I would like to ask the Minister, how many beds are we going to have in Hamilton when this new hospital is built? Does he know?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: One hundred, and outpatient day care facilities for 300.

Mr. Davison: Does the Minister presume that there will be some of those beds ready this year?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would not presume that because I cannot recall the details. This

is being built by an outside body. We are only providing the grants.

Mr. Davison: May I ask the Minister, then, if I bring him the correspondence on this case in Hamilton where I can show that the superintendent says that she is on the list for Cedar Springs and it is just impossible to get her in, he will see if we can get her moved there?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will have the file, because I keep all of them, and if the hon. member gives me the name privately I will be glad to see why she has had to wait four years when the assessment team said she should be admitted.

Mr. Davison: It is not only one, this has happened in a good many cases. This one of four years is the longest one but we have others that are two years old.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on page 66?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that this would be the appropriate time to raise it since you are discussing the vote hospital by hospital, school by school, but I understand that the responsibility for the Warrendale treatment centre comes under the Minister's colleague and that would be the appropriate place to ask about Warrendale.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Warrendale is now operated by The Department of Health.

Mr. Nixon: I see. It is not listed here, is that because it is a branch of Thistletown?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: A branch of Thistletown.

Mr. Nixon: I see. I would be interested in asking the Minister, Mr. Chairman, about the results of the professional committee looking into the methods of treatment at the former Warrendale—which also had in its terms of reference an examination of the methods of treatment at Thistletown and some other boys' village, I believe, which is privately administered—and if he is prepared to publicly indicate what the results of that study were. I understood that the study was broad enough so that there was a comparison of the various treatment methods and this might be as useful a place as any to indicate what the results of the study were.

Mr. Chairman: I have no objection to the Minister answering the question here except that it is not before us under this vote at this time; if he wishes to answer the question, as long as we do not debate it. I would like to stay with this vote that is before us.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is in vote 808.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further under page 66?

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Yes, I would like to speak on this, but we have a private members' hour.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, in view of the agenda which I have, I think we could go ahead with these estimates for just a few minutes before commencing the private members' hour.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest. Apparently the Minister of this department has come up with certain solutions to problems, sir, that may answer the purpose if you were acquainted with the individual cases. But I, too, have people in my neighbourhood and I have written to the Minister on different occasions. I might say that I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that this is a proper approach on this subject, that a member has to write to the Minister to try to get someone in an institution when that seems to be a worthy case, because you are putting a person in ahead of others who should possibly have been there before. I do not know how to approach the problem when people come to me and say, "My doctor has approached him, my wife is at her wits' end and she will wind up in an institution if she does not get this help." The only recourse that a member has is to write to the Minister.

We find ourselves in this position, that we get a nice letter back from the compassionate doctor—I am sure he feels exactly the same way about them that we do—but we cannot get these people in to get the treatment that they need. So I was wondering, with a waiting list of some 150, let us take the minimum, how can these people get the treatment that they need and that they need now? We do not want to go and hammer on the Minister's door, we do not want to aggravate the people who run these institutions, but there is a problem here, Mr. Chairman, that has to be handled. I am of the opinion that there are hundreds of people in this province who need care and need it now, and there is no way that we as members can get the door open to them. I think more space is needed.

I will do what I do not want to do, and that is again write to the Minister and his department heads about the three cases that I have in my own little village. They should have been put in an institution many years ago, as I see it. They have a method whereby they say this person does not need it as badly as others, and therefore with a month or two in an institution they can go back to their parents. I do not think it helps the institution or the parents, and under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, we must have space and we must have it immediately for the people that I speak of. I know that they are people who have no other recourse but to come into the institutions and stay there permanently, as I see it as a layman. But who am I to quibble with the doctors and the experts in this field? We have no other choice but to bring this to the public and we do not like to do that under these circumstances, because it is most embarrassing to the families, and yet the children need help.

I hope that the day will come that these conditions will not continue to exist and there will not be cases such as the hon. gentleman to my left spoke about, the hon. member for Hamilton East. I know of a particular case where the doctor has been trying to get a youngster into an institution for the last two years and that file is intact in my office. But you do get this nice letter from the Minister himself and I know he does refer it to the proper department. But you get this run-around and you do not get the necessary results, and therefore the people are still saddled with his burden that they can do nothing about. I know not what the answer is except something should be done and done quickly.

I would like to know why, if the doctor in the community believes that this youngster should be in an institution, why it is sufficiently good enough for the people in the institution to think that they can get by with just part time. I believe, because I have reason to believe, that these are honourable people that I am dealing with, and that the youngsters cannot get the treatment that is necessary by putting them in an institution for a month or two and then taking them out and sending them back home again to frustrate the family, to keep the mother at home where she might be able to do something worthwhile to maintain her family in a much better way, and possibly go to work where homes such as the one I speak of need that kind of assistance. To my mind there is something radically wrong. There is not the space, and I would be the first to say that I am wrong if someone could point me in that direction. I find no other reason but in all fairness and sincerity to say this government has come short of the mark when it comes to providing the necessary space for children that need that and need it today.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member is very sincere in his attempt to help his people, but of course here is where the whole philosophic attitude breaks down. The cases that are coming and clamouring for admission are doing so in many cases because the parents believe they cannot cope with this situation. We have studied this. The research people in London studied this, I believe it was for three years, and taking all of the cases they saw, they found that of all children referred in the first instance by the family physician as requiring institutionalization, only 21 per cent of them actually required institutionalization; less than 19 per cent for retardation, and the other 2.5 or 2.75 per cent for multiple physical handicaps as well as the retardation.

This has been proven, this is a scientifically proven fact, that a great number of the children who can be admitted for short-term relief are much better in that they can enjoy a more normal family life and do not have to look forward to a lifetime of institutionalization. The hon. member said that the mother might be engaged in something worthwhile.

What is more worthwhile than looking after the child they were given—handicapped, it is true, but it is the family child, it is part of the home, and the parents themselves recognize this, and emphasize this. Indeed, most of their efforts are now being directed towards support for community facilities and this is why the government has spread its efforts in this area, rather than emphasizing the establishment of more and more institutions.

I am quite certain that if we doubled the capacity of our institutions, we could have them all filled. I have grown to learn a great deal more about this problem than I myself knew, because when I became Minister, my usual and normal reaction when I saw a retarded child was, "Don't take it home, put it in an institution", but now I recognize how wrong I was. Unfortunately, too many of my colleagues still believe that this is the proper handling of a retarded baby.

This is totally wrong. For the first five or six years at least, that infant has an inalienable right to the warmth and the love of the home and family, a relationship that can only be built up by the family. Now, there are

those who will tell me, "Oh, the terrible effect it has on the children."

I had one of the most interesting experiences I have ever enjoyed in my life last Saturday morning, in Ottawa, when I met some 350 young people. I think 25 per cent of them are siblings of retarded children.

This group came together of their own volition and established an organization, and they call themselves the YAC—the youth activity committee of the Ontario association for the mentally retarded. The work that they are doing, to promote understanding in the community of the problems of the retarded and the problems of the families of retarded, is nothing short of phenomenal.

Now, these kids—and they were all young teen-agers—25 per cent of them at least have brothers and sisters who are retarded—have learned to understand, and to live with the problem, not because it has been foisted upon them, but because they themselves have developed an understanding and a rare empathetic appreciation of the problem.

They are trying to spread this throughout the community. We, in society, need to recognize that these children who are mentally handicapped, are no more difficult than many of the children who are born physically handicapped. We do not think of sending our child who is born without an arm, or without an eye, or an ear, or a leg, to an institution for life. Why would we send the mentally handicapped child?

Some of them must be institutionalized. We have developed, after much study and much experience—not ourselves but from the sum total of the experience of many in this field—that 1.55 beds should be provided for each thousand of our population. Our bed state in Ontario for retarded people is now almost at that figure.

Why would we build more institutions just to provide human storage for these unfortunate people who, we have learned, can make some contribution to society. I feel badly for these parents, but I think that my staff can do more to help them understand their problem and live with it, and this we have proven; this because it has been attested to by great numbers of parents, and great numbers of relatives.

Mr. Bukator: Is there ever a member in this House who wants to understand the problem as the Minister has learned to understand it, because of his experience of being close to the problem, you are looking at one now.

I know this, that we apparently are not getting through to our doctors then, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister.

The Minister said himself, on occasion, that he has said to his patient, "This youngster should be institutionalized" because of the condition of that youngster. And doctors throughout the province are using this method. The parents come to their member and the member writes to the department or to the Minister to get this relief that we believe is necessary.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I might have used the wrong words when I said the mother could have been doing something better, I did not mean it quite in that way. I hope you can understand that. What I was saying was that if a youngster keeps the mother at the bedside, constantly caring for this youngster, certainly she is not doing what she ought to do for the rest of her family.

There are instances such as the Minister himself has described, where youngsters ought to be institutionalized, and these are the type I was talking about.

Having said that, I am going to review the cases I am acquainted with and talk to the doctor, and to the parents, and find out whether they are the type of case that the Minister speaks of in this House. We ought to then start an education programme with our doctors and not have them say to their member, "You are not doing the job that you ought to do because you cannot seem to accomplish what a member ought to do".

We find ourselves in the middle and I do not think it is our job, as legislators, to have to pull strings and put some youngster ahead of another, when the one in the first instance might have needed the care that much more.

This ought to be aired, this ought to be publicized and the people ought to know why many youngsters are not put in institutions.

If this new method works, and it is working, more power to you. But as I see it, people have become frustrated because they cannot get through.

It would appear to me, as a citizen of this province, that someone is coming short of the mark and I have taken it upon myself to say to the government—and I am one who is stubborn in his way of thinking—that you have not provided the necessary quarters and, until such time comes that I can be convinced the reason they are not in is because they ought not to be there, I shall continue to say that you are not providing the necessary

quarters for many youngsters who ought to be in an institution.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on page 66?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, just on this precise point, if the Minister feels strongly that we should not be building such institutions for cold storaging of children, what is this in the vote to be established—an institution requiring $575,000 worth of salaries and $175,000 worth of maintenance for $750,000?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This has to do with our regional centres, sir, that have been announced in the white paper.

Mr. S. Lewis: These are to be additions to the existing hospital schools then, for the purposes of regional centres?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Regional centres for the emotionally disturbed children.

Mr. S. Lewis: All right, let me take it a step further, Mr. Chairman. When is the Minister going to break up these large conglomerate institutions like Smith Falls and Orillia and begin to provide the community-based cottage unit services which his department has been talking about for some time, and which are entirely relevant to what the member for Niagara Falls has just raised?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have announced on several occasions that we are doing this now. I cannot physically break the building down. We are unitizing the building; we have made a fairly marked degree of progress in this matter already. The educational unit, for instance, has been separated out; it is the responsibility of The Department of Education. The vocational units are being broken down, the nursing care units are being broken down, and the residential life units have been separated off now. I hope I did not mislead the House into believing that we were going to physically break up the buildings. The people of Ontario have a huge investment in these buildings and we simply cannot destroy them because their lifetime has not been nearly reached yet; but we can break them functionally into units and this we have done.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Minister that no more than six weeks ago I visited the superintendent at Smiths Falls, which is a classic example around which much of the discussion has revolved, and he said that not a thing has changed in that hospital of any consequence since it was a matter of public controversy two years ago. When I challenged him face to face about precisely the internal administrative changes at Smiths Falls which the Minister has just described, he smiled, and he smiled rather wryly because he does not believe and no one in this House believes that if you sort out the educational programme you are somehow altering the basic content of the Ontario hospital school at Smiths Falls.

We cannot persist in viewing these buildings as conglomerate institutions any longer and if it means actual demolition in such areas then I think actual demolition should be contemplated. You have a population of something in excess of 2,500 youngsters and they are all housed together in overcrowded wards, frequently with unhappy consequences, tragic consequences. Until you divide the Ontario hospital school system up into cottage units, which has been promised time and time again by this Minister and this government, then there is no question that the member for Niagara Falls has a case, every member of this House has a case. In fact you are providing no one in the medical community with an alternative resource. It is either have the child stay at home with all the attendant family anxiety, or put the child in Smiths Falls or Orillia, which everybody agrees is an inappropriate resource in many aspects for such children.

Really, Mr. Chairman, until we have the intermediary solution, namely cottage units, on a small group basis, 12 to 15 in a unit, throughout the province of Ontario, which this department has promised, then there is no solution to this problem and the superintendents of the hospital schools know it full well.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we wish to call in the private members' hour, under the heading of other motions, item No. 23, standing on the order paper in the name of the hon. member for Waterloo South.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 23, by Mr. A. E. Reuter.

Resolved:

That legislation should be enacted to amend The Planning Act, RSO 1960, sections 26 to 29, as repealed and re-enacted at the 1960-61 session of the Legislature, being part 2 of the said Planning Act, dealing with areas of subdivision control, to provide that compiled or composite plans as described in The Registry Act, RSO 1960, section 94, be included as registered plans of subdivision.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I move resolution No. 23 standing in my name on the order paper, and which has just been read. The purpose of this resolution is to provide a remedy for a situation that exists in some parts of the province of Ontario wherein land conveyances have taken place that are in fact invalid, and the individuals to whom such conveyances have been made actually, under present circumstances, have no title to their property.

The Planning Act, RSO 1960, sections 26 to 29, as re-enacted at the 1960-1961 session, enables municipalities to pass by-laws restricting the conveyance of land having an area of less than ten acres. This is a very broad description of the main provision of the section and there are of course many other provisions, but for the purpose of this resolution, I believe that the broad description will be sufficient. There is no argument as to the desirability of this legislation as a means of controlling municipal development. I believe that much benefit by way of orderly growth patterns within our towns and our cities and our townships has resulted with the enactment of this very important piece of legislation.

This particular Act has had several amendments over the years and I would like particularly to mention the section dealing with the establishment of the committees of adjustment under part 4 of the Act, as enacted at the 1962-63 session. I would also like to mention the amendment of 1960-61 to section 26, subsection 15, which validated certain other infractions which under prior provisions of the Act deprived an owner of legal interest in his land. That is section 26, subsection 15, which is quite a lengthy section of The Planning Act, with explanatory notes.

In order to provide the hon. members, sir, with a clearer understanding of the problem, for which remedy is sought by this resolution, I will relate the history, as I find it, of the composite or compiled plan. In doing so I will cite the examples as exist in my own riding of Waterloo county. I do not at this moment profess to know about the situation in other parts of the province, and I will not make mention thereof, but I will give you examples as they do exist in my riding and my adjoining riding, making up the county of Waterloo.

About a century ago, in the city of Kitchener, which was then Berlin, a large tract of land known as the German Company tract was divided into lots of approximately 200 acres. This was in accordance with a programme about the time of Confederation, under which the province was being surveyed and divided into concessions. Proper registration of these sections was made in accordance with the provisions of the registry laws of that time.

As urban development took place, particularly in areas bordering highways, these large sections were divided. Such divisions, or splitting up of the large lots which were farms at that time, was done in some cases due to the death of a farmer and the conveyance was made to a surviving son or daughter. As time passed and urbanization took place, the Legislature of Ontario found it desirable to require registration of plans for these sections and in most cases the lots so divided were of uniform size and remain so today. As mentioned in the resolution, present provision respecting these compiled or composite plans is found in The Registry Act, RSO 1960, at section 94.

In 1946 The Planning Act was amended to provide for the registration of plans of subdivision to control the helter-skelter conveyancing of the large lots and subdivisions thereof by means of the metes and bounds description. The Registry Act, section 94, permitted municipalities to prepare a composite plan of the remainder of these original large 200-acre lots and in doing so they had to give the names of the registered owners and they had to number the lots, each lot within the plan so registered. In my county again, there are presently more than 20 of these composite plans within the boundaries of the two cities of Kitchener and Galt and the town of Preston.

It appears that owners of lots within registered plans, pursuant to section 86 of The Registry Act, as opposed to composite or compiled plans, can subdivide their lots quite legally and no prohibition exists, despite any municipal by-law designating the area as an

area of subdivision control. An area so designated, that is an area of subdivision control, is subject to the application of the rules requiring the consent of the committee of adjustment and the absence of such consent would render the conveyance null and void.

In Waterloo county it was felt by some of the lawyers that the owners of lots in these composite or compiled plans could subdivide without the consent of the committee of adjustment by reliance upon section 94 of The Registry Act, as exempting the owners from such requirements. This opinion was divided as to whether or not this in fact was correct, and in order to clarify the situation regarding these compiled or composite plans, a special case was tried before Mr. Justice Stewart, in accordance with what I am told, for the benefit of the members of the legal profession, is rule 128 of the consolidated rules of practice.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the learned judge gave judgment in favour of the plaintiff, one Alma Elrick. The plaintiff had applied for a building permit, to erect a building upon her lot with the intention of conveying the remainder. The defendant in this case was the corporation of the town of Hespeler, but they refused to issue a permit, insisting that she must apply to the committee of adjustments pursuant to the provisions of The Planning Act, section 32, as enacted at the 1962-63 session.

In giving judgment the learned judge ruled that the compiled plan was a registered plan of subdivision within the meaning of The Planning Act, and in quoting the learned judge from the Weekly Reports, the Toronto weekly court, I will quote some of his comments thereon. He goes on to say that:

> The applicant owns lot 32 as shown on plan No. 832 for Hespeler and wishes to sell a part of it. If the composite plan of the town is a registered plan of subdivision she may do so as her property does not become within the ambit of the restrictive by-law. If, however, it is not within this category she must apply to the committee of adjustments as provided in section 32 (a) of The Planning Act as amended.

Mr. Justice Stewart says that he was first of the opinion that the composite plan did not subdivide the area, nor was it a registered plan of subdivision, but that it merely redefined the existing limits of parcels of land within the area, delineating and giving a lot number to parcels previously defined by metes and bounds descriptions, and of course incorporating previously registered plans. However, it appears, and I think this is very important and relevant, that the municipal board has consistently held that owners otherwise having the right to sell may do so without applying to the committee of adjustments. This view may be supported by the wording of section 94 (a) of The Registry Act.

The learned judge went on to say that the use of the word subdivision in this section, though not perfectly analogous to the present problem, seems to indicate that a composite plan redefining, as it were, existing subdivisions is a plan of subdivision. It is conceded, of course, that this plan has been registered and that lots have been sold under this registered plan, so Mr. Justice Stewart therefore found that the answer was yes, and ruled in favour of the plaintiff.

However, to complicate the situation, the defendant—as I mentioned, the corporation of the town of Hespeler—lodged an appeal with the appeal court of Ontario which in this case was composed of Mr. Justice MacKay, Mr. Justice Wells and Mr. Justice Evans. The court of appeal unanimously overruled Mr. Justice Stewart. I might say for the benefit of the members of the legal profession, in case they want to refer to this, the case has not been reported, but I do have a copy of the reasons for decision and I would like to read some of them at least into the record. The appeal board said:

> With the greatest respect for the views of the learned trial judge, we are of the opinion that question (1)—

That is, whether or not it is considered a registered plan of subdivision:

> —should be answered in the negative. It seems to us that the plan prepared by a municipality under section 94 (1) of The Registry Act cannot be regarded as a subdivision plan as defined in section 26 of The Planning Act.

The appeal board goes on to say:

> Section 94 (1) of The Registry Act does not refer to the composite plan as a subdivision plan. The plan does not subdivide lands of any registered owner, it merely locates the lands of such owner on the plan and assigns a lot number to each parcel of land owned by such persons at the time the plan is prepared and registered; whereas a subdivision plan as provided by section 26 of The Planning Act provides for the subdivision into lots of land that was previously one parcel.
>
> A person owning land under subdivision control wishing to sell part or parts of a

lot or parcel owned by him, subject to the exceptions provided by subsection (3) can only do so by means of a plan of subdivision in compliance with section 26 (1).

To hold that question (1)—

That is, whether or not these composite or compiled plans are actually registered to be deemed registered plans of subdivision:

—should be answered in the affirmative would enable the owner of a parcel of land of say, nine acres, to sell part of it in contravention of the by-law of 1947—

Which was applicable in this particular case:

—placing the lands under subdivision control.

That composite plans under section 94 of The Registry Act are not the same as registered plans of subdivision under section 26 of The Planning Act seems to be recognized by the provisions contained in section 94, subsection 11 of The Registry Act.

For these reasons, the appeal will be allowed with costs.

Now, that was the ruling, sir, of the appeal court in spite of the reasons given by Mr. Justice Stewart, which created quite a situation. As I say, I am speaking only of Waterloo county. I have reason to believe that a similar situation does exist in other parts of the province, but again I am not stating that it does.

Many conveyances have taken place, wherein lots within the previously mentioned composite or compiled plans, have been approved, and title has been passed without the consent of the committee of adjustment.

These plans have been approved and the solicitors acting for the subdivider, or the owner, have approved them, and passed title to them, without the consent of the committee of adjustment.

This is the point, that such actions have been based on the assumption that compiled plans were plans of subdivision, as ruled by the hon. Mr. Justice Stewart.

Under the provisions of section 26 (15) of The Planning Act, the amendment of 1960-61, conveyances that had been in contravention of local by-laws and which constituted infractions of the provisions of the prior section 26, were validated with the enactment of the said new section 26 (15), to which I had previous reference.

It is submitted, sir, that the situation regarding composite or compiled plans presents a similar problem to that for which subsection 15 was included in section 26, at the 1960-61 session of the Legislature. It is further submitted that the circumstances surrounding "judge's plans" are similar to those of composite plans and that this deficiency should also be corrected.

In discussing this problem with some of the members of the legal profession in my riding, I did receive some background history on the matter and the problem as presented to me by one of the prominent lawyers in my riding is this: As earlier stated in the history of this presentation, many conveyances have taken place within the county of Waterloo, and perhaps other parts of the province of Ontario, where solicitors laboured under the belief that composite plans were registered plans of subdivision, and they have approved and passed title to split lots.

It would appear that such approval and certification of title would be invalid, in view of the appeal board ruling, that such lot-splitting conveyances are null and void, and that many innocent people acting in good faith have no title to their homes.

I, in my recommendations, sir, suggest what should be done, and I would also like to read into the record the recommendation as presented to me by the same solicitor with whom I consulted in this matter.

He recommended, firstly, that these composite or compiled plans be declared to be plans of subdivision under The Planning Act, having in mind the protection afforded to municipalities by their right to pass lot-splitting by-laws; or secondly, if the foregoing is not acceptable, then it is argued that validation of these lot-splitting conveyances should be made by legislation similar to the legislation passed in The Planning Act of the statutes of Ontario, 1960-1961, subsection 15, which validated offences and conveyances, contrary to the provisions of by-laws of subdivision control—otherwise many persons owning property and houses would appear to be, at the present time, without any title whatsoever.

I might say, sir, that there are some lawyers in my area who, to put it rather vulgarly, would not touch one of these things with a 10-foot pole, because they simply cannot certify title so they keep away from them.

Of The Registry Act, various sections and subsections have been repealed and re-enacted and many amendments made. It has been submitted that all compiled plans and judges' plans should be deemed to be and have been registered plans within the meaning the The Planning Act.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How did he get judges' plans in there?

Mr. Reuter: The people in my county, sir, are finding the same problem surrounding judges' plans, the very same thing.

Mr. Singer: Oh surely not!

Mr. Reuter: Mr. Speaker, this submission is placed before the hon. members with the hope that full support will be forthcoming, and that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) will take the matter under consideration, in order that the current faults might be corrected.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): I would get the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the gentlemen who applauded know exactly what the speaker was talking about. If they have that impression, they are a lot better off in this particular debate than I am. Maybe I should relinquish my time to some of them to further clarify the problem.

As I see it, and again in the Niagara peninsula, we have many registered plans. I have never heard of a composite plan and I have not been unfortunate enough, or fortunate enough, to get involved with a judge's plan. There are original plans some hundred years back, laying out a village; the village that I come from was incorporated back in 1850. Now they have taken the big lots and they have cut them into smaller packages. The Planning Act merely states that you have got to file a small portion of this for park purposes—five per cent—and we have not had this problem with many hundreds of plans registered.

It would appear to me that this particular problem is peculiar to that area of Kitchener or Waterloo county, where someone, and I would be the last to accuse lawyers of doing things they ought not to do, because they are learned men.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Go ahead and do it.

Mr. Bukator: Learned men who know the law, they certainly charge enough for the services they make. It all depends on how far you want to go back. If you want a full search, it costs a little more than a subsearch. But someone did not do any searching, or if they did, in that particular area, they were paid for something that they did not do correctly, because they should have known that this composite plan was there. They should have known that if there judges' plans, they are there also.

It appeared that some of the lawyers drafted deeds which they had registered at the registry office, as I understand, overlapping one plan over the other. So now the hon. gentleman from that area wants the situation cleared up.

I would suggest, that since the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is here, and they must have come across this problem once or twice before in the province, that we will go along 100 per cent with this resolution to clear up this nasty situation, whereby they, in turn, will do things legally where they have been doing them illegally in that area, maybe, and in many other areas also.

This may be happening, I do not know, but surely the Minister of Municipal Affairs, with his staff of experts, can clear this situation up.

If it cannot be done through that area, with general legislation, maybe the hon. gentleman would bring in a private bill. A private bill can be debated. The authorities and the experts in the private bills committee, as I have watched them operate, will no doubt clear the situation up, make this problem legal and bring about the situation that needs be.

So I make two suggestions. One, through legislation, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs himself, and his department, to clear up the situation, and secondly, a private bill.

We have no other choice but to help a brother in the political field in need. We support this resolution, regardless of whether we think it is right or not, as it is something better than they have had up to this particular day.

It is a most complicated method and, ever since I was asked to speak on it this morning, I have checked with lawyers, capable men on every side of the House. They all wanted to help, because the member who has this resolution before you is a very fine fellow, as you know, Mr. Speaker, and he wants to clear up a nasty situation. I can only point my finger, as much as I hate to, to an old friend of mine, the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He is wanting in his department, or he would have had the situation cleared up. Surely he speaks to the private members on this side of the House—I know there are many, and the Minister cannot give them all time—but this could have been cleared up, I am sure.

I do believe, before this House rises and calls it off, until we have to go to the hustings, that this Minister will show the

efficiency of his department and bring about legislation that will clear this situation up.

If need be, the members of the Opposition would be glad to bring in a private bill—I know we can clear the situation up for you, if the government is too busy.

Having said that, I think, perhaps, I have taken up enough of your time. However, I realize the problem of this hon. gentleman because, if there is a cloud on the title, and the land cannot be registered, there are many people who have a lot of money invested every day that goes by, especially when they must put in the services the subdivisions call for today.

I might just deviate slightly—in Kitchener, the mayor, Mr. Butler, a brother to the hon. member who sits in the House here, has done something to bring about better conditions for the people of that area whereby they have dissolved, under this Planning Act, after eight years. I think if a subdivision is in existence, and they do not complete the plan, I understand the municipality can take the necessary steps to dissolve that plan and renegotiate an agreement whereby lots could be sold to the people of that area, for as little as $1,700 with the necessary services and no frills.

While we are on that subject, maybe that particular thing could be looked into, not only for that area but for the province as a whole.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, certainly there is confusion confounded in Waterloo county.

Mr. Bukator: I thought I had cleared it up.

Mr. Young: I am not sure anything has been cleared up here this afternoon, and it is going to take, I think, the good advice of the hon. member for Niagara Falls, as well as whatever advice this House has, for the hon. Minister to get this thing squared away.

It would almost appear that they have legal brains in Waterloo county without brains that work without regard to the law. I do not know how that can be.

Mr. Reuter: Absolutely not!

Mr. Young: This is not the case? Well, the hon. members says not, but how in the world they could ever get themselves in a mess like this, unless that were true, I am not sure.

Mr. Reuter: The appeal board did it.

Mr. Young: The appeal board; well, of course, I do not know what that means, but you have had two decisions, one by the justice and then the appeal board, and the appeal board reversed the other. Evidently, a lot of this was done after the original—do I understand correctly—a lot of this was done after the original judgment, before the appeal board ruled?

Mr. Reuter: It was, Mr. Speaker, between the time the special case was tried and the appeal. There were some, but there were a good many which took place prior to the special case which was tried, and it also required validating these prior cases.

Mr. Young: A lot of this was done after The Planning Act was passed, so that we had The Planning Act for these people to follow and yet they chose not to bother going to the committee of adjustment. A couple of legal brains got together and they decided this piece of land could be conveyed to this person. They had a cosy little arrangement by which they conveyed it and the committee of adjustment be damned, that was the general attitude, I understand.

Mr. Reuter: That is not right, Mr. Speaker, there was no committee of adjustment.

Mr. Young: I see, then the whole Planning Act was ignored; this is what happened.

My good friend tells me The Planning Act was in existence after a lot of it was done, but the original mistakes were made before The Planning Act came into existence. Instead of conforming to The Planning Act and instead of trying at that point to get the thing rectified, it was continued in the good county of Waterloo. So since it continued, problems have arisen with great alacrity and with repetition.

It just seems to me that what has to be done here has already been outlined by the hon. member for Niagara Falls. There is no question that proper plans are going to have to be placed on this land and that in some way those deeds are going to have to be sorted out. How that can be done? Only the lawyers with a little more sense than these particular people—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Young: All right, I still maintain that some lawyers have a little more sense than those who did the original transfer of land—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): All lawyers have equal sense.

Mr. Young: —and then we are going to have to find a way by which this tangle can be

untangled and this property properly pinned down so that we know where the owners are. All I can say is that it seems to me that the Minister will have to present a proposal to this House. His experts have to go into this thing in detail and find out where the original mistakes were made, if the boundaries can be defined—and I suppose they can—if title can be made good—and I suppose it can, nothing is impossible in this field. Surely we do not have two people owning the same piece of land. I suppose the cloud on the title may lead to this, but somebody is going to have to expropriate or somebody is going to have to waive his title, I do not know, but this surely can be worked out.

I think we ought to hear the proposal, and we should from this point on instruct the legal beavers in Waterloo county that there is a Planning Act in this province and that they ought to carry out the provisions of The Planning Act and perhaps we can get this whole tangle straightened away. I doubt if any more of it happens now; I take it for granted that this is not going on any more, from the hon. member who spoke.

Mr. Reuter: That is absolutely wrong, it is still going on.

Mr. Young: Oh, it is still going on, still going on. So that as long as this confusion remains, evidently the legal minds in Waterloo county are going to continue this kind of mistaken activity. I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister ought to take this in his firm hands, he ought to put some of his brains in his department to work on it and come up with a solution. I assure him that if he comes up with a practical and reasonable solution to clear these titles, and if he also instructs the people in Waterloo county that this kind of thing has to cease—

Mr. Reuter: On a point of order, sir. This is not just common to Waterloo county and I resent the hon. member continually referring to the members in Waterloo county. We are talking about 120 solicitors in Waterloo county and they are all behind us. It does happen in other parts of the province, it is not just Waterloo county.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, this arose in Waterloo county; the hon. member for Waterloo county brought it before the House, it was the hon. member for Waterloo county who confused this House on the issue, and obviously the confusion has arisen there, it has been brought to light there. So I say that the hon. member for Waterloo county get together with the Minister and bring up a solution. I assure him that the members of this group will cooperate fully if that solution is practical and if this activity is not to continue in the future.

Mr. Sopha: Minister?

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Minister?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of abolishing the solicitors from practising in the town of Hespeler, but I am very pleased to have received the recommendations made by the hon. member and the matter will be given serious consideration all in the fullness of time.

Mr. Speaker: This concludes the debate. This resolution No. 23 will be stricken from the order paper.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to go into the estimates of The Department of Labour at 8 o'clock.

It being 6 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 82

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 1, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 1, 1967

Estimates, Department of Labour, Mr. Bales 2851

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 2883

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 1, 1967

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The 15th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour):

This is the first time I have had the honour and privilege of introducing the estimates of a department of this government. And the first thing I want to do is to acknowledge my appreciation to my predecessor (Mr. Rowntree) who is now the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs for the work that he did in reference to the department. Were it not for the careful and thorough building job he did during his four years in this portfolio, my task would be vastly more complicated.

Every member of the House is aware of the fact that The Department of Labour has been greatly strengthened and its services, programmes and legislation have been reviewed and brought up to date. The implementation of my predecessor's "blueprint" for the department has been completed. As a result, the department's reputation and its ability to act effectively within the broad field of its responsibilities have been greatly enhanced.

If you compare these estimates with the appropriation approved by the House one year ago, you will note a substantial increase. Since this is my first time in this situation, I naturally have some mixed feelings about proposing what appears to be a doubling of the budget of The Department of Labour. However, I am hopeful that the concern of the House will be mitigated by two principal factors:

The first has to do with bookkeeping. In the industrial training vote, we are changing from a net to a gross basis of budgeting. Instead of using anticipated recoveries from Ottawa to reduce the expenditure figure in the estimates, we are showing a total expenditure figure and applying recoveries from Ottawa in the area of revenues in the estimates.

The second factor involves people. Expenditure by The Department of Labour for the maintenance or expansion of its services and programmes represents a direct and vital investment in the development of the human resources of this province, an investment that acquires increasing significance year by year, as our society and economy become more complex, and as we face constant change in every facet of our lives.

I realize that such a reference as, "the development of our human resources," is cold and impersonal. Unfortunately, our limited times makes it necessary to speak in rather general terms. It is simply not possible now to detail in a meaningful, individual sense the impact of the activities of The Department of Labour on the lives of the people of this province.

Of course, in judging whether our programmes are doing the best job possible, it is important to try to relate them to the individual. While considering the record of a year's activity—the number of union-management disputes resolved; the total amount of wage underpayments collected for people by labour standards investigators; the safety inspections carried out; the case load of the human rights commission; the total number of persons in training for various occupational skills—one should bear in mind that these things represent a tremendous accumulation of individual problems that have been solved, or are being solved, through the operations of a departmental programme and organization.

On the other hand, the individual is part of a society, and the extent of his well-being is also the measurement of the society's health and progress. Within this context, the sum total of departmental activity represents an expansion of social and economic well-being through the reduction of industrial conflict, prevention of exploitation, development of skills, protection against industrial accidents, and so forth. In essence, the various programmes of the department operate to help people become more effective producers,

earners, citizens and all that these things imply for the individual and the community as a whole.

My own objective, or policy, as Minister of Labour—and this is the policy of the government—will be to ensure that The Department of Labour moves forward in all areas of its responsibility; that it constantly strives for improvement in methods, as well as programmes; that it initiates, rather than merely responds; that it is intimately involved in the life of the whole community and thereby in the mainstream of thought and action; that it is not only involved with those it serves, but that it also involves them in actively forwarding its aims. I hope that I can demonstrate, at least in general terms during the course of these estimates, how this policy is being implemented.

While the government's role is shaped within the context of a changing economy and society—and while its responsibility is to help change the economy and the society where change is needed—its year-to-year operations are affected by, and reflect, the current social and economic environment. For example, in periods of particularly buoyant economic activity, with full employment, longer average working hours and so forth, there will be more opportunity for industrial accidents to take place, or there will be a different group of factors operating to make collective bargaining more complex. There is no reason why these effects should be inevitable, and it is, of course, our responsibility to learn from changing situations and to apply what we learn. All this underlines the necessity for constant study, evaluation and re-evaluation of all aspects of the department's activities and I will have occasion to refer throughout these comments to research that is under way, is planned, or the results of which are being implemented.

Turning first of all to safety services of the department, one of the most vital concerns of The Department of Labour lies in the prevention of industrial accidents. The campaign to improve occupational safety must be multi-pronged, utilizing inspection, regulations, penalties, consultation, research, education and employer-employee cooperation. In the past year, the labour safety council brought together at two conferences, persons from labour, management, and other fields to review the accident prevention system currently operating in this province and to suggest improvements. A second series of conferences is planned for 1967. As a result, the council is studying a number of proposals, including the feasibility of further integration of existing programmes.

The council is continuing to support a study in depth by the University of Toronto's industrial engineering department into the underlying causes of accidents. Another project, being carried out by a team from the University of Waterloo, is developing a system for the production of better accident statistics that are required to guide the programmes of the department's safety branches and the safety education associations. Surveys by the council indicate that people whose safety is at stake believe their own welfare depends primarily on their individual sense of responsibility, and on proper training and instruction in safe work procedures. Thus, the department is considering means of highlighting safety consciousness in occupational training programmes carried out both institutionally and on the job.

Steps are being taken to make the accident prevention programme of the industrial safety branch more effective through the adoption of what I would describe as a "consultative" approach. Previously, the inspectors of the branch have confined themselves to the identification of hazards and the ordering of corrective action; now, they are not only identifying hazards, but they are also seeking to generate more understanding on the part of employees and employers of the reasons why these are hazards and of the best means of dealing with them. It is our belief that this kind of approach will help to create a greater safety awareness by both employees and employers between inspections and will be, as well, a source of technical assistance to employers in rectifying unsafe situations.

During the coming months, the field staff of the industrial safety branch will be expanded and continued emphasis will be placed on the training of existing staff to aid them in meeting safety problems arising from changing technology. Enforcement of The Construction Safety Act is the joint responsibility of the province and the municipalities. We are strengthening the programme through the recruitment of additional staff and an extension of the training programme for enforcement personnel. The regulations under The Construction Safety Act, and the regulations covering underground work are currently being revised.

The elevator inspection staff will be significantly enlarged. The new regulations under The Operating Engineers Act are nearing completion, with the help of the labour-management board of review, and work is

going forward on new training courses for operating engineers that will help them adjust to technological change.

Turning for the moment to labour-management relations, in the field of collective bargaining between unions and employers, this will be a very busy year. An estimated 3,000 agreements are coming up for renegotiation, and perhaps as many as 1,500 will involve the conciliation services of The Department of Labour. Some 600 construction contracts in several large urban centres of the province will reopen. In October, November and December, auto industry agreements will be under negotiation. Other large manufacturing agreements due for renewal are in the rubber, chemical and agricultural implements industries. In addition, several large municipalities will be bargaining with their unions.

Collective bargaining in 1966 was characterized by a high level of conflict, due largely to the tight labour market and to the generally buoyant condition of the economy. The main issues proved to be those of wages and related benefits, as against those associated with security in employment. There were 299 strikes in 1966, compared with 269 in 1965, more than in any previous year in the past decade. Most were of relatively short duration, but some had a particularly heavy impact on the public. Indeed, labour-management relations became the subject of intense public debate and concern. Arising out of this situation, Ivan C. Rand was appointed Royal commissioner with broad terms of reference to explore means of achieving greater harmony in labour-management relations.

While hard bargaining was the rule, rather than the exception in 1966, one cannot say that collective bargaining as a method of determining working conditions is breaking down. Far from it. At the same time, the conciliation branch of the department was able to be more effective than ever before in bringing the parties to an ultimate resolution of their disputes. The House will recall that last year my predecessor announced a new policy of being much more selective in the appointment of conciliation boards, in order to make the whole conciliation process more meaningful and expeditious. Conciliation officers were given more technical help and they were able to settle more disputes—54 per cent of the total referred to them, compared with 47 per cent in the previous year. The number of conciliation boards appointed dropped from 394 in 1965 to 257 in 1966, but boards were able to settle a slightly larger proportion of disputes referred to them. Conciliation officers settled some 44 disputes after formal conciliation services had been exhausted and when the parties were close to a strike position.

I shall not repeat, Mr. Chairman, what I have already announced in the House in connection with the establishment of the Ontario union-management council. If all the parties to collective bargaining—labour, management and government—work together with a will to get things done, I believe this body can make a valuable contribution to the resolution of problems of mutual concern in the industrial relations field.

Under the heading of manpower services, I would advise the members that several thousand individuals are being given new opportunities for employment and improved earnings through the department's industrial training programme. At the same time, employers in all parts of the province are being helped to meet their skill needs and to develop their own training resources and capability through financial and technical assistance from our industrial training branch. Some 15,000 persons are registered as apprentices in 100 trades, while more than 11,000 have participated in short-term training in industry within the past 18 months. The registration of new apprentices in this fiscal year will total more than 7,000, compared with approximately 5,000 in the previous year.

The department's role in industrial training is an integral part of Ontario's overall education and training system, carried on in close association with The Department of Education. There is day-to-day coordination between the two departments that is guided by an interdepartmental committee of senior officials.

Several steps are being taken to improve the quality and, indeed, the relevance of apprenticeship training. For example, the number of provincial and local apprenticeship advisory committees is being increased in order to keep the department well informed about the changing structure and skill requirements of trades. New, and in many cases, accelerated training schedules have been developed for guiding the on-the-job activites of apprentices. A general advisory committee on trades in the manufacturing industry, formed under the chairmanship of Dr. C. Ross Ford, retired director of the federal government's technical and vocational training branch, has concluded that compulsory certification should not be applied to industrial trades, but should be confined to

the construction and service trades. It is now examining methods of applying apprenticeship training to the particular skill requirements of general industry.

The apprenticeship programme is being modernized in other ways: We are offering specialized guidance and counselling services. We have introduced what we call the progressive achievement test to gauge whether mature students who do not possess formal educational entry qualifications for apprenticeship nevertheless should gain admittance to apprenticeship training.

Effective at the end of January, the living allowances for apprentices attending full-time classes were established on a scale running between $35 and $90 per week, relating to the number of dependents, and whether the apprentice is living away from home while attending classes.

I have referred to the various improvements that are currently being made in the apprenticeship system. But I believe careful consideration must be given in the future to such aspects of apprenticeship as its duration. It is true that every existing trade-training programme follows the recommendations of employer and employee representatives in each trade. Nevertheless, I trust that with the active assistance of the trade committees, a careful assessment can be made of this and other questions. We cannot afford to be anything but realistic in the content of our training programmes.

As I have indicated, the department has been particularly active in developing and carrying out projects in industry for skills whose training requires periods ranging from four weeks to one year. Since its inauguration 18 months ago, this short-term training programme has given employment to hundreds of unemployed, or under-employed, persons and equipped them with marketable and remunerative skills; it has upgraded several hundred others, and enabled them to face more complex and demanding assignments.

In the past 18 months, we initiated 316 short-term training projects, involving a total commitment to train some 20,000 persons over the life of the particular projects. At present, approximately 40 additional projects are under consideration by the industrial training branch. We have carried out intensive evaluations of the projects operated thus far. As a consequence, emphasis has been placed on deeper and broader training.

One thing we have learned from our new training programmes is that industry does not need massive subsidization from government. While modest financial incentives can be justified on the basis of their compensating industry for taking unemployed or disadvantaged persons into employment and training, the real requirement of industry is for training know-how—assistance in learning how to train. This will continue to be available from the training specialists of the department.

Under the heading of labour standards I would advise that the labour standards branch administers minimum wage, hours of work, vacation pay, industrial standards and fair wage regulations. Its efforts are directed toward ensuring that the wages and working conditions of employees with relatively little bargaining power do not fall unacceptably far behind those generally prevailing in the community. On a broader social and economic basis, these labour standards programmes are designed to help rationalize the allocation of human resources to industry, while at the same time safeguarding the individual against exploitation and the vast majority of industry against unfair competition based on exploitation.

The policy of the department is to administer the various labour standards actively and impartially through officers assigned to all parts of the province. Their efforts—and the need for the standards which they are enforcing—can be measured in terms of the thousands of dollars collected and turned over to working people who have received less than their entitlement.

In the department there is a women's bureau and the primary role of this bureau has both individual and community implications. It is to help in the removal of barriers in the path of women who want to, or must, be in the regular work force. And on the other hand, it is to expand, for the benefit of the economy, the effective employment utilization of one-half of our human resources. While women now constitute some 32 per cent of our work force, there is a clear need for a higher proportion, if possible, to be in a position to put their education and skills to use in employment. In this connection, it gives me great pleasure to be able to tell the House that these estimates provide for means of attaining this objective.

We are establishing, on a pilot project basis, an occupational counselling service intended to aid mature women with post-secondary education in finding suitable employment. This service will seek, on a consultative basis only, to supply realistic advice on training and employment opportunities for this group of women in the greater Toronto area. The project will also guide the

women's bureau in its continuing efforts to encourage more training facilities in educational institutions and in influencing industry to make use of this labour potential.

In order to improve communications between the department and members of the public whose principal language is not English, we are establishing a multi-lingual service in the public relations and information branch, to provide translation and interpretation assistance. The new service will be devoted to giving non-English-speaking Canadians a better understanding of their rights and obligations under the department's services and programmes.

The human rights commission is one of the most important branches in the department. Discrimination on the basis of race, colour or creed constitutes a crushing personal blow to any individual who encounters it, but it also impairs the maximum development and utilization of human resources. It is for these reasons that the work of the human rights commission and its administration of the human rights code are so important. Direct enforcement of the code is, of course, only one aspect of the programme. Educational efforts are perhaps of greater significance.

With officers located at Windsor and the Lakehead, as well as in Toronto, the commission is in a position to enlist the active participation of the provincial community in the creation of the climate of mutual respect and understanding that will overcome discriminatory practices. Field work, direct involvement with the public through meetings, seminars, is buttressed by an intensive educational programme in which all the media of communication are utilized. Particular attention is being paid to the problems of the Indian, especially in northern Ontario.

The Age Discrimination Act came into operation on July 1, 1966, prohibiting discrimination in employment on the basis of age for persons between 40 and 65. More than 30 formal complaints have been received by the commission and all, to date, have been or are in the process of being settled satisfactorily. An educational programme associated with this legislation has been started.

A research branch has been established in The Department of Labour and this branch is essentially a supporting service for all the other areas of departmental activity and its work reflects this responsibility. In the past year, the branch's collective agreements library has become fully operational. It now has some 6,000 current contracts on file. These were obtained through the cooperation of unions and employers and I wish to thank all parties who have cooperated in making the library a success. It is widely used by unions, employers, students, and others. This library will now assume a regular reporting function. The branch has undertaken many projects during the past year, but I shall mention only a few that have occupied a major part of its resources:

Preparation of background material for the Rand Royal commission, particularly a major contribution to the "Report of a study on the labour injunction in Ontario";

A cost-benefit analysis of some short-term training programmes, involving detailed investigation of projects in the mining, shoe manufacturing, garment, foundry, and aircraft industries.

It is gratifying to inform the House that these studies indicate a satisfactory return on the government's investment in training programmes. Further research will be pursued this year in the training field. Steps have been taken to coordinate our manpower research with that being done, or planned, by the federal Department of Manpower and Immigration in order that there will be no duplication of work and consequent wastage of resources.

We expect to publish material shortly on analyses of collective agreements with respect to technological change, training and shift work. To guide the parties at the bargaining table, a study on occupational trends in Ontario has been published, and the branch has cooperated with other government agencies in several surveys. We will continue to support university research projects that are related to our field of interest.

Another section just recently established is the data systems and data processing branch. Reference was made by my predecessor last year to the fact that the department intended to move into the automatic data processing field in order to bring the administration of its programmes to a level of effectiveness and efficiency that cannot be attained with normal manual methods. While this is a long-term programme involving seven branches, we are already well into the conversion of our system of inspection scheduling and follow-up control from one involving thousands of files and pieces of paper to one applying modern computer technology. At the same time, this branch functions as a planning unit to assist the department in designing and applying modern management methods to its operations.

Mr. Chairman, I have endeavoured to outline developments in the labour department's

major areas of responsibility, and some of our plans for the coming fiscal year. I am sure the members of the House will recognize that we have important work to do that is essential to furthering individual welfare and the growth of the department's usefulness. I will be pleased to deal with the various questions that come before the House during the course of these estimates.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, before commenting briefly on the estimates of The Department of Labour, I would like to pause for a moment to congratulate the new Minister on his recent promotion. I am certain that he will bring to the department a depth of understanding and a great deal of capability. I am certain that his efforts will lead to great success and I wish him well.

During the debate on the estimates of The Department of Labour last year, I spoke of the unrest in labour, which was very apparent at that time. We still have it with us and the Minister in his comments made reference to it.

If you will recall, Mr. Chairman, I mentioned that it was quite obvious that labour and management were headed on a collision course. We maintain that labour and management are closer than ever at this time to meeting on the road to disaster. We have had the terrible strikes and big problems at Tilco, in Oshawa and in many other centres. At this very moment there is an impending strike in the construction industry in Metropolitan Toronto, the strike in the Hydro and at Johns-Manville. Strikes seem to be the order of the day. Unemployment is low, profits, wages and prosperity are high, yet the turbulence of labour unrest is still with us.

During the estimates of The Department of Labour last year we pointed out to the Minister the need for a shake-up of his department in many fields including labour legislation, arbitration, and conciliation, and a new hard look at the whole area af labour-management relations. I mention this because during the estimates last year the then Minister of Labour casually mentioned that there was a joint labour-management committee which had been meeting in secret for a while. We on this side of the House were pleased to hear this although we were given no details as to the operation of this joint labour-management committee.

Subsequently, the chairman of this joint labour-management committee, Dean H. B. Woods, published a proposal for an Ontario union-management council to which the Minister made reference in his remarks. In this proposal Dean Woods gave some of the history of the informal joint labour-management committee, including its terms of reference, the committee's experience, and certain conclusions which the committee had arrived at.

Briefly, the committee felt that its usefulness would be enhanced if its status was clarified both in relation to the government and in relation to the parties of interest which made up the committee. The committee, therefore, suggested that if a permanent group was to be set up it should be established in accordance with certain recommendations which were set out in the proposal.

We in the Liberal Party have always been very interested in industry-wide management-labour forums where there could be a continuous consultation and thereby a better understanding on the part of both parties. Therefore, we were particularly interested in the recommendations set out in the said proposal. In announcing the Ontario union-management council in the House, the Minister made reference to the constitution and to the terms of reference suggested by the special committee. However, the committee made certain other recommendations with reference to procedures, administration and research, and relationship to government, which we felt were important.

Briefly under the heading of procedures, the recommendation was that the committee would be free to determine its own procedures and to decide whether or not to make recommendations on any particular matters. On issues referred to it, it could therefore submit unanimous reports, a report with recorded dissent, or no report at all. With reference to administration and research the recommendation was that The Department of Labour would bear the administrative costs of the committee and the department would be prepared to supply funds to finance research which the committee might want to see undertaken either under public or private auspices.

Lastly, in the area of relationship to government, the recommendation was that the ultimate responsibility for all labour legislation should clearly rest with the Minister of Labour and the government. The committee felt that neither it, nor any of its members, should be expected in any way to defend government policy. The question then narrows down to whether the government intends to completely follow the recommendations of the original labour-management committee with reference to the new union-management coun-

cil. If there have been any eliminations or substitutions in the government's intentions, perhaps the Minister might like to inform the House later as to the reasons for same.

In any event we in the Liberal Party wish to compliment the Minister on this forward-looking step and hope that it is but the forerunner of many other beneficial changes. We feel that this committee could well lead to the continuing labour-management dialogue on an industry-wide basis which this party seeks, as we are dedicated to the premise that free collective bargaining is a must. Our goal is labour-management peace based on continuous consultation. The Minister having made this significant advance, we would bring to the government's attention another area where we feel that significant changes in public opinion have occurred. Because of this it is entirely possible that the government should seriously consider abandoning its traditional *laissez faire* attitude with reference to inter-union affairs.

Bill 73, which is still before this House—a far-reaching amendment to the human rights code—indicates that this new Minister of Labour may have the foresight and initiative which this party feels is a prerequisite to the type of government action that the current economic situation demands. Broad sweeping changes must be initiated, and perhaps this new Minister of Labour may be the person to take the first step in that direction. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking of the new field of Canadian union autonomy. We have all heard of contractors who claim that they have lost this or that job because their employees, although union members, did not belong to the right union. Many have been the claims of individuals here in Ontario that their constitutional rights as citizens of Canada, and of Ontario, have been abrogated by actions of unions controlled by head offices located in a foreign country. From all appearances it would seem that all efforts to work toward labour-management peace may be rudely shattered by this new concept, this new search for autonomy by certain Canadian unions here in Ontario.

For these reasons we feel that the Minister of Labour, perhaps in cooperation with The Department of Economics and Development and The Department of Citizenship should initiate research in depth into this whole new field of Canadian union autonomy. In the department's annual report and in the Minister's comments this evening under the heading of "research branch" there is lengthy comment on the need for, and the capability of, the research department which this Department of Labour has. And so it would seem, Mr. Chairman, that the research facilities are available for the type of investigation that we feel should be made. Mr. Chairman, we feel that this matter of Canadian union autonomy is of such importance that the Minister of Labour should take urgent action at this time to examine it in detail. Too often this government moves from crisis to crisis. There is every possibility that a series of crises may occur in this field in the very near future and the time for government action is now.

The government research branch could, we suggest, look into these areas, for example: firstly, a thorough examination of the problem of Canadian union autonomy itself; secondly, the research department could look into whether members of Ontario unions are being deprived of their civil rights by certain international unions; thirdly, the research department could determine if there is any substance to recent complaints by some Ontario contractors and sub-contractors, and by certain union members, that they have lost bids and jobs because their men belong to the wrong union; lastly, the research department could assist the Minister by determining and suggesting what, if any, action the Ontario government should, and could, take and the reasons for such proposed action.

In another area, Mr. Chairman, we feel that the time is long past for the initiation of a hard look into the question of wage parity and all its ramifications with reference to the Ontario economy and the Ontario labour force. From what I understand the strike at Johns-Manville is based on this question of parity and I think there will be many others coming up in the very near future.

Productivity, prices and all other significant issues should, we feel, be thoroughly investigated by The Department of Labour research facilities. In the light of increasing demands for wage parity in certain industries such as the auto workers, the Minister of Labour should make these facts public so that all may know the pros and cons of wage parity. We have asked for such a study before, Mr. Chairman, and we are still awaiting it, but we feel that the time has come for such a study to be made quickly and the facts put before the public.

The Liberal Party has always urged the government to strengthen the Ontario labour relations board with more men of proven ability, adequate clerical staff and skilled researches. Our intention is that in the field of

labour disputes, *ex parte* injunctions would be abolished and all other injunctions would be transferred to this expanded labour relations board, which would deal with these and other complicated questions inherent in the new technology associated with automation in a speedy, fair and sophisticated manner.

Before leaving the field of labour-management relations, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly on a letter dated April 15, 1967, from the steering committee on negotiation rights for professional staffs on the proposed professional negotiations Act. This letter was addressed to all members of the Ontario Legislature and I presume all members have received a copy thereof. In this letter, the steering committee on negotiation rights for professional staffs makes it quite clear that they are extremely anxious that the government take action on the matter of collective bargaining rights for professional employees during the current session of the Legislature. I quote from the letter:

> As members of the Legislature are aware, this issue has a history dating back to 1943 when professional employees were given collective bargaining rights under federal statute PC 1003, but had been withdrawn in 1948 when provincial legislation took the place of wartime legislation. Since that time, now almost 20 years, professional employee groups have been petitioning the Ontario government for the re-establishment of these rights in a form that would meet their special needs.

Reference is then made to a brief which was attached to the letter and which is not important at this time. Continuing with the letter:

> On every occasion during these years, the government received these professional employee representations cordially, and promised that their suggestions would receive the government's sympathetic consideration. Prime Minister Robarts and the honourable Dalton Bales, Minister of Labour, have been particularly receptive and have led the steering committee to believe that every effort would be made to introduce suitable legislation during the current session of the Legislature but to date this has not been done.

The letter, Mr. Chairman, goes on to ask the members of the Legislature to do anything possible to see that this legislation is brought forward. No doubt all members have received communications from constituents on the proposed legislation. I have received many but only one stating that the writer was opposed.

For the record, that particular professional engineer felt that he had two basic reasons for being in opposition. Firstly, he felt that the bill would not achieve the professional recognition which he thought was the motive of its supporters. Secondly, he felt that the bill would have the effect of stifling individual initiative and encouraging mediocrity by protection of numbers. However, Mr. Chairman, as I have stated, the overwhelming majority of professional engineers seem to be in favour of quick passage of the legislation during this session.

The only amendment that I have been asked to bring to the Minister's attention would be the one to specifically include the professional employee in the civil service. I am informed that if this amendment is not included in the legislation, then by virtue of The Interpretation Act the professionals in the Ontario civil service would be denied the opportunity to participate in group negotiations under the Act. This, of course, would not be fair to the civil servants. In view of these facts, we would ask the Minister to take concrete action on this important matter as soon as possible.

Turning now to the area of construction safety, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks on our party's position. Inasmuch as this is construction safety week, I felt this might be an appropriate place to comment on this very important matter. We have always believed that this field should come completely under the jurisdiction of The Department of Labour. We have pointed out many times the dangers inherent in a situation where enforcement of the statute is left to inspectors who are responsible to and paid by the various municipalities, particularly here in Metropolitan Toronto where we read almost daily of sewer and tunnel collapses. There is no doubt the government should take action quickly.

Mr. Chairman, I quote freely now from an article by Dennis Foley, staff writer of the Ottawa *Citizen*, of February 4, 1967. This article is very important because it points out the shocking situation we have in the field of construction safety. The article states:

> Seventeen workers were killed in construction accidents in Ottawa last year, one of the worst records in the country. These accidents, especially the spectacular Heron Road bridge and Elgin Street building collapses, shook the construction industry to its foundations. It forced agonizing re-

appraisals of long-standing methods and practices. Numerous inquiries were initiated.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this next paragraph is most significant:

> Yet officials responsible for construction safety steadfastly refuse to accept any responsibility for these deaths or to look within. There is no soul-searching within the confines of the city's safety inspection branch or the province's Construction Safety Act administration bureau.
>
> It is understandable why construction workers themselves view accidents on the job as being inevitable and one of the risks they accept. But it is less easy to understand why officials specifically charged with construction safety refuse to acknowledge that a better job on their part might have prevented at least one of the 17 deaths.

Mr. Chairman, this is very true, when one reads the criticisms which Gerry Gallagher of local 183 of the labourers international union here in Toronto makes on behalf of his union members. In an article in last Saturday's Toronto *Daily Star* on Mr. Gallagher and on his union, some very revealing facts were set out and I want to quote very briefly from that article. The article states:

> Gallagher does not speak to hear the sound of his charming Irish lilt. During 1965, 68 construction workers died in Ontario. In B.C. and Quebec, the two other major construction provinces, 121 were killed in accidents. And then there are the innumerable injuries. It is estimated there were more than 18,000 last year in Ontario alone. All this despite the new safety regulations which Gallagher helped to write a few years ago with others on an Ontario government committee after a Royal commission was held on construction safety.
>
> "Oh, it is all very nice to have all these regulations," says Gallagher, "but you should see some of the dopes we have got enforcing them. We are crawling with inspectors—building inspectors, trench inspectors, bridge inspectors, city of Toronto inspectors, company safety inspectors, most of whom don't know bad shoring from the bottom of a beer glass. My men are still getting killed. Nuts," he added, or something like that.

This attitude on the part of Mr. Gallagher has been brought about by what we feel to be one of the serious deficiencies in The Construction Safety Act. We really feel that all of the matters connected with construction safety should be brought under the jurisdiction of The Department of Labour.

Returning to the article of the Ottawa *Citizen*, it goes on to say that this is especially confusing. It is referring to the attitude of construction workers on the inevitability of death. It says:

> It is especially confusing when no less than eight Ottawa coroners' juries in the last three years either noted that stricter adherence to safety regulations might have averted certain deaths or urged an upgrading of the inspection system along with more qualified inspectors.

This is exactly what Mr. Gallagher has asked for his Toronto union:

> When questioned about these inquest findings and recommendations, an Ottawa city official said a lot of accidents would happen regardless of safety inspection. "This might be a defeatist attitude but they are bound to happen." The city's building inspection branch is undertaking no definite programme to upgrade or improve the qualifications of its safety inspectors, relying chiefly on yearly provincial seminars.

I believe the Minister made reference to these in his remarks.

Since the Heron Road bridge tragedy which killed nine men, vociferous labour leaders have decried the concept of the accident factor being inevitable, or that it cannot be controlled. Mr. Gallagher is one of these labour leaders. They consider accidents the inevitable result of neglect. They feel accidents will be controlled when the neglect is no longer tolerated. Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to your attention the views of a government employee which we feel is indicative of the government's attitude. The article, in the Ottawa *Citizen*, goes on to state:

> James McNair, administrator of the Ontario Construction Safety Act, occupies his Toronto desk with the confidence of a man who knows that if he is fired it certainly will not be for incompetence. Nonetheless he holds rather unusual views about the function of his department. Responsibility for the safety of workers rests on the contractor, not the safety inspectors. Inspectors are secondary, Mr. McNair feels. His bible is The Construction Safety Act, which he vigorously enforces as vigourously as one can with ten safety inspectors, two of which are stationed in Ottawa.

> The confines of the Act plus the obvious shortage of personnel leave Mr. McNair with many "outs" as to why his department has not cut down the number of construction deaths. In 1966 there was 72 construction deaths in Ontario compared with 54 in 1960 and 37 in 1962, the year the construction safety branch was formed. The number of all industrial deaths in Canada rose from 1,134 in 1960 to 1,263 in 1965, or 11.3 per cent. Construction deaths during the same period jumped from 199 to 266 or 31.6 per cent. Nearly 50 per cent of the increase in deaths in all industry over the six-year period was in the construction field.

This, Mr. Chairman, indicates the importance of safety in the construction field. The article goes on to say that Mr. McNair uses some of the obvious "outs" to excuse his department's record. Many he does not use. For instance, he does not consider that increased inspections are the answer. The solution as he sees it is to eliminate potential accident causes by creating an accident-free environment.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, there are some in the construction industry who do not see how causes of death and potential accident causes can be separated, including one senior official of The Department of Labour. "It is an inspection problem," this government spokesman was quoted as saying in the *Financial Post* last December. Other officials say, "We are reviewing the problem". One thought is to correlate the work of the municipal inspectors to standardize and improve safety. Another said, "An inspector at the municipal level is not an engineer and inspection is an engineering problem". Yet another comment is, "Even an engineer when inspecting has to make calculations and study the original drawings, for example to check the safety of the work in progress". "After the Ottawa Heron Road bridge disaster, this department is reviewing the whole inspection picture," says another Ontario official.

It is our contention, Mr. Chairman, that any and all changes made to the Act without The Department of Labour bringing the whole field of inspection under its control really provide no solution to the problem of construction safety deaths. During the Throne Speech and in the Minister's remarks earlier, he proposed new legislation. A new labour standards code was mentioned and reference was made to the fact that a construction safety programme, strengthened with additional staff, plus an extended training programme for enforcement personnel would be forthcoming. Once again, Mr. Chairman, we state that this is merely patchwork. The real solution for the problem lies in the whole field of construction safety being put directly under the care and control of The Department of Labour.

I want to point out that the association of professional engineers of Ontario and the association of consulting engineers of Canada are not shirking their responsibilities although at law they are not responsible for safety precautions on job sites. Their obligation is solely a moral one. Under The Construction Safety Act, the contractor is legally responsible for safety on the job. In essence, these professional bodies feel that the true question is: Are we prepared to expose all those who are incompetent? Since these two private bodies feel this way, we in this party feel that the aim of any legislation and the aim of the government should be similar. If there is incompetence, if there is any factor which could lead to a safety problem and possibly death, then it should be the direct responsibility of The Department of Labour and the government.

In the area of safety on construction projects, apparently a major problem is that there is a deficiency in the number of engineers who are trained in safety procedures and methods. Apparently there are no universities graduating safety engineers at this time. Professional engineers who do specialize in safety, have more or less taught themselves. It is very possible that a postgraduate course in the field of safety would be the solution. In any event, this is one area where The Department of Labour, in conjunction with The Department of Education, should take positive steps as soon as possible, to see that by the 1968 school year appropriate courses are made available so that engineers can be trained in the specialized field of safety.

Apparently when the whole field of construction safety is considered, the typical government attitude has been that the least government is the best government and the closer it is to the municipal level, the better. With this we disagree. Our party, Mr. Chairman, is on record as saying that the province should assume full responsibility in the field of safety. Men are dying because the government has not acted beforehand. We feel that it should and must take over this field, completely, and the sooner the better.

Turning now to the field of human rights, Mr. Chairman, it has always been our opinion

that this government appears to make use of the field of human rights for its own ends. Certainly it has taken forward steps in the various amendments which have been made to the code. However, with the increase in immigration which is bound to occur under the new federal legislation, we feel that the human rights code should be brought up to date forthwith.

In a recent article in *Time*, Mr. Chairman, there were comments on the racial situation in Britain and the problems which immigration brought to that great country. People say that it could not happen here, but if it happened in Britain, it could happen here. Since it is a foregone conclusion that most of the immigration which comes to Canada comes to Ontario, it is our feeling that we are going to have an influx of foreigners, and people who are newcomers to this country. These people will be requiring the protection of an up-to-date and complete human rights code. Mr. Chairman, we feel that this is the time to make a once-and-for-all effort by compilation, research, education, and the combined package to make humain rights something which in Ontario is better protected than throughout all of North America.

Ontario has been a leader in the field, Mr. Chairman, and we are very proud of this. We go along with complimenting the government in that regard but we do feel that instead of going about this, as the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) has said, from step to step, we should really do whatever has to be done with reference to this code once and for all.

Turning to the field of the rights of women, Mr. Chairman, in the Manitoba Legislature a few days ago there was unanimous support given for a study on the status of women in that province. Unlike Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we have any problem as to finding the money to pay for such a study here. Since we do have all sorts of commissions and we are able to provide for these, we feel that perhaps the time has come for Ontario to initiate its own study into the status of women in the province of Ontario—in its broadest form.

I am not at this time going to go too deeply into the field of discrimination against the female worker. However, I would say that we are concerned because women will be among the first in our society to feel the effects of automation. Some suffer discrimination now in the areas of pay and advancement at their work in spite of the human rights code. We feel that discrimination will be practised much more widely as the dislocations of automation occur. It has been estimated that two thirds of all Canadian clerical workers are women. There is no doubt that the increasing use of computers and other new techniques in Canadian offices will have a marked effect on these women. As new processes are introduced in the future, women may be laid off or may not be replaced when employees quit. The Conservative government has done almost nothing to prepare for these changes.

In Ontario there are 763,000 working women—by our figures, 25 per cent of the total labour force. The average working woman is 37 and married. Nearly a third are over the age of 45, and 62 per cent are in clerical, sales and service occupations. I was interested to hear the Minister state the new project that his department has set up with reference to the working woman and he can be commended. But I should say, Mr. Chairman, that most of the women who do work at this time work because they must, and we believe that the government of Ontario must, in its inquiry into the status of women, start a wide-ranging investigation to study the effects of automation and to see what government can do to mitigate its harmful side effects. Also we believe that women should be protected in their employment by proper amendment to section 4 of the human rights code. In this manner women could use the code for their protection against unfair employment practices, based solely on the sex of the employee.

Before leaving the field of human rights, Mr. Chairman, I would make reference, as did the Minister, to The Age Discrimination Act, 1966. It is the view of this party that subsection (a) of paragraph 1 of said statute should be amended so that age would be "from 40 years or more and less than 70 years," instead of the existing figure of 65 years.

In closing my comments on the estimates of this department, Mr. Chairman, I would comment very briefly on the workmen's compensation board and its operations. Over the years many members of this party and others have complained about the low level of payments which are made to injured workmen and to the survivors of those who have been killed during the course of their employment. In these days of inflation it seems that everyone in labour and management has been asking for, and receiving, increases. It is about time, Mr. Chairman, that something is done for those in receipt of payments from the

workmen's compensation board. In particular we speak of the widows and dependents of those who were killed at their work. We feel, Mr. Chairman, that without waiting for the report of the McGillivray Royal commission, the Minister should call in experts like those who could be found in agencies such as the social planning council. These people are trained in the needs and wants of people and could advise on proper payment levels. Payments being made by the board could then be brought in line with the recommendations of these experts. Subsequently the level of payments should be reviewed on an annual basis in the light of changes in the cost of living index.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would make reference to the new computer and other machinery which the government has installed. Because of these I would renew our request for an updating of the board's methods of collections so that payments are made on a quarterly or other regular basis. Last year we were told that it was not possible for changes to be made to the board's billing system because of the lack of proper equipment. With or without the new computer we feel that any system can be improved. As for the board's system, an overhaul would bring twofold results. Firstly, business would appreciate regular billings which could be planned and provided for. As for the board, its losses would be minimized in the event of bankruptcy or dissolution of a business which ceases operations without funds in default of its payments to the board.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues will be making further and other comments as the various estimates of The Department of Labour are examined. This is the end of my comments.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I wish first to join with the hon. member for Etobicoke in offering my congratulations to the hon. member for York Mills in his appointment to this most important portfolio, the Minister of Labour for the province of Ontario. I say that in all sincerity because as the Minister has said, his work and his department deal in the main with people and their welfare and livelihood. You know, Mr. Chairman, there have been indications of late that the tenure of the Minister may be of short duration, but of course only in that regard will time tell.

I do not rise tonight in the sense of being a critic of a particular department, but rather I would like to join with anyone else in trying to make suggestions that will help solve some of the problems in this important field of management and labour relations. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we can all agree that it is the desire of all members of this House to bring about the best possible atmosphere and attitude in the field of trade union organization and collective bargaining that will have the least adverse effect on our productive capacity.

We have capital and management on the one hand providing the tools and facilities, and on the other, we have the employee, the actual producer, ever watchful for a fair share of the productive wealth. Then we have the injection of technological changes and automated methods that both sides have to adjust to, and one might say, then, that there is the public to consider. They say, Mr. Chairman, who are the public? Who are management and employees but the public? All management and all employees in their respective endeavours have their mutual interests and problems.

Mr. Chairman, we are living in a young country as evidenced by the festivities that are taking place right across Canada at the present time and we expect great growth and development in this province of ours. This growth and development will also apply to the trade union membership of which, at the present time, we have only about 24 per cent of the potential work force in the trade union organization today. We are having many growing pains in the field of labour relations, sir, and I think we can say that 1966 was a year of much labour discontent which brought about precipitous or wildcat strikes, and court injunctions, which of course prompted a great deal of concern and comment mostly aimed at the trade union movement.

The trade union movement has started a programme of meetings and rallies to present their side of the story to their members and to the public. Then we have the hon. Mr. Justice Rand's commission established by the government to provide the opportunity for all interested parties to present their views, not only in regard to court injunctions in labour disputes but also in the broad area of labour-management relations.

I, for one, Mr. Chairman, am confident that Mr. Justice Rand will recommend solutions to some problems. I am not so confident that the methods shall be applauded from both union and management; but then I do not

feel it is the responsibility of Mr. Justice Rand to please both management and labour, but to find some mutual solution in the jurisdiction he has undertaken.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we need to be too disturbed about the labour scene of 1966. In a thriving, growing democracy we have to go through phases of growing up. We in Canada have never witnessed these union-organizing periods of the early days of this century in the United States and other countries. And those who have read labour history know of the violence and bitterness that prevailed; strikers were booted, dragged and killed by private and government troops; stabbed and slashed by bayonets and sabres, imprisoned and exiled from their communities.

I think we can commend both labour and management in this country for orderly development, at least to the extent that it has grown. Surely we must agree that the continual growth of the numbers of organized workers is inevitable, and I for one am concerned that it is highly essential—even though there are still a few who hope against hope that unions somehow, some day, will disappear.

Mr. Chairman, the organized workers' numbers shall grow from the present 24 per cent in this province. There are about 550,000, and they will grow as time goes on to the potential of about 2.5 million of our work force in Ontario, and with this growth shall move more towards the sophisticated procedures of the older countries. The unions are at the present time laying the groundwork for a more enlightened approach to organization and collective bargaining.

There is some move into the consolidation of small locals, merger of unions in the relative industries—necessary to adapt to a possible new phase of one of industrial-wide bargaining—even provincial-wide bargaining in certain areas in the construction trades, in the trucking industry, and, for example, the steel industry and subsidiaries, the auto industry and others.

I would say that this kind of growth took place some years ago, as I found in my experience, in the steel workers union. One plant, the Steel Company of Canada, had 13 other subsidiaries across this province. Because of the provisions of The Labour Relations Act to which they adhered very strictly, we had to establish a bargaining unit, a negotiating committee, in each of the locals, even though it was obvious to both sides that the bargaining would be done by one committee through the one set of negotiations and would apply to the whole industry. But we could never get management to see the benefit and the money-saving and time-saving benefits that would have applied to that kind of bargaining.

This government, through its Minister of Labour, on more than one occasion has expressed the desire to exercise the least amount of control and interference possible in the affairs of labour and management.

So if we can agree, Mr. Chairman, that the continued growth of union organization is inevitable, we should take our heads out of the sand and move to this end. While we wait in anticipation for the report of Mr. Justice Rand, the Minister has moved in the establishment of an Ontario union-management council with a membership, in my opinion, of the most experienced and sincere men in the industrial relations field today, and I commend the Minister in this endeavour. I am sure the time is ripe for this kind of continued dialogue in review of mutual problems facing labour and management in our ever-expanding industrial province.

In saying that, Mr. Chairman, I feel there are some areas the Minister can move on now to remove some of the obstacles towards achieving our mutual ends. I feel he has the means of reducing the reasons for a great deal of the animosity, the frustrations and discontent that arise in the procedures of organization and collective bargaining.

Need I mention again the drawn out delays in the conciliation procedure? I mentioned at some length my concern about this problem in my Throne speech, but I would like again to appeal to the Minister to take a real look at the procedures of conciliation, at both the conciliation officer and board stages. I know the flexibility developed in this area by the previous Minister of Labour, as indicated in the present Minister's report, has some effect. And if this is the case then taking the measures that I suggest would, I think, have added success in this direction.

I do not think there is any logic in setting mandatory procedures on parties who are trying to negotiate agreements if they do not agree that other parties can be of some assistance. I think the conciliation services and the board should be voluntary, only allowed in the situation where both parties agree that they can be of some help. With that, I think we should establish strict and fixed deadlines for collective bargaining agreements.

As I said before, it does not really matter about the length of the period as long as it is within reason. It could be the termination

date of an agreement, because you would only have to have them start bargaining some time ahead of the usual date when an agreement terminates, or you could set a fixed time some period ahead of the termination of agreement.

But I think we have to make both union and management realize that this is the date we have to conclude our bargaining and they will both dedicate themselves to that end. Where we leave flexibility in time limits, one side or the other, when it is advantageous to them, will use those time limits to drag out negotiations. And, in turn, they both have to face the serious situation of membership being frustrated, discontented and not abiding by the direction of their leadership when the proper time comes.

The other areas I want to talk about in which I feel the Minister can move to help, is the certification procedure. First, the time limits of applying for certification and finally arriving at the award of the board.

I have in my possession the submission of the united steel workers of America to the Rand commission. I would expect that the hon. Minister has had a copy. I hope he has had time to read it, but I would just quote from a section of it to point out in better words than I can, the position of this union in this regard. On page 39 they state:

> The principal cause of delay has been with the board in deciding whether particular employees should be recognized as employees within the meaning of The Labour Relations Act and thus be included in the union. The problem arises in the application of section one, subsection three which reads in part as follows:

and I quote:

> For the purpose of this Act no person shall be deemed to be an employee (b) who in the opinion of the board exercises managerial functions or is employed in a confidential capacity in matters relating to labour relations.
>
> The present practice of the board is to appoint an examiner to inquire into the duties of the person in dispute. The examiner attends at the premises of the employer and examines the individuals concerned. The person is then cross-examined by the parties and each party is entitled to call for examination and cross-examination of additional witnesses. The evidence is then transcribed and forwarded to the parties for any objection or criticism.
>
> After the parties have had an opportunity to file any objections to the report, one or more hearings is scheduled by the board to hear (a) objections to the examiner's report and (b) arguments as to whether or not on the basis of the transcribed evidence, the individual concerned should be in or out of the bargaining unit. The board then reserves its decision and after considering the matter for various lengths of time, renders its decision.
>
> But it is in this process, which occupies weeks and months, and often results in the office workers failing altogether in their attempts to gain the right to bargain collectively. We respectfully suggest that this problem could be satisfactorily reduced, and the uncertainties be removed, by (a) clearly defining either in The Labour Relations Act, or the regulations of the board, what constitutes the exercise of managerial functions and employment in a confidential capacity in matters relating to labour relations; and (b) imposing a time limit by which the board's procedures must be completed and a decision made.

Mr. Chairman, one might ask what has long delays to do with the final certification? Well, if we remember a few years ago, when the plants were organizing, the office workers were under the sort of paternalistic relationship with management. They had nothing to do—or wanted nothing to do—with the worker in the plant.

But over the years, when the plant employees have received wages and better conditions and holidays, and all the things that go with a collective agreement, they now find that they are falling behind. In many plants today, the office workers are looking for the opportunity to organize themselves into the trade union movement, so that they can take their proper place in the field of collective bargaining to achieve, what they feel, is a fair share for their employment.

But we have this ridiculous situation of when the management defines the bargaining unit in his own right—take, for example, if he had seven stenographers in one office, and one stenographer happened to be involved in correspondence between the industrial relations officer and the union agent for the plant employees.

They would try to exempt that whole office from the bargaining unit. This is not an extreme example; we have had cases of this nature and we do not think that this should apply in any sense.

If there is one person who is involved in this kind of relation between the industrial relations officer and the agent for the office workers, then there is justification. On the other hand, they say that the other six employees would, on occasion, have to be involved in some correspondence between the industrial relations officer and the agent for the bargaining unit, so they should be exempt. It is just a ridiculous situation.

I think that, as they have pointed out, the department should sit down and try to define more clearly who would be exempt, who would be defined as in managerial functions or in confidential capacity positions, so that that kind of a decision could be expedited much more quickly.

The other serious part of certification, of course, is the one I have mentioned before, the type of vote that is conducted. This applies as much to the office workers as it does to the plant employees. That is, Mr. Chairman, when the vote is conducted, they must obtain a majority of those people eligible to vote, rather than those people voting.

I would like to tell, for example, what happened in the Westinghouse plant in Hamilton. About a year ago, the united electrical workers applied for certification and the vote was held. I understand there were some 3,000 in the office workers group, and there were 779 declared eligible to vote.

Out of those, there were 389 who voted for the union and 344 against. On first sight, you would say that seems to be a pretty clear indication of their wishes. But then we found that 43 did not vote and three ballots were spoiled. So under the voting procedures of the Act, you have to add the 46 votes on to the 344, which gives you 390 votes against and only 389 for, and the union lost that certification by one vote.

I am happy to hear that they are now ready to apply again for certification, and they seem to feel that they will be successful this time. This sort of situation should never have happened last year, because it does develop, among the employees who want to get into a union of their choice, a loss of confidence in the people they have asked to help them organize. They become frustrated and discontented and, of course, they are then susceptible to the kind of approaches that management will make. You know what happens when they get them in that position —a little increase in pay, or a few more holidays, or a longer coffee break—and then they lose their interest in their welfare.

The other area I would like to touch on, into which I think the Minister could move, and which has the same application in the whole field of relationships, is in enforcing the arbitration proceedings under The Labour Relations Act. Certainly there is a great need for more trained, qualified personnel in this field.

We understand that the federal Department of Justice not long ago, increased the salaries of judges to $19,000 and I understand that, with that, they are now forbidden to act as arbitrators, conciliators, or mediators, in that position. This will again put the heavy burden on those few that are left in this field, and I really think that the frustrations and delays, in regard to grievance arbitration, can be avoided just with the Minister developing a crash programme for trained personnel in this field of special arbitrators.

When saying that, Mr. Chairman, I feel that these are some of the areas the Minister can move on now to remove some of the obstacles to achieving these ends.

I would hope that if he gives attention to more positive and precise conciliation procedures; more attention to a democratic and speedy certification, particularly in the field of the technical office and clerical workers; and more attention in the field of adequately trained personnel to expedite grevious arbritrations, that this will help to bring about a greater degree of mutual understanding.

One other area I would like to mention to the Minister is the union check-off. I cannot understand this government, or the Minister of the department, in not providing in The Labour Relations Act at least a check-off provision, that would be a voluntary and revocable check-off to those employees who desire it and who ask for it by a majority vote.

I would refer again to the steel workers' submission to the Rand commission on this situation. I do not think the situation exists any place in the province, except in the gold and silver mines. There is a table in their submission under appendix (e) on page 51 and they give us 25 cases.

In all cases, the majority report recommended the voluntary revocable check-off but the results were—six cases dropped, 18 rejections, and one acceptance. Certainly, with this indication from the very respectable judges who have sat in all of these cases, and who understand the necessity and the need for this kind of a provision in sophisticated up-to-date union functions, and then to have the company just ignore them.

Of course, they would have to be dropped for the sake of peace in most cases, because they would offer a sop in some other direction. I believe this is about the only province in Canada that I can recollect which has no provisions for some type of union security. I would ask the Minister to give this section some consideration.

Mr. Chairman, last April I introduced an amendment to The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act to provide three weeks vacation in the first ten years of employment and four weeks after. The technological revolution now makes it possible to supply all our needs with a great deal less work. Ontario, as the leading industrial province, should take the lead in ensuring that the benefits of automation, and increased productivity, are shared by everyone and not just siphoned off to the few in more profits.

One way to do this is to provide for more generous vacations in our labour code. A year ago, Ontario was dragged into the twentieth century when the Conservative government finally agreed to raise the minimum vacation period from a miserly one week to two weeks after three years of employment, and this is still below the standard of the federal labour code, and the four western provinces, which provide for two weeks after one year of employment.

It is away below the standards of Saskatchewan, which, as long ago as 1958, under the CCF government, provided for three weeks vacation after five years employment. Ontario should be ashamed that its standard is disgracefully below the standards of our principal European rivals for standards of living, namely Sweden, which requires four weeks vacation for all employees after one year's service.

Norway also has a mandatory four weeks vacation period after one year and Australian law provides for three weeks after one year's employment. More generous vacations are good business; not only do they contribute to the health and well being of employees, but they will produce a tremendous upsurge on spending on travel, tourist facilities and sports and recreational equipment.

They can also help to spread out available work and reduce unemployment. The latest figures show that unemployment is again on the rise in this province and part of it is due to automation. Unfortunately, not all workers can afford to travel on their vacations because our meagre minimum wage laws do not insure them enough income. Our party supports a minium wage of at least $1.75 per hour but until this figure is accepted by the government, the more generous vacation policy can supplement the inadequate minimum wage and give workers a little more help.

It enables workers to have time to do necessary repairs and work in painting on their homes and thus saves them expensive maintenance costs. This will also contribute to the maintenance of property values by preventing neighbourhoods from becoming run down. For years, the government resisted proposals to improve our vacation standards on the grounds that this was a matter for collective bargaining. At the same time it threw more and more road blocks in the way of unionization and supported union-busting employers.

The new Minister, I am sure, has given us a new look in his remarks tonight. I notice that they did not carry some of the threats of the previous Minister's reports last year and I hope that this new look will help in developing the kind of programme the Minister has presented to us.

One part of his report I cannot agree with is in his first page where he says:

> Every member of the House is aware of the fact that The Department of Labour has greatly strengthened and its services, programmes and legislation has been renewed and brought up to date.

I have noticed that you have done a commendable job in the service programmes but your legislation, certainly, does not match what it should be in a province of this importance.

As a result of some of the obstacles in the way of union organization, only 24 per cent of the labour force in this province, as I mentioned before, enjoys the benefits of belonging to a trade union. Most of them have succeeded in improving their vacation standards above the statutory minimums but it is not fair to make the other three-quarters of the labour force wait for the government to remove the road blocks to unionization before they, too, can share in the benefits of the technological revolution.

I therefore call on the hon. Minister to show that he is in tune with the second half of the twentieth century, by moving in this direction in regard to vacations with pay legislation. I am sure that it will benefit a great many people. I would just like to place on record some of the vacation with pay programmes in other countries. I think it would be of interest to the hon. members.

I just mentioned Sweden—since 1965 they have had four weeks after one year's employment and two days' vacation per month if the employee works fifteen days or more.

In Norway, since May, 1965, they have four weeks after one year's employment, and, of this, they must be given three of the four weeks between May 16 and September 30.

In Austria, since 1962, wage earners have had two weeks after one year, three weeks after five, and four weeks after 15. In the salaried area in Austria, there is two weeks after one year, three weeks after five years, four weeks after ten, and five weeks after 25 years.

In Australia, since 1963—three weeks vacation after one year, and this applies to both the state and the federal laws.

So I feel that there is lots of justification for this government to move in this field.

Mr. Chairman, the Rand commission has been established and it is dealing with the many aspects of labour injunctions, compulsory arbitration, and the broad area of the legal aspects. I will wait in anticipation for the hon. Mr. Justice Rand's report, and I will join with all the members in hoping that it does contribute to the objectives that we want to see come about in this province.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I have made notes of the various points raised by the other members during the course of their statements tonight, and I propose to deal with the points that they have raised during the course of the discussion of the various votes. However, there are one or two matters that I would just mention, at this point, in case they do not come up again.

First of all, the hon. member for Etobicoke raised the question of the Woods committee and the labour-management council that has been established, or is being established. I simply want to assure him, and other members of the House, that there will be no impediment put on that committee and I would want them to be free to act and operate according to their own rules. The recommendations of the Woods committee will be made available to them and they will follow, and freely develop, their own procedures.

In connection with the matter of Canadian union autonomy and the question of research —that, of course, will be carried on but I would also point out that a good deal of research has been done of late, particularly by Dr. John Crispo. In his book, entitled *International Unionism*, he deals with this matter in a number of cases.

One other point in that, is in reference to the human rights code—I note the hon. member's reference to the United Kingdom. In recent weeks the chairman of the United Kingdom race relations board has been here and has had discussions with our commission as to the practices carried out here. We have a close liaison with them and I think they have gained some information from us.

In reference to the hon. member for Wentworth East, there is one particular point that I would raise, and that is in reference to arbitrators. We are very concerned as to the turn of events by the federal government in recent weeks under their new Act whereby judges may well be precluded from acting as arbitrators.

We are concerned as to this, but we are endeavouring to develop a panel of arbitrators, with the assistance of union and management, to find another group that will be accepted. We have initiated discussions with both groups in recent weeks to try to resolve the problem we now face.

I would prefer to deal with the other matters under the various votes and, Mr. Chairman, if we may, we can proceed in that manner.

Mr. Chairman: Shall we proceed with vote 1001?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, perhaps we should get an indication of the votes that various matters come under in the Minister's view—for example, the point raised by the hon. member for Wentworth East with regard to the undemocratic procedure the government still persists in keeping in The Labour Relations Act, whereby a union to be certified must get an absolute majority of the votes of all those eligible to vote rather than of those merely voting. Also, what about the question of some sort of union security provision mandated by law in collective agreements? Now, does that come under the vote of the labour relations board or conciliation services, or this first vote?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I would think it would come under the matter of the labour relations board.

Mr. Chairman: Or conciliation services.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Or conciliation, either one.

Mr. Bryden: Anything relating, then, to The Labour Relations Act would come under one or other of those votes; is that it?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is up to you, Mr. Chairman, but that is what I would think.

On vote 1001:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, there is a matter of some general importance I wanted to ask the Minister about. It has to do with the comparatively new federal policy for taking over the entire costs of certain manpower training programmes. It has never been made entirely clear, as far as I am concerned, whether this new programme simply takes the place of the old five-point retraining programme or whether, in fact, it could be construed to cover the programmes that are administered by The Department of Labour.

Their emphasis has been that the federal government does not wish to intrude into education *per se* but has felt they could contribute to the provinces in their programmes for manpower training. It seems to me that some of the responsibilities that this Minister does administer might come very well under this programme and I wonder if there has been any talk or neogtiation along this line?

Mr. Chairman: I think that close liaison between The Department of Education and this department might come under the industrial training branch in the second vote.

Mr. Nixon: On the matter of policy?

Mr. Chairman: If the Minister wishes to discuss it under main office?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It does not matter to me, Mr. Chairman; take it whichever way you wish.

Mr. Chairman: Under the main office vote? The member for Etobicoke.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, with reference to item 5—we have $140,000 being spent for assistance to amateur sports and I am wondering if the Minister would be good enough to give us the general guidelines that he or his department uses, in determining what, if any, assistance in the line of sports equipment and that sort of thing goes to a particular team. I have always wondered just how they decide that so-and-so team or so-and-so league gets ten bats and four bases, for example. Does the Minister have a general set of guidelines?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, our general policy is to encourage amateur sports of all kinds. Normally, an application is made by a league for equipment and then the department considers the number of people involved, and the need, and allocates the equipment accordingly.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, if I may, there has been occasion in my own particular riding—and I do not know if this has happened elsewhere—where a league might be set up and might operate for over a year. And no one in this particular league would be aware of The Department of Labour and the facilities that might be available; the member for the riding might not know about the league. I can think of a specific case.

First of all, does the Minister or does his department have a specific method of finding or looking for leagues and groups that participate in sports? Secondly, I would like a little more specific answer as to the specific guidelines that this department uses in determining what gifts or what contributions might be made by the department to a particular league. So there are two questions. I would like a more specific answer.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, we do not promote the fund widely for the simple reason there is only so much money available and we have a large number of requests which come to us year after year. But we do try to take into account with each request their previous record. And we also make the necessary inquiries as to the type of equipment they need and their activities and any other necessary information.

It is done on an application basis. We welcome the inquiries and applications and we try to deal with them as fairly and equitably as we can, but there has not been a publicity campaign in reference to the funds. On the other hand, most people in those groups appear to know of the existence of the fund and the purpose behind it.

Mr. Braithwaite: If I might say, Mr. Chairman, there has been in my riding one or two cases where a whole year has gone past and they were not aware of this. I suggest only to the Minister that his department might contact the various township or other authorities —the recreation departments where most of these leagues do register in order to get space, and so on. I think that in this way it would not be on a hit-and-miss basis.

Just because a particular league or group does not know about government money being available and the purpose for which it is available, I do not think it is fair that they should be eliminated for a particular year until by chance they may find out about it. I suggest to the Minister that perhaps he might

send some sort of notification to the various recreation departments in the various municipalities. This would not entail advertising; it would just entail making the facilities of the department known to the particular municipality.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I was going to make exactly the same recommendation that the hon. member for Etobicoke has just made. That is, the department should be using the recreation commissions or committees wherever they may happen to be located. The large Metro areas do have recreation committees. And I think all of this athletic equipment that is going to these organziations should really be funnelled through the recreation department in the community.

As it is now, it is definitely on a hit-and-miss basis. The individual who may happen to know a member of Parliament goes ahead and gets the grant to the athletic organization. But were he not to know a member of Parliament, he has got a snowball's chance in the proverbial place.

May I suggest to the Minister that he use the offices of recreation authorities in communities so that there would be no duplication. Likewise, that the athletic organization in the community that needs the help should get it before the one that happens to submit a letter to the Minister; simply because they know it is available and it is $100 less that they would have to raise in some other fashion.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I notice that maintenance last year was in the area of $190,000 and the maintenance proposed in the Minister's estimates is up to $345,000. Could we get some sort of explanation as to the reason for the increase, and perhaps an explanation of what is meant by maintenance?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, maintenance comprises office equipment and supplies of all nature and is now centralized in one set of stores. We have developed this in recent months and with an expanding department you are bound to have an increase for such equipment and supplies. But we are endeavouring to concentrate our records and operation for better administration.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am sorry, but I do not understand what the Minister means by that general statement. I wonder if he could be a little more specific?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, if I can assist the member, we established a new central stores area that we did not have before and we use that to supply the different sections and the branch offices. For that reason, since we have established this, the allocation for supplies in this area has increased accordingly, because they are concentrated there rather than throughout the various sections, as I believe was the case in previous years.

Mr. Braithwaite: Where was it shown in previous years? It must have been somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Bales: It was shown in each individual branch, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Braithwaite: And now—

Hon. Mr. Bales: There was an allocation for that under each section, for example, industrial training, and so on, whereas now it is under one.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me about the new publication *Task*—I think it is new, I have just seen it in recent weeks, since it has come into my office.

What is the purpose of this and when was it started and what is the cost expected to run to for a year?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, this is a publication that was begun, I believe, at the beginning of 1966, or thereabouts. At that time, I think, it came out four times a year. At the present time, and this year, it will come out every two months.

The cost, I believe, is in the neighbourhood of $4,000 and the publication deals with the programmes of the department to provide general information for the public. There has been some criticism. I note for example, in reading last year's estimates and the debate in that connection, it was said that we should get our information out among the public in a wider way than we had previously. This was an attempt, and I think a very effective attempt, by the department last year to commence a magazine of this nature.

It deals with general information concerning The Department of Labour and provides it for the public.

Mr. Nixon: Looking at one of the copies that came across my desk I was impressed at the emphasis you were giving to certain changes in the regulations involving boxing glove weights, and matters of that nature. I really was quite impressed by the set-up

of the publication, but not so deeply impressed with the importance of its content. You say that this is in response to the urgings that you have received here and elsewhere that the public be informed of your programmes. Last year it was published four times a year and this year, six times, I understand.

It seems to me these things in government departments go in cycles and we are definitely in an uphill phase, or manic phase in this particular part of the responsibility of government. I think all Ministers and most branches are in the process of bringing out new publications and they are very expensively and attractively produced. The contents are somewhat of less impressive nature, as I have already indicated.

It seems to me that in a budget where the Minister himself is somewhat apologetic for the large increases that he is asking for, that there might be more practical ways of getting the programmes that he administers across to the public, than through this particular method, because this surely is not a publication meant for public consumption. The only place I have seen it is in my own office. I do not know who else gets it; I presume that the members of the Legislature do, and certain others on a selective mailing list.

But I certainly would commend to the Minister's attention the suggestions that were made by other members here tonight, particularly let us say, for your athletic programme, where you could contact those who are specifically interested and involved, and who come under the particular jurisdiction, by a mimeographed letter that might give them the specific information they want without going to the trouble and expense of still another publication of the type that we are discussing just now.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well I appreciate the member's remarks. We have an obligation to send out information among the public. I might say that the circulation is, I think, about 25,000 copies.

Mr. Nixon: Is that the standard mailing list?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is actually deducted as an assist to enforcement and communication of our legislation to the interested groups, and is sent to union officers and to management groups throughout this province, and to the public as well.

I may say, in touching on the point you raised about recreation and the equipment matters, all recreation groups throughout this province have a liaison with our athletic commission. They work together in that regard.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister specifically what athletic activities, other than track and field, the athletics commissioner has promoted in the last year?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Actually we have assisted a great number of groups.

Mr. Newman: Assistance is a different thing from promoting. What did they help develop in the province?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well, assistance is not concentrated in any one particular field. The athletics commissioner is not setting out to develop a particular sport, or give special emphasis to it. I think we have to appreciate that the amateur aspect of sport is the important thing, and we are trying to assist in that throughout the province. I may say there were about 1,300 organizations that received equipment last year, not in large amounts, but in small amounts.

Mr. Newman: That was at the request of the association, not because of the athletics control commissioner being there—he did not promote that—these associations went to him. What did he do?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well he did a great deal to assist in that regard. He also moves throughout the province speaking to a number of groups and encourages them in the amateur field.

Mr. Newman: Well Mr. Chairman, I have to disagree with the Minister's statement there, as far as him promoting anything. I cannot see anywhere that the commissioner does any promoting, other than being the liaison between the Minister and the athletic organization in the dispersal of funds. I have yet to see anything from the athletics control commissioner's office promoting any type of athletic activity in the province.

I understand that track and field does get some type of assistance. He may assist the Canadian legion in the track and field activities, but I hear nothing other than that, Mr. Chairman.

To me, the athletics control commissioner's office should be taken away from this department. It should be put where it belongs, under education. This is the wrong place for it completely; it should not be in The Department of Labour.

The only function that we can see in your book that the athletics control commissioner's office does is to collect funds from boxing and wrestling and disperse funds to athletic organizations that have requested them. Even in the control of boxing and wrestling, I notice only one professional boxing licence—because it costs $500, one professional wrestling licence because it costs $500, and 480 professional wrestling licences class 2 because they cost $5.

So you can see that it is strictly a boxing and wrestling organization, and I think this organization should go right into The Department of Education. But while the commissioner is in there I think he could make himself of some value and that is by listing, for all athletic organizations in the province, a schedule of athletic events that are being held throughout the province at all times. Then an organization could simply inquire of their recreation department, if they have one in their community, what athletic events are coming up, say, in the month of April, and they would receive a schedule of athletic events and could then schedule their own programme accordingly.

As it is, there is no place in the province you can find out what is going on, other than going to the AAU and there are too many different branches of the AAU in the province to get anything concrete or anything definite.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1001?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to a matter of policy in the department. I suppose that is the function of the first vote. In my opinion, in this province, in the field of labour relations—and this is my opinion, I have never discussed it with my colleagues—we ought to very seriously consider, the question of whether there ought to be some form of a labour court.

In this age of specialization when we hear, in other branches of the law, advocacy of specialists sitting on the bench in particular fields—and I refer to the report of the select committee on company law where mention was made of the desirability and the application of special knowledge in that field.

In my view, we must begin to consider whether or not we ought to have a panel of judges who will deal with questions of law. I emphasize that—questions of law which arise out of the contractual nature of the collective bargaining agreement.

In that regard, I refer to a section of The Labour Relations Act which provides that:

> Every collective agreement shall provide for the final and binding settlement by arbitration without stoppage of work, of all differences between the parties arising from the interpretation, application, administration or alleged violation of the agreement including any question as to whether a matter is arbitrable.

Then the section goes on to say that,

> If a collective agreement does not contain such a compulsory arbitration clause then it shall be deemed to contain the model clause that is set out in the Act.

It has always seemed abiding strange to me that appeals from boards of arbitration which, after all, deal with matters that might affect the economic well-being of thousands of workers—literally and factually, sir, thousands of workers are taken to the courts by means of the archaic, labourious, highly technical device of the prerogative writs.

Upon their reception in the courts, the judges—at least the judges in Ontario—in their wisdom, have decreed that the standard of measurement, whether the appeal is well-founded or not from that decision of an arbitration tribunal, is to be the application of the formula: Could the arbitrators—this is the question posed by the appellate judges—could the arbitrators reasonably, upon the facts before them, come to the decision which they did come to, and if that question is answered in the affirmative, then no appeal lies from that decision.

Cases are to be found in the reports where learned judges, exercising great skill and experience, have said:

> Had we determined this matter in the first instance, we would have come to the opposite conclusion, but we cannot say that the arbitrators who heard the case on the merits, could not reasonably come to the conclusion to which they did.

That is a strange system of law, where judges permit themselves to say that; that is a strange system of law, and how must a worker feel? What must be the taste of bitter ashes in his mouth when he is made aware of a decision like that? Here we have three judges, clothed in the majesty of the common law, sitting in Osgoode hall and saying to the worker, "had we heard the matter in the first instance, we would have come to the opposite conclusion."

Well, if in reason and common sense, the opposite conclusion ought to have been arrived at, then clearly a sensible system of law—which has before it always the picture

of justice which is blind—then demands that the opposite conclusion be come to.

It becomes imperative, or else the worker, in his unsophisticated way, is entitled to say: "What is all this fooling around? Why fool around with it if the three judges of appeal, who are the very top of the hierarchy of our system, if they think we got a raw deal, then why do we not get our just desserts?"

Now let me illustrate: Conceivably, if you were involved in a motor vehicle accident outside the Nickel Range hotel in Sudbury and there were 32 witnesses, spending a summer's evening there, who saw the accident, and the damage to the fender was $80 in the accident, then you could go to a division court. Supposing—which is not stretching credulity—16 of them saw the accident one way and 16 saw it the other way, then you could have a judge sit there for three or four days and hear all 32 and then he would render his decision over an issue that involved $80.

But if you had an issue involving 14,000 workers, whether they are to be paid a premium for overtime work on a Christmas day which falls on Sunday, and the board of arbitration refuses to accept jurisdiction to determine whether they should get the premium for the Sunday Christmas overtime, you cannot even get to a court for a sum of money—supposing it is $1 an hour for 8 hours, 14,000 workers, $8 each, that is $112,000—and you cannot even get the case into a court for determination.

That is a reported case. The workers maintain that they were entitled to overtime pay for Sunday, Christmas Day 1960, and they went to a board of arbitration. My friend, the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young), will be delighted to hear that it was Tupper Bigelow who sat as chairman of the board of arbitration—that will not reinforce my friend's high opinion of him.

Mr. Bryden: Who in heaven's name appointed him?

Mr. Sopha: The united steel workers appointed him.

Mr. Bryden: Not as chairman.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes. He is on the panel for local 6500. He ruled, when this matter came before him in arbitration, that they had no jurisdiction to hear whether or not 14,000 workers were entitled to the premium pay, because each worker should have filed a grievance—if you can imagine anything as ridiculous as that.

He said the union was not the proper agent to file the grievances for this overtime dispute. Each worker, on the Monday morning—no, within seven days I think the CBA says—within seven days of the failure to pay that premium, each worker had to walk in to his union steward and hand him a grievance about the deficiency in his pay envelope.

Then the union representative dissented; the company representative sided with the chairman. When they refused to accept jurisdiction in the matter, it went by *certiorari*—one of the archaic, prerogative writs that not many lawyers know anything about, because when somebody comes in and wants to use one of the prerogative writs the ordinary lawyer—those types that the member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) talks about—has to telephone down the street to a colleague to see if he has a precedent for *certiorari*.

Here is a remedy invented in the time of the Stuarts, when equity was as long as the chancellor's foot—400 years old. Well, the matter was taken by *certiorari* before Mr. Justice Gale and he said that it was all wrong; it was completely wrong, and that the obligation was upon the board of arbitration to hear and determine the matter on its merits.

He remitted it back to the board of arbitration to examine the clause in the collective bargaining agreement, for the purpose of determining whether the company properly owed those 14,000 workers the overtime premium for Sunday, Christmas Day, 1960.

The company was not to be outdone by that and they did not have the fullest confidence in Mr. Justice Gale's decision, so they appealed to the court of appeal and the matter came on before three learned judges. I do not criticize them, they applied their talents, knowledge and experience of the law, and they used the old formula that had been used in the Westinghouse cases. There are two Westinghouse cases and there is another Inco case that came from Port Colborne. They are in the period from 1957 to 1959 and the formula was applied to the effect that if the board of arbitration could reasonably come to this decision on the merits, then they could not interfere; they could not substitute their judgment for that of the board of arbitration.

Why not, I ask rhetorically? Why should they not? If a judge with many years of experience in the law, in its practice and its study, can decide the liability for $80 damage on a fender, then why can he not substitute his judgment in the matter of interpretation

in a clause of the collective bargaining agreement which, after all, is a question of law. The meaning of a clause, the determination of that issue, whether those workers were entitled to the $1 overtime premium was a question of law exclusively. It is a more apt question for the determination of the three judges sitting in Osgoode hall—that is for Magistrate Bigelow, who is himself a lawyer, and two laymen, who compose the board of arbitration. So that bares the issue.

Who was more qualified to determine that issue? Of course, to ask the question is to answer it: The three judges sitting at Osgoode hall were more qualified to answer it on the material before them. But the way the law is in Ontario, you see the refusal of the courts to leap into that question and determine the rights of those workers. That case would have gone to the Supreme Court of Canada, I daresay.

And interestingly enough, I say to the Minister, none of these arbitration cases, so far as I am aware, have yet gone to the Supreme Court of Canada. There has been no final determination at the top, so to speak, of whether that rule that I have stated, the reasonableness of the decision, is the proper application of the law. The case did not go because of the very unsalutary union picture at Sudbury when the unions were fighting for their lives between each other during the representation proceedings. And now, last Saturday, they got married here in the city of Toronto. It is a very wholesome and a very optimistic event for our community, that those two unions have merged. It is just a shade more important than the declaration of Mr. Soden that he is not NDP—that is a significant event and I say to the Minister that that declaration of Mr. Soden has so upset the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) that he cannot bear to come here, he is so upset!

Mr. Bryden: He is here ten times as often as you are! You should not talk about anybody not being here.

Mr. Sopha: He would be here about a day a week, then.

Mr. Bryden: He is here most of the time and that is more than can be said for you.

Mr. Sopha: I am in Sudbury looking after Mr. Soden.

Mr. Bryden: You mean you are in Sudbury trying to recover an impossible situation!

Mr. Sopha: I am looking after Mr. Soden.

Mr. Bryden: Well, you have one, and we have 14,000—

Mr. Sopha: That really upset him—we have the president!

Mr. Bryden: And we have the 14,000.

Mr. Sopha: I have to admit that he is not Liberal; he is Conservative. Is that not a horrifying thought? He announced in the Toronto *Daily Star* that he is Conservative. I will have to talk to that man.

I say, that is a very bracing aside I had with the hon. member, but to get back to—

Mr. Bryden: Typically irrelevant!

Mr. Sopha: But important—important! I will bet you a quarter that Jerome beats your guy by 4,000.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sopha: I say to the Minister that one has to exercise great care and one must bear in mind the ingrained attitude of the trade union member and his built-in fear of the courts. And I do not think it is so much a fear of the intervention of lawyers in these matters; it is a fear of the delay that is involved in the realization that if these matters of law get into the courts, there will be appeal after appeal and then the delaying of the final decision and the determination of their rights.

An intelligent society can cope with these things and the research branch of this department—whatever it does, I do not have the faintest way of knowing—but I would commend to the Minister serious study of the possibility of providing in this Act, by way of an addendum to this compulsory arbitration feature, some consideration of a vehicle in the judicial process where an appeal could be taken from the decision of the boards of arbitration.

Let me add this footnote, that in studying the decisions of arbitration tribunals—which in recent years have been published in very handy volumes—one is struck by the lack of application of the doctrine of *stare decisis*, and almost a pride or an exultation in the arbitrator that a decision made in Hamilton or in Cornwall or in Windsor is guidance to him only and he is not bound by the decision of a fellow arbitrator.

Well a lawyer knows that does not make for a healthy development of the law, because one of the points of genius of the common law has been the application of the doctrine of *stare decisis*—the notion that the higher

court in employing a superior wisdom and insight and experience to these matters of law, lays down a final rule for the guidance of people who meet similar situations.

That is one of its beauties and certainly it does not constrain its flexibility. We know as lawyers that it does not constrain its flexibility. It gives on the one hand the facility to advise the client that in these circumstances here is what will probably happen to your litigation. On the other hand it gives the judge the opportunity to recognize a new set of facts and to interpret the law in a flexible fashion to meet changing circumstances.

To say that is to describe the great gift of the common law that emanated from the United Kingdom and found its way to all four corners of the globe. In this society, here in Ontario, I say we could lead the way by providing some tribunal—and I do not say it has to be a court; if there is a fear of judges in the majesty of their gowns, then it does not have to be that—if labour would distrust or view such a body with suspicion. It could be some kind of an administrative tribunal staffed by lawyers who would apply the principle they well recognize—principles of law to the interpretation of the legal questions that are inherent in these collective agreements.

The collective agreements are written by lawyers. Mostly, the company lawyers write them, and I sometimes think that the people who write the collective agreements deliberately employ the *obscurantis* phrase – they deliberately leave it ambiguous in order to give themselves some flexibility. In matters of law, as in everything else, in matters of labour law there is always room for improvement. And I like to think, and I have reflected upon this a good deal, that the system as it is now reeks injustice—it reeks injustice—those 14,000 at Sudbury, who, after Mr. Justice Gale gave his decision, thought they could look forward to that extra premium and that in every case where Christmas and New Year fell on Sunday they would get that extra premium because of the precedent. They had to go away from the issue; they had to go away from the issue with no decision at all, none at all, because the board of arbitration refused to accept jurisdiction, and nobody ever commanded them to hear this case on the merits and decide the meaning of that clause in the collective bargaining agreement. We can improve on that, I say to the Minister in the most cordial fashion; we can improve on that by providing some vehicle for the final determination of the rights that adhere on both sides under a collective bargaining agreement.

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, half an hour or so ago when the member for Sudbury was in his more customary position of being absent from the House, it was understood, I thought, that matters relating to The Labour Relations Act would be dealt with under either the conciliation services vote or the labour relations board vote. Now if we are to get into the question of the compulsory arbitration of labour agreements—

Mr. Sopha: You were not here when we started.

Mr. Bryden: I think there is a far more important point than that just raised by the member for Sudbury, but I would like your direction, sir, as to whether this is the time to get into it or if we should wait until one of these later votes.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the members that it was my feeling that the member for Sudbury could more properly have made his remarks under votes 1003 and 1005. I hope that the member will not make it his intention to repeat all of these remarks under the two votes I mentioned, 1003 and 1005.

Now back to vote 1001; the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on January 20 the Minister came out with the press release notifying us of the revised regulations to The Athletics Control Act. For this I would like to commend him because I think the revision is one that has been needed for quite some time. However, I would like to point out to the Minister something that strikes me as being kind of strange and this is concerning head injuries, or injuries to the brain as a result of being injured in the boxing game. He does mention that the weight of the gloves has increased from five to eight ounces and the primary reason for the increase was to prevent a greater injury to the boxer's brain. May I ask the Minister why he did not consider the use of headgear if he was so interested in preventing brain damage. I will ask rhetorically at this time and have the Minister answer later.

Then in his press release he also mentions that a new clause had been added which requires boxers who are residents of Ontario to undergo an electro-encephalographic examination when first applying for a boxing licence. The boxer has to get the exam only when he applies, whereas the professional referee has

to pass this medical exam once a year. Why would a boxer not have to examined more often than would the referee? The boxer must be examined once only, whereas the professional referee must be examined every year.

Hon. Mr. Bales: In reference to the first point the hon. member raised, I think we should bear in mind that the padding on the mat was increased substantially as well, and we felt that the two things—increasing the weight of the gloves and the additional padding on the mat—would meet the requirements and the situation.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, I did not quite get. As I understand it you indicated that you wondered why the boxer needed only one examination whereas the referee needed a yearly examination. It is my understanding, a Canadian boxer requires a medical examination before the contest or within a reasonable time of the contest. The other requirement was a new one in reference to referees because we wanted to see that they had a yearly check-up.

Mr. Newman: The Minister's press release refers to this examination "when first applying for a boxing licence"—no other time is mentioned in the press release—whereas the professional referee must pass a medical exam once a year. So the referee must be examined yearly whereas the boxer only has to be examined once and that is when he first applies for the licence. He may be required to be examined at other times, but the compulsion is only for the first time.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, the boxer is examined prior to every fight.

Mr. Newman: But if he is not knocked out he does not have to have that type of examination?

Hon. Mr. Bales: There is an examination before every fight.

Mr. Newman: Yes, but the examination before the fight is not an EEG?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No.

Mr. Newman: It is just the regular physical exam. It is not the EEG exam?

May I ask the Minister, then, if he is going to consider the financing of a portable track for track and field athletics so that we could help develop track and field athletes during the winter season in the province. I made this suggestion a year ago—two years ago—and the Minister thought it was a good suggestion and then all of a sudden changed his mind.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, in reading last year's estimates I did recall that the hon. member raised that question. I think that is a capital item and we will give consideration to it. At the moment I cannot give further assurance but there is no immediate decision to proceed with this. I think we have contributed to other groups that have had or have provided a track but we have not provided one ourselves.

Mr. Newman: Very much so, Mr. Minister. I think that you have contributed to others but you see the lull is during the winter seasons and this is just the time when you could be having these track and field meets in every arena in the major centres in Ontario. It could be a portable track that could be transported to London, to Windsor, to Kitchener and so forth so that we could give a little more emphasis to track and field.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1001 agreed to?

Mr. Braithwaite: Before leaving this vote, Mr. Chairman, in item number 4, under advertising, we have $299,000 and I am wondering if the Minister could give us a breakdown on the $299,000 and some idea of what is meant by legal costs?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It comes under the information branch and I will break this down as best I can here: Advertising and publicity, $100,000. Exhibitions, $50,000. News syndication, $5,000. Consulting services, $4,000. Publications and brochures, and so on, $40,000. Films, $30,000. Then, of course, as well there is staff development and there are legal fees included.

Mr. Braithwaite: I wonder if the Minister could go a little slower? I could not get all of those.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Glad to. The advertising and publicity is $100,000. Exhibitions is $50,000. News syndication, $5,000. Consulting services, $4,000; that is a decrease, incidentally. Publications, brochures, $40,000. Films, $30,000; that is a new project. And in addition we have staff development of $10,000, under this heading, and legal fees to $10,000.

Mr. Braithwaite: If I may ask the Minister, what exactly is meant by "legal fees"? Do you not have a staff of lawyers?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Occasionally, Mr. Chairman, we engage legal counsel, particularly in

reference to human rights matters. The normal legal work, of course, is carried on within our own department. Before we engage outside counsel we have the policy of referring the matter to The Attorney General's Department to see if they propose to conduct the matter themselves, and if they are willing to, that is fine. Then they do it. If they wish us to engage outside counsel, then we proceed on that basis.

Mr. Sopha: You have told the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) you do that, have you?

Mr. Braithwaite: And on item 8 of this vote, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us the details of the grant—of that $1,000?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Last year, Mr. Chairman, I am advised that of the $1,000, we spent $600; I believe that that was to assist the Labour Day parade at the exhibition.

Vote 1001 agreed to.

On vote 1002:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I was asking the Minister, a few minutes ago, about the possibility of having some federal funds available for the general responsibility in manpower training that is carried out by his department.

I would understand that most of this work with Ottawa would come through The Department of Education and to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) but it seems to me that, under the broad view that the federal people may take in this regard, we could have a part of this requirement met by another jurisdiction, as far as the cost is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could answer this in a general way. We have had discussions with the federal Department of Manpower over a period of some months, beginning before the bill was introduced into the federal House, and, that, of course, it has just recently been finalized. But we have carried on discussions with them, pointing out the problems, as we saw them, based on their draft suggestions and other matters. We hope that we shall reach an agreement with them, and we are working towards that at the present time.

No formal agreement has yet been finalized between The Department of Labour of this province and the federal departments, but we have made certain operational arrangements with reference to apprenticeships. The federal government is paying the following costs with respect to registered apprentices in Ontario: the related classroom training costs for tuition is 100 per cent; training allowances for adults, 100 per cent; travel costs for apprentices, 100 per cent; industrial training branch administrative costs, this matter is still under negotiation, it is not finalized.

The provincial government is paying the cost of the training allowances for non-adults —that is, those not in the labour force for a period up to three years—we are paying 100 per cent of that cost.

Mr. Nixon: This is not under negotiation?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, it is excluded under the new federal legislation, so that we bear that cost for that group who are not out of the educational field, or the school field, for three years.

In the short term training field, we are still negotiating with the federal government in an effort to devise some means of joint participation.

Mr. Nixon: Is that on-the-job training?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes, that is right. We are proceeding with that and as I said before, we are endeavouring to work out an agreement with them. We anticipate that will come about.

Mr. Nixon: Did I understand the Minister to say, Mr. Chairman, that they were still negotiating on the share that the federal government would pay for the industrial training branch itself?

Hon. Mr. Bales: For the matter of administration, overhead costs and so on, we are still negotiating in reference to that.

Mr. Nixon: If the agreement then is fulfilled, along the way the Minister has described it, with perhaps one or two points still to be settled, what will this do to the amount needed for next year, in comparison with the $9 million we are asked to vote this year?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, the $9 million figure is really gross, and, as I pointed out in my statement earlier tonight, moneys that we receive from the federal government in this same field, will be credited as revenue. So that it will not, in effect, be costing us the $9 million.

We had that figure in our budget this year when it was established in December—we

did not know what the provisions of the federal agreement would be, and we wanted to see that this training programme was carried forward in the province, it is too important to drop. Now we will recover quite a substantial amount of that cost.

Mr. Nixon: Can you estimate what the recovery would be?

Hon. Mr. Bales: At the moment, quite frankly, I cannot.

Mr. Nixon: How will it be put into the accounts? Just as income into the consolidated revenue fund?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes.

Mr. Braithwaite: Could I ask the Minister, with reference to the adult retraining school at Keele and Annette in Metro here, from whom the monthly cheques would come? Would they come from the province of Ontario or from the dominion government?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, that institution comes entirely under The Department of Education, not under our department.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am asking the Minister this, Mr. Chairman, because my office received a call just today, this being the first of the month, and this happens quite often. As for the people who are taking adult training—no matter what department claims jurisdiction—the problem seems to be that many of these people have children and they are living from pay cheque to pay cheque. I want to bring to the attention of the Minister, and through him to the government, that many times these cheques—the adult retraining cheques—do not arrive on the first of the month. As I said, I received a call today from a lady up in Rexdale.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the point the hon. member is making, but I do have to say to you again that it does not come under our department. It comes under The Department of Education.

Mr. Braithwaite: Perhaps then the hon. Minister might be good enough to bring it to the attention of the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis).

Hon. Mr. Bales: I will be glad to, if you are prepared to pass along the specific matter to me, or the general problem, I will be glad to take it up.

Mr. Braithwaite: That is what I thought I would just tell you right now. The cheques are late in many cases and this leads to the people being late. They have to go downtown to get the cheque, apparently, if it does not come in the mail. You can go downtown and pick it up, but if you are not in school on time, you can be late, and if you are late twice, you might be put out.

This is the problem, Mr. Chairman. I thought that I would bring it to the Minister's attention. Perhaps he could see if anything could be done about getting the cheques out perhaps at the end of the month, because everything must be paid on the first.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Sir, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister that there seems to be a problem with respect to the recognition of certificates issued by this department to such people as electricians in Ontario who meet the standards of this department. There seems to be a problem of their recognition in Quebec, and I am told that the situation in Quebec is such that there is even an intra-provincial difficulty in the recognition of certification.

That is to say that if a person bears a certificate issued in the region of Sherbrooke, he has difficulty being recognized for work in Montreal, but there seems to be an almost total reluctance to recognize certification of people from Ontario.

In my own community, sir, many electricians are hired by contractors—sub-trades which get contracts in Quebec—and upon going over and presenting themselves for work there, they are unable to take up the job because the Quebec authorities will not recognize their certification.

In this age of ecuminicity in the Confederation picture, as well as in the churches, surely some form of treaty can be made. Quebec is very interested in the treaty making process right now—surely the Minister's counterpart in Quebec could be prevailed upon to apply some common sense to this matter so that our tradesmen, when they are going into Quebec, are able to take up their work without any artificial bars.

I would like to hear from the Minister, if I may, what is the attitude of the Ontario government towards the emigration, so to speak, of Quebec tradesmen? I hope I do not hear that we put up any unnatural or unrealistic bars against them.

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, Mr. Chairman, in reference to this matter, we are endeavouring to work out a reciprocal agreement with

Quebec on this and I would share your hope that we do not put up any artificial bars in the same connection. I had a case before me last week from the Minister of Labour in Quebec which we are trying to work out. That was an individual matter, but I may say to you that we have already had some discussion and we are trying to work toward a reciprocal agreement on this basis.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Is the hon. Minister considering certifying the lineman's trade? The international brotherhood of electrical workers, local 911, have been in communication with him suggesting that he certify the trade of linemen. They would like to have set up a training curriculum to be jointly administered by both the IBEW and the CUPE as well as the employers—electrical linemen.

Hon. Mr. Bales: This matter is under consideration and we have certain recommendations from the committee in that regard.

Mr. Newman: This year?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I would hope so, yes.

Mr. Newman: Thank you. May I ask the Minister then if he is considering special courses that could be taken in the new type of educational system that is rapidly coming to the fore—that is the colleges of applied arts and technology—certain types of programmes that could come under their jurisdiction rather than the industrial training branch?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We anticipate that the new colleges of applied arts and technology will give classes that will serve the need for apprentices.

Mr. Newman: Will this now supplement their on-the-job training or in-training programme?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well I think it might. As you appreciate they take certain classroom and institutional training and I would think that part of this would be there and I would hope some of it would be expanded in certain trades.

Mr. Newman: Would we pursue apprenticeship programmes under this vote? May I bring to the attention of the Minister the recommendations of the youth committee concerning apprenticeship programmes. On page 390 of the youth committee report, recommendation 153 is that the department undertake a personal contact programme to reach employers and management of the major trades where apprenticeship programmes are urgently needed in an endeavour the fill the needs for more skilled and semi-skilled personnel. The next recommendation, No. 154, is that those departments closely related to apprenticeship training, labour education, economics and development coordinate their efforts in assessing the present state of this need and implement an expanded programme as soon as possible. Recommendation No. 155 is that a statistical and research branch be established in The Department of Labour to keep abreast of employment needs of the province in terms of age groupings, sex as well as education in trades training qualifications. And the last recommendation, No. 156, is that research be undertaken by a research branch to assess the requirements of all industries and employers of labour in Ontario to better gauge trade training and educational goals of the potential labour force.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask whether the recent recommendations of the advisory committee on apprenticeship training in general industry have found their way into regulation as yet?

Hon. Mr. Bales: In some cases, but not in all cases. We have been bringing forward quite a number of changes in recent regulations.

Mr. Sopha: Some of them went into effect today, did they not?

Hon. Mr. Bales: One regulation did today but we brought forward others in recent weeks.

Mr. Sopha: There seems to be some mixed reception among trade union people about this business of leaving the apprenticeship programme on a voluntary basis in general industry and drawing a distinction between it and those who are working for independent contractors. Has the Minister any views on the feasibility of the maintenance of that difference? It amounts to a dichotomy in approach I would think.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The general advisory committee on industrial trades really was in favour of the present arrangement of bringing in this recommendation and again it is a matter that can be further considered in the future.

I have some views in reference to apprenticeship training itself to which I want to

give careful consideration in the coming weeks and months, but I would like to see some broad changes in this regard. Particularly, I feel that there are some courses and trades that are falling out of use and out of importance whereas there are others that we should greatly encourage.

Mr. Sopha: I know this is a matter of grave concern to local 6500 of the united steel workers—if I can presume to speak for them, and I do so with trepidation because my friends usually speak for them here, but knowing Mr. Soden as well as I do perhaps I can. They see no reason—my hon. friend from Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers) is perfectly aware of this problem too—why the hundreds of tradesmen employed in the International Nickel Company should be treated any differently, so far as their certification is concerned, from those who work for private businesses in the various trades, in the construction industry and elsewhere.

As a complete layman in this field, objectively I cannot see any reason for it either. If a young fellow apprentices in an industry with the training facilities that International Nickel has, or Falconbridge, or some of those other big companies—and they can give excellent training in a trade—I do not see why they should not be required to go on and complete the certification the same as a person working for some small operator who does not have the facilities for that training that the big industry can give. I know this advisory committee has applied itself to a study of this, and the advisory committee contains trade union nominees, but now I am told that some of the people in local 6500 say, "Well, that might have been the recommendation but we think it was a hasty one." Certainly the president of the international union of mine, mill and smelter workers, local 598, who always was a Liberal—there was no trouble with him, he always was a Liberal.

Mr. Bryden: Who was this?

Mr. Sopha: MacArthur, Robin MacArthur; an excellent young fellow he is too.

Mr. Bryden: You are not talking about Solski?

Mr. Sopha: Solski is a Liberal.

Mr. Bryden: Well, he is a commie actually.

Mr. Sopha: Is he?

Mr. Bryden: It is the old Liberal commie tie-up, yes.

Mr. Sopha: You say that outside the House and I bet you would be clutching a writ of summons for slander, if you had the guts to say that outside the House. That is a rotten, dirty statement and completely untrue, completely untrue.

Mr. Chairman: Please address your remarks to the chair.

Mr. Sopha: It shows the filthy nature of the remarks my friend is capable of making about a perfectly respectable citizen.

Mr. Bryden: This righteous indignation means nothing; it is the old Liberal-commie tie-up.

Mr. Sopha: I say to you that if you say that about Solski you are a liar. You are a liar.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, admittedly we have to put up with a great deal from the hon. member for Sudbury, but I am suggesting to you that the expression he just used is completely out of order and should not be tolerated in this House.

Mr. Sopha: Neither should your filth.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would ask for a ruling on whether it is in order for one member to call another a liar in this House. Admittedly, with the hon. member for Sudbury rules go right out the window but I think there comes a time—

Mr. Sopha: If you say that outside the House, I will recommend to Solski to sue you for slander.

Mr. Bryden: Let us not have a diversion, Mr. Chairman. I am asking for your ruling if it is in order for one member to call another a liar in this House.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would say for one member to call another a liar and not produce proof of any kind that he is a liar—simply telling him he is a liar—I think that is out of order.

Mr. Sopha: To call Mr. Solski, our candidate in Sudbury East, a communist makes my friend a liar.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is persisting and it is completely out of order to use such a term with respect to any member of the House. The hon. member for Sudbury ought to be prepared to withdraw it without a ruling from the chair. But

if he is not prepared to withdraw it, I submit to you, sir, that if there is to be any semblance of order in this House at all that he should be asked to withdraw.

Mr. Chairman: The chair has ruled that the remarks are out of order.

Mr. Bryden: Well, then, he should be asked to withdraw. Surely that is the ruling of the House.

Mr. Chairman: Is the member for Sudbury prepared to withdraw his remarks?

Mr. Sopha: You have no powers of discipline, sir.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine has requested—

Mr. Bryden: No, I am asking you to rule, sir, that the remark be withdrawn; that is the rule of the House.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman has ruled that it is out of order.

Mr. Sopha: Do you so rule, sir?

Mr. Chairman: I have ruled that the remark is out of order.

Mr. Sopha: Very well, in view of your ruling, sir, I will withdraw it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Etobicoke.

Mr. Braithwaite: On vote 1002, does the Minister have any particular policy with reference to licensed barbering schools? I know he has received a brief from these people. I am wondering if the regulations which have been brought down affecting these few schools have as their true purpose, the putting out of business the few barbering schools that are in operation at this time?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, there are four barbering schools of the type referred to by the hon. member and we are not trying to put them out of business, sir. We are trying to raise their standards only.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, apparently the schools claim that by fostering apprenticeship and by putting hobbles on the operations of the schools, the Minister is in fact putting them slowly out of business. First of all, they make the claim that they are prevented from sharing in any benefits of programme 5 which are available to their students. Next, they make the claim that the taxpayer should not be asked to provide more facilities for formal training of barber apprentices and that the schools should be engaged to provide the required courses.

They feel that since all persons who wish to engage in barbering in Ontario must pass the same examination, they should all be required to work at the trade for a probationary period to further prove their competence. At present, such a period is planned for the graduates of licensed schools and not required of other applicants. While the schools are in favour of higher academic standards, they would point out that nearly one-half of the Ontario citizens have not obtained this level of formal education.

Their submission is that the department should maintain a programme of testing all persons, otherwise suitable, in major areas of Ontario and thus assist the schools in their selection of students who will raise the trade to higher standards. Notwithstanding the Minister's comments, the submissions that have been made to me, Mr. Chairman, are that in one way or another The Department of Labour by various means is in fact putting these schools out of business.

I know that representations have been made to the Minister. I am wondering if he is giving consideration to taking any steps whatsoever which would keep these schools alive, because they are private enterprise and the party the Minister represents has always been in favour of private enterprise. But in this particular case, I feel—

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh, no.

Mr. Braithwaite: Not so, eh? Well, that is too bad. But as far as I am concerned, I feel in this particular case these schools are doing a duty. They are not costing the taxpayer any money and there is no reason why the Minister and his department and the regulations which have been brought forward should be used to put them out of business.

I would like to hear whether the Minister has given any thought to doing something to alleviate the position of these schools?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I can only reiterate what I said previously, that we are not attempting to put them out of business at all. We have had discussions with them and, as a matter of fact, officials of my department met with them and, I believe, with their executive secretary only last week. I appreciate the point the member is making and we will continue our discussions with them. We are trying to raise the standards and to help.

Mr. Braithwaite: But, Mr. Chairman, that does not do anything about the position they are in. That is a nice statement but it really does not say anything about what the government proposes to do to assist these schools. It is not as if they are not being operated correctly. As I understand it, as far as health matters and their method of operation are concerned, they are under the direct control of The Department of Labour. Why, for instance, should people who wish to go to these schools have to prove that they have grade 10 academic standing in mathematics, English and science, whereas it is not required if you are going to a government school? No matter what the Minister says, in fact—

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, may I assist the hon. member? The grade 10 requirement holds true for all cases and we are endeavouring to adhere to it.

Mr. Braithwaite: You are?

Mr. Newman: Are you taking equivalent—

Mr. Braithwaite: Well, why cannot the department take an equivalent standing of a person who, through maturity or experience, has a sufficient education?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, in my statement at the beginning of tonight's discussion I referred to the matter of mature pupils and their equivalent standing and the same applies in this instance. We attempt to hold to that standard of grade 10 or the equivalent.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am pleased to hear that, Mr. Chairman.

The only other question I would have of the Minister is: he states he has met with these people just a few days ago—

Hon. Mr. Bales: I have not.

Mr. Braithwaite: Or has somebody in his department not met with these people? Has the Minister been unable to meet with them? I know that they wanted to meet with you directly. Is there any reason why you did not meet with them?

Hon. Mr. Bales: There is no reason at all, Mr. Chairman. I cannot meet with everybody, the essential thing is that their matters were considered by my officials and looked after and I was kept posted on the matter. If need be, later on I will be glad to meet with them.

Mr. Braithwaite: Now the Minister says that their problems were dealt with. I would like to know just what conclusions came out of this discussion. Has the Minister any concrete plans to assist these schools? There are not many, but they are rendering a service, and it seems a shame that they should be put out of business by regulations which perhaps the Minister is not aware of. I do not know. There are no concrete plans; is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, it is a continuing discussion.

Mr. Braithwaite: Yes, but meanwhile they are going out of business.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, there is an interesting pattern emerging in these estimates. The Minister's department, sir, is constantly in the process of continuing discussion and continuing negotiation. Perhaps as we continue through the estimates we will reach a conclusion at some point.

One small fact emerged and I wanted to ask the Minister about it. He indicated his own feelings that certain trades were obviously becoming obsolete and certain others rather more relevant and that over the next few months in the period of continuing negotiations and continuing analysis, he would like to sort them out.

Might I ask the Minister on what basis he has come to the conclusion about the obsolescence, or otherwise, of certain trades?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is a consideration only. For example, in the trade of masons, at the present time we have only 10 active in this field. Obviously the demand for it is decreasing very rapidly. In the plasterers' field, we have only 28 at the present time, and this is a continuing pattern.

For example, painters and decorators, their numbers have gone down to 42; we find a much greater demand for other trades, new trades. So I think we must take this into consideration in determining apprenticeship courses in a changing pattern and changing times.

Mr. S. Lewis: So your consideration is based primarily on the demands in terms of the number of apprentices rather than—

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is one of the factors, not—

Mr. S. Lewis: One of the factors. What I really wanted to get at, and perhaps it is more

appropriate under the research branch, is the extent of your analysis of work force requirements in an industrial economy, so I will hold that.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister what he is doing to overcome the incident of drop-outs in the apprenticeship programme? In checking over his annual report, I find that of the registrations, a little over one third actually drop out and do not complete the programme.

Hon. Mr. Bales: We have counsellors in the apprenticeship field and we have increased that staff somewhat. We are hoping to increase it more, so that we can have the counsellors pay regular visits and provide guidance for the apprentices. We realize there is a need here and we hope to meet some of the problems in this way.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the hon. Minister if some of the drop-outs actually get into the field before they are ready to finish their apprenticeship, or do they simply drop out of the apprenticeship completely?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Some of them do drop away, others remain in the field. I think it depends, to a degree, upon demand.

We also, I might add, are attempting to have exit interviews with them before they go out into the trade.

Mr. Newman: There is one matter that is really glaring in here, Mr. Minister, and that is that of the 60 registrations for bricklayers, only one completed it.

Mr. Chairman: Is the member directing a question to the Minister?

Mr. Newman: No, that is quite all right.

Vote 1002 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if you will permit me?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: During the session of the committee that has just come to an end, I must report to you, sir, that one of the members of the House made a very serious allegation against the party of which I am the leader, and against the particular individual who happens to be the mayor of the city of Coniston and a nominated candidate for the Liberal Party in Ontario.

The member of the House said that the particular person was a communist and that he was fulfilling the old communist-Liberal association—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, apart from—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Nixon: What is the point of order?

Mr. Speaker: Let the member speak.

Mr. Bryden: I may say that he is not quoting me accurately.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the member continue, please?

Mr. Nixon: I feel sir, that since you have jurisdiction over the order of the House, I wanted to bring to your attention that these were grave allegations made in the House with all of the protection that is here involved. The part that could not go, without at least bringing it to your attention, was the fact that he has brought up some obscure idea that is in his mind, that there is an association between the Communist Party and the Liberal Party and that this particular person, who is not a communist, is a communist —in his own words.

I feel that this is a serious matter indeed, sir, and that he should be brought to order by your instruction.

Mr. Bryden: On what basis?

Mr. Speaker: The member is speaking to a point of order.

Mr. Nixon: Because it is incorrect and you should withdraw it. There is no association between the Communist Party and the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Nixon: —Liberal Party, any more than there is between your party and the Communist Party. It is stupid.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Does the member wish to speak to the point of order?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that it is even recognized as a point of order, but if it is, then perhaps I should speak to it.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member want to speak to it? I was going to say that really, in my opinion, it is not a point of order, because it was an aside to the member for Sudbury. I happened to be sitting in the House at the time.

Mr. Nixon: You will find it on the record.

Mr. Speaker: Well, it was an interjection, and all interjections are out of order.

Mr. Bryden: I do not think it should be ruled on that basis.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The interjection was out of order, and I consider the point of order to be out of order.

Mr. Bryden: I do not think that is satisfactory, Mr. Speaker. I submit there was no point raised, but if it is only going to be declared to be no point of order on that basis that it was an interjection, then I do not think that is at all satisfactory.

Mr. Nixon: How can he say something—

Mr. Bryden: It seems to me that if a comment is made in the House that is out of order, then it is out of order whether it is an interjection or not. What I may, or may not, have said about Mr. Solski, in my opinion, is not a matter for the Speaker, but I am quite prepared to state what I said about Mr. Solski, if that will assist you, sir. I am also prepared to state again what I said about the Liberal Party and if anyone—

Mr. Speaker: I do not want any further discussion.

Mr. Bryden: —and if anyone wants documentation on the tie-up between the Liberal Party and the Communist Party over here—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Bryden: —I can give it to you starting from the Grey North by-election.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The whole discussion is out of order.

Mr. Bryden: How does he get to make a statement then?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): He is out of his head.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I thought, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we might examine the business that lies before this House for the next day or so.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I think we had better return to Health.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We will continue with the estimates of The Department of Labour tomorrow, and then we still have to complete the estimates of The Department of Health. After that, we will deal with Reform Institutions, after that, Municipal Affairs, and after that Public Works. Of course, the estimates of The Department of Health must be completed first. I think that gives the line-up for the next few days.

Mr. Sopha: The Confederation debate?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The Confederation debate—I have not got a firm date for that, but I will undertake to give plenty of notice.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): It started last Friday.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.15 o'clock, p.m.

No. 83

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Second report, standing committee on legal bills and municipal affairs, Mr. Kerr 2887

Health insurance registration board, bill to establish, Mr. Dymond, second reading 2888

Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading 2888

Hospital Services Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading 2889

Questions to Mr. Randall re purchase of land in Renfrew by OHC, Mr. Spence 2889

Questions to Mr. Randall re OHC geared-to-income rental scale, Mr. Worton, Mr. Nixon 2890

Public Health Act, bill to amend, reported 2890

Niagara Parks Act, bill to amend, reported 2890

Raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, bill to authorize, reported 2908

Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported 2909

Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1966, bill to amend, reported 2909

Tile Drainage Act, bill to amend, reported 2909

Estimates, Department of Labour, Mr. Bales, continued 2909

Recess, 6 o'clock 2924

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: I rise on a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! We are not at the stage of proceedings where a member can rise on any point.

We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: in the east gallery, eastern high school of commerce, Toronto, and in the west gallery, Blessed Sacrament separate school, Toronto, and Yorkdale vocational school, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton) from the standing committee on legal bills and municipal affairs, presented the committee's second report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill 86, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the *Daily Sun-Times* in Owen Sound carries the Canadian Press headline story today that the hon. member for Woodbine stated in the House last night that in the by-election of 19—

Mr. Speaker: Now, did this particular paper make reference to anything that offended the member?

Mr. Sargent: You bet your boots it does.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): It did not even mention the hon. member's name.

Mr. Speaker: Does it affect your privilege?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, it does!

Mr. Speaker: That is, the privileges of the member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: That is right.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the member's point of privilege.

Mr. Sargent: That is good. The press report says that the member for Woodbine stated that in the Grey North by-election in 1962 the Liberal Party—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not say any such thing.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the member's point of privilege.

Mr. Bryden: He is going on—I do not know if he was here last night—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: We will hear a little more on the point of privilege. I will determine then whether he has one or not.

Mr. Sargent: The member for Woodbine has stated in the 1962 Grey North by-election —I was not here last night, I have to read it in the press—that the Liberal Party had communist activities. I am shocked, Mr. Speaker, that a normally nice guy—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, the member should come to his point of privilege.

Mr. Sargent: I would challenge him to document these charges in or outside the House, because there was no by-election in Grey North in 1962.

Mr. Bryden: I did not say there was—

Mr. Sargent: The press is saying this.

Mr. Bryden: The press is wrong.

Mr. Speaker: I must tell the member he must point out what was in the paper—

Mr. Sargent: I am doing this.

Mr. Speaker: —how it affects your privilege as a member. What did the paper say that affected your point of privilege?

Mr. Sargent: According to the press report, I was party to a communist activity in the Grey North by-election.

Mr. Speaker: The member must dwell on that only and not anything about the member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member's name was mentioned? If not then he does not have a point of privilege. I might say the report is quite wrong.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member anything to say regarding where he thinks his privilege has been affected by that article in the paper?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I think he should document this or apologize before this House—

Mr. Speaker: That is an allegation in the paper. The member's name has to be in the paper. If the member wants to correct something, then put the record straight.

Mr. Sargent: —or if he has reference to me outside the House, I will take him apart.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the member does not have a point of privilege.

Mr. Bryden: Except that he has now raised a matter which creates a genuine one. I did not say anything last night or at any time about any by-election in Grey North in 1962, if there was one. I do not remember there being one, but if there was one I want to make it clear that was not the by-election I was referring to. I was referring to the famous Grey North by-election of the 1940s when General McNaughton was the Liberal candidate. I said, Mr. Speaker, that I could document this charge as far back as that Grey North by-election and I said nothing about anything in 1962.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Senator McCarthy is dead ten years ago today but his soul goes marching on.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury does not have a point of order.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): McCarthy tried to be a Liberal too.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

HEALTH INSURANCE REGISTRATION BOARD

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill 100, An Act to establish the health insurance registration board.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill 101, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, before the motion carries, I think it should be recognized in this House that the combination of Bills 100 and 101 is simply to facilitate Ontario's entry into a universal medicare scheme and they combine with Bill 102 for that purpose. That purpose should not be disguised or misconstrued in this House and we in this party welcome the evolution in this direction.

There is no doubt that the merging, which this bill provides in principle, of the hospital insurance and the medical insurance and the setting up of the separate division and the negotiations behind the scenes with Ottawa, all presage eventual entry into the universal plan.

Our only reservation in this regard is that the Minister not allow that entry and the implementation of universality to be undermined or perverted by some of the principles he has put to the federal Minister of Health and Welfare. Undoubtedly the position of private carriers should not occupy the status and prestige which he is prepared to give them. Government should not make the requests which it has made of Ottawa in respect of certain administrative costs for private carriers. Indeed, this province should be prepared to cooperate, as certain other provinces have indicated, to meet the federal formula without making certain of the demands about which we have all read in the press.

I welcome the establishment in principle of these bills, Mr. Speaker, as an entry into universal medicare. We look forward to the announcement, but trust it will be on terms which support the principle of universality rather than undermining it.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister will let us know

whether he intends to have the bill referred to a standing committee?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have no objection to it going to a standing committee, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HOSPITAL SERVICES COMMISSION ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill 102, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, Bill 100 came and went so quickly that I was not quite aware that it was before the House, but the one comment I have to make I think is equally in order under Bill 102. The two bills involve the principle of a new board which, in effect, will collect premiums for both the medical care insurance plan and the hospital insurance plan, and it seems to me that this is a case of bureaucracy running rampant. I would agree with what the member for Scarborough West said in relation to the previous companion bill here, that if there is any move toward universality we are in favour of it, but why do we have to keep proliferating boards?

I think there should be some better explanation than we have had up until now as to why we need a board pyramided on top of other boards in order to carry out what I think is an important but pretty straightforward administrative job, which is the collection of money from people. We said last year, and I repeat it, that the sensible and logical way to handle this matter is to have one commission which would be responsible for both hospital insurance and medical care insurance. It would do all the collecting of the premiums and all the administration. It would, no doubt, have different divisions for different phases of its work, but to have this centralized in one administration is surely the sensible and the efficient way of doing it. I do not feel so strongly about this as to oppose this or any of the other bills at any stage, but I do view with some apprehension the multiplying of administrative boards. Heaven knows, we have enough of them already. The majority of them are probably inescapable, but why start creating boards just for the sake of creating boards? Or if there is some reason other than merely creating boards, then why do we not have it on the table?

I submit, sir, that the sensible approach to the problem that is dealt with in these three bills is a unified administration for all phases of medical care insurance. That agency would be in a position to take in further plans if they should later be developed, as I hope they will be as, for example, plans covering pharmaceuticals, dental work and so on.

One administrative agency is surely the sensible way of doing this. I think I know what the reason is for this very clumsy and inefficient way of doing the job. However, since it is merely my surmise, I will not state it. I think the genuine reason, if there is a good reason, ought to come from the Minister himself.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 11th order; committee of the whole House—

Mr. Speaker: Before the House goes into committee of the whole House, the Minister of Economics and Development wishes to answer a couple of questions that were submitted to him yesterday.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry they moved away so quickly, I did not have the opportunity earlier.

I have a question here from the hon. member for Kent East (Mr. Spence):

> Would the Minister advise the House from whom the Ontario housing corporation purchased 32.12 acres of land in the town of Renfrew for housing development purposes; the purchase price and what plans have been made for the development of the property? Why was the property not listed among recent land purchases tabled in the House this year?

The answer to question (1) is Thomas F. Barnet of the town of Renfrew. The answer to question (2) is $56,200 or $1,750 per acre. And question (3), a preliminary plan of subdivision has been prepared by central mortgage and housing corporation on the basis of which preliminary engineering designs have been prepared by the Ontario housing corporation. A draft plan of subdivision will now be prepared and it is anticipated that development will commence this fall.

And to the fourth question, the report "Vacant Land Held by the Federal-Provincial Partnership", which was tabled on April 26,

listed this land. It appears on the first page immediately following Arnprior.

And the next question was from the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton). There were two questions:

> Do the Ontario housing corporation rent-to-income rates vary across the province according to the cost of living and income in the various regions, or are they the same for the whole province? If the rates do not vary, would the Minister consider changing the rent-to-income scale to make it more flexible?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the Ontario housing corporation geared-to-income rental scale was recently amended and the new scale comes into effect May 1, 1967. As the rent charge is related to family income, the rates do vary according to income levels in the various municipalities throughout the province. The percentage of income which is charged for rent, ranges from 16.7 per cent at a monthly income of $192, up to 30 per cent of a monthly income of $560 or more.

These rental rates are inclusive of heat, domestic hot water, water and the provision of a stove and refrigerator. In certain instances some or all of these features are not provided by the Ontario housing corporation but are paid for directly by the tenant. In such cases, the value of the service not provided is deducted from the basic rental scale at rates varying according to the area concerned. In effect, therefore, recognition is given to local costs. As a matter of interest, there are some 20 variations of this basic scale throughout Ontario and it will thus be appreciated that there is a considerable measure of flexibility in the scale.

The third question, Mr. Speaker, was from the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon). The question was:

> What were recent increases in rentals in the rent-geared-to-income project in Brantford and how does the Minister justify these increases?

The answer is: A new geared-to-income rental scale was introduced across Ontario with effect from May 1, 1967. The new scale provides for lower rentals for families in the lower income category—16.7 per cent at a monthly income of $192 including the provision of services, rising to 30 per cent at an income of $560 monthly.

As rentals are geared to income, it must be appreciated that rental rates fluctuate as incomes rise and fall. In the case of Brantford, the local housing authority has just completed its annual review of tenant incomes, and, where earnings of a tenant have increased over the preceding year, higher rental rates in accordance with the progressive rental scale are now being applied.

The highest rent being paid, at this time, in the Brantford development, is $132 per month including heat and water. The tenant's income in this instance is $500 per month—a percentage of 26.4.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Some are $200.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let us see them. I do not think they are.

Clerk of the House: The 11th order; committee of the whole House; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

House in committee on Bill 71, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 71 reported.

THE NIAGARA PARKS ACT

House in committee on Bill 74, An Act to amend The Niagara Parks Act.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on section 2, I wonder if someone in the government would let me know whether or not the Minister is going to report to the assembly? I see that this provision of clause 2 provides that the Minister is responsible for the administration of this Act, and if he is responsible in the traditional sense, then I assume that he will report in some formal way about the affairs of the commission to this assembly, so that the matter could, if and when necessary, be debated. I wondered whether the Minister might quite well comment about that?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Minister without Portfolio): This is intended in the bill.

Mr. Renwick: When he says it is intended, does it mean that it will be something more than filing the report?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Renwick: But that there will be an opportunity for debate—

Hon. Mr. Allan: The Minister will be expected to answer in the House—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, who is expected to answer in the House now on the present operation?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member knows that the legislation has not yet been passed by the House.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, am I forced to conclude that no one is going to tell us what is happening in the Niagara parks commission?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): He has just said that he would report.

Mr. Singer: No, I want to know what happened that brought about this crisis, and the House leader knows full well what I am getting at. I think it is high time, Mr. Chairman, that the government reported to the people of Ontario why six men resigned and why Tod Daley said such terrible things about the hon. Minister. I think we should find out what it is all about.

Mr. Chairman: Of course, the member knows that this is not before us at the present time.

Mr. Singer: Well, it is the only way I can figure we can get it in, because they will not tell us—

Mr. Chairman: I must rule it out of order. Section two is before us.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, before section 2 goes through, if the Minister who is responsible for that will report to the House, under which department will he report?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I may point out to the hon. members that this commission gets no funds from the House, from the consolidated revenue fund, so that it would not be necessary to report under any department. It would be a report by the Minister who is responsible.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, can one then elicit an assurance from government that this Minister, who is now discussing the Act clause by clause, will in fact report to this House at some point in this session on the affairs relating to the commission, as a separate point in the estimates? Can we have that assurance?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I would point out that we are dealing with—

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with section 2, which says the Minister is responsible for the administration of this Act. Part of that administration, or inherent in the administration, is reporting to Parliament. We are asking, therefore, directly on this clause, when will that report to Parliament be made and in what manner. There is still much time left in this session, Mr. Chairman. I assume that the report can be made and that the Minister can—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh, yes, we are dealing—

Mr. S. Lewis: We are in committee, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We are dealing with the sections of the bill in committee this afternoon. Now let us have a little quiet.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The Minister has given voluntary indication as to his position with respect to the matter. He has said that is what is intended in answer to a question. We are concerned today with the sections of the bill. The government is responsible for the legislation—for all legislation.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect—I am simply asking for an assurance from government that a report will be made on the part of this Minister to the Legislature this session, based on clause 2 of this bill. Now do we have that undertaking?

Mr. Chairman: I do not believe that this comes under this section of the bill, as to whether he should report to this Legislature at this session.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, it is inherent in the administration of this Act! Mr. Chairman, I would move then that section 2, subsection 1 (a) be amended to read:

> The Minister is responsible for the administration of this Act and will report annually to the House, formally, at a specific point during the course of the estimates on the Niagara parks commission.

Mr. Chairman: Do you have a written amendment?

Mr. S. Lewis: It is coming, Mr. Chairman, and in order that the bill be judiciously worded, legal counsel is presently engaged in directing it.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): While that is being straightened out, ask him, Mr. Chairman, where the estimates of the Niagara parks commission are shown.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am assuming that the government is not avoiding the issue and will accept it in good faith.

An hon. member: We do not need the amendment.

Mr. S. Lewis: We do need the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment—

Mr. Singer: What is the amendment?

Mr. Chairman: That clause 2 be amended to provide that the Minister will report annually to the House at a specific time to this and subsequent sessions.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, the question that the Minister of welfare raised—I suppose technically out of order while legal counsel was working on the drafting of the amendment—points up the imperative need of such an amendment. It is a fact as the question of the Minister of welfare implied, that no estimates come before this House—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I wonder if the member for Scarborough West would bring to the attention of the member for Woodbine, the proper designation of the new department.

Mr. Bryden: I accept your correction, sir. At any rate, the point I was trying to make was that the Minister's question quite rightly implied that no estimates of the Niagara parks commission ever come before this House. This organization has acted as a little independent empire for heaven knows how many years, but a great many years. It is not the only one, but it is an outstanding case.

Because revenues which are collected from various activities carried on by the commission are sufficient to cover its expenses, it has never held itself accountable to anyone.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member if he will, please, stay with the amendment before us, or the section.

Mr. Bryden: This is the whole point of the amendment, Mr. Chairman. It has never held itself accountable to anyone, but the fact still remains that the revenues it raises are public moneys. They should be accounted for.

The expenditures that it incurs involve the spending of public money and should also be accounted for. Now the government in this bill has gone half way, in my opinion, toward rectifying the situation. It has now said, in effect, that at least this commission will be accountable to a Minister of the Crown. There will be executive accountability, but there still is no provision for accountability to this Legislature—absolutely none at all.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? The committee of public accounts of boards and commissions, and so on, have the right to call this group before them. Were they called this year? Has any demand ever been made for it?

Let me make this one point clear: This government is prepared, willing, ready and able to account for any operation, whether it is a department of government—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: —or whether it is a board or commission—

Mr. Singer: That is a lot of nonsense; we have asked for a report on the Niagara parks commission about a dozen times.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, may I just complete my—

Mr. Singer: And now the Minister is refusing!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh, what discourtesy!

Mr. Singer: What discourtesy, indeed! Tell the truth then; tell the facts.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: You people come into this Legislature and complain that boards and commissions do not report, and you never ask a question when you are called before the committee!

Mr. Singer: Tell the facts!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I believe I had the floor but I yielded because the House

leader wished to ask a question; he has asked his question—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine has the floor.

Mr. Bryden: Thank you, sir. The Minister has asked his question and I would say to him that I am in no position to speak with respect to this year, because I am not on the committee on government commissions this year, and I am not familiar with its proceedings. I will say, however, that I was on that committee for a good many years and it was one of the greatest wastes of time that one could ever imagine. I believe that the committee has been in existence in one form or another for at least 15 years, and to my knowledge it has never gotten off the ground in all that time. It has never really done a systematic job on anything.

As to the question of the House leader as to whether or not the Opposition asked that this specific commission come before the committee—again, I cannot speak for this year or for last year—

An hon. member: Speak for yourself!

Mr. Bryden: I can speak from my own experience, which was over a number of years on this committee. Time after time, Mr. Chairman, I and other members asked that certain boards or commissions come before the committee and they never came. The chairman, in consultation with whom I do not know, would decide what boards and commissions were going to come, when they would come and that was what came. We did not have any influence on the proceedings of that committee at all. Now I am talking from my experience; there are other members—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the programme for this and other committees has been determined by the chairman on the suggestion of the members. In fact, the programme established for the standing committee on government commissions has always met the wishes of the committee as a whole, and the hon. member must know it. We have never avoided bringing a government commission before that committee.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order the member for London South has raised, it simply does not lie in the member's mouth to say that that committee operates in accordance with the resolution of the committee. We passed last year—

Mr. White: I am saying that is the only determining.

Mr. S. Lewis: Listen for a minute.

Mr. White: I am saying that.

Mr. Renwick: Will you listen? Last year there was a resolution passed by that committee as to how its affairs would function; that it would have counsel; that its hearings and proceedings would be—

Mr. White: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to the member's point of order. Surely he cannot bob up again and speak about a point of order. The member for London South on a point of order tried to create the impression that the standing committee on government commissions is governed by the resolutions and decisions of that committee. It is not so governed.

Mr. White: The programme is determined.

Mr. Renwick: The programme was not determined—none of its operations have ever been conducted by consultation with anyone. I would suggest that the member for London South—

Mr. Chairman: Order! I am going to ask the members to refrain from interjections please. One of the members stood up in this House on a point of order. He has a right to do so. Somebody is speaking to that point of order here and he has a right to do so.

Mr. Renwick: I am simply saying that I do not want the member for London South, on the guise of a point of order, to mislead the House as to what takes place in that committee. If that committee was functioning properly there would have been no need for us to interject in this debate on this section of the bill. It is because that standing committee is not permitted to function properly that we have to raise the question with the Minister as to whether or not there would be a debate in the House.

Mr. Chairman: May I ask the member to briefly comment on the point of order and resume his seat? Right.

Mr. White: On this same point of order, Mr. Chairman. On a point of order, please. This, Mr. Chairman, is what I did say. I did not say the committee chairman decided the

size of the staff, and so on. What I did say, and what I say again with complete assurance, is that the committee as a whole decides which commissions it is going to hear each year and that the government has never made any attempt to keep any commission from appearing before that committee, and the members of that committee know what I say is true.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not really think there is a point of order involved here at all. I stated on the basis of my experience that requests of Opposition members for specific boards frequently were ignored when I was there. I did not say that the government determined the agenda of the committee. I never did have any idea who determined it. I know that I as a member of the committee when I was on it was never consulted about it and I know that last year there was a specific resolution passed by the committee. Usually committees do not go to that extent in determining procedures, but there was a specific resolution to have a specific board come before the committee and as far as I know it did not come.

Mr. Chairman: The member is trying to prove a point and I would ask him if he could—

Mr. Bryden: I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, or I thought I had. I do not know what it is about this merry month of May. Here I am trying to make my small, and I hope, constructive contribution to the problems of government and it seems that a donnybrook arises around my ears to my complete amazement.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I would ask the member if he will please to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am looking at section 1 of the bill and I wish to read it to you. Section 1 of the bill reads as follows—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think I am as good as the next one in yielding the floor but—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Section 1 of The Niagara Parks Act is amended by adding thereto the following clause:

(aa) "Minister" means the member of the executive council designated by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to administer this Act.

Mr. Bryden: I have some remarks to make and I think I should be allowed to make them.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Bryden: I am not yielding the floor.

Mr. Chairman: I suggest to the member—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I suggest this debate has nothing to do with what is said in section 1.

Mr. Chairman: Section 1 has been passed and we are dealing with section 2, and an amendment to section 2.

Mr. Bryden: And before the House leader interjected with a question some little time ago—

Mr. Chairman: Could we stay with the amendment?

Mr. Bryden: —I had been calling attention to the fact that under the clause as it stands in the bill the government has gone halfway towards creating some accountability for this little independent empire down in the Niagara peninsula. It has only gone halfway, however, because there is no way—and we know from long experience—of having a Minister account to this House, in committee of the whole or committee of supply as the case may be, for an administration unless he has to bring estimates into the House. We know from past experience that in the case of the Niagara parks commission, estimates will not come before the House. Therefore this House, in its committee of supply, will never have an opportunity to review the activities of that little empire, as it has been in the past. I suspect that under the new chairman it will be less of an independent empire than it has been, but we still have a right and a duty on behalf of the people of the province, to review the activities of public agencies and we do not get the opportunity to do so.

In fact, hon. members will recall that earlier in this session I had been acting under the assmption that at the end of the estimates of the Provincial Secretary there would be an opportunity to deal with matters relating to the LCBO and the LLBO. I was told that I was totally mistaken on that. The Minister, I should say, said that he would see if an opportunity could be arranged later. I have heard nothing from him since and I am not pursuing him on the matter at the moment, but

it is quite obvious that there is no recognition by the government that there is any opportunity to review in this House the activities of such independent agencies unless they actually have to come here for a vote of money. That is why I think that the amendment is most important, Mr. Chairman. I think it establishes the principle not only that the commission will be accountable to the Minister—that is important and that is established in the bill—but the amendment will establish the additional principle that the Minister will be accountable to the Legislature in respect of this administration. I think this is a vital democratic principle.

I get tired of seeing independent boards and commissions set up which regard themselves as totally independent of this Legislature. Unless they are in a purely judicial function, and this one certainly is not, I see no reason why there should be that independence. In fact I think it is a negation of the fundamental principle of democracy that the elected representatives who themselves are accountable to the people should hold all agencies of government to account. We will be derelict in our duty if we do not do it, and this House will be derelict in its duty if it does not accept the amendement proposed by the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, speaking on the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. White: Do I have the floor now?

Mr. Chairman: I am giving the floor to the member for London South.

Mr. White: Speaking to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal first of all with the procedure which has been evolved here during my eight years as a member. I would like to recall to your mind that I was at one time the chairman of the committee on government commissions and I will ask you to remember that at that time and in every subsequent session the committee members have been given the opportunity at the first or second meeting to decide which of the government boards and commissions should appear before them that year. It must be self-evident that if 20 meetings are held, 30 or 40 boards or commissions cannot be heard.

But I am going to say now, what I did when I rose on a point of order, that there never has been any effort made—never in the eight years of my experience—for the government to keep any particular board or commission from reporting to that committee. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Woodbine made reference to a resolution which the committee passed a year ago asking for OMERS to appear before it—

Mr. Bryden: Not at the next meeting as the resolution required.

Mr. White: He did not mention the name, of course he did not. He conveniently forgot that because the illustration he wanted to use proves the point I am making. That is, that the committee did determine to hear OMERS, and at the first time available the OMERS representative in the person of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) did appear and gave testimony and answered questions, which proves my point.

I am interested, Mr. Chairman, in the suggestion implied by the amendment that there is some superior procedure involved in having a board or commission report to a Minister, who in turn reports to the Legislature. In point of fact, when the University of Western Ontario bill appeared before the private bills committee, certain members of that committee, sir, argued that the university financial accounts should be put directly to the Legislature and not submitted indirectly through the responsible Minister.

I think that does strengthen the control that the Legislature has on public expenditures and I think the direct supervision which the Legislature can exercise over the Niagara parks commission and any other board or commission it wishes, through the standing committee on government commissions, is a much more influential way of providing the supervision which all of us, as members, wish to have.

I want to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to another confusion. The member for Woodbine stated that the amendment would establish that the Minister is accountable to the Legislature in this and other matters. Well, of course, that goes without saying.

Mr. Bryden: No, it does not.

Mr. White: The government is responsible for each of the boards and commissions. The government is responsible continuously for all of the policies and programmes and expenditures and revenues, and so on. Of course it is.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member has stood in his place on a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: We have been hearing a great story about these commissions. How many times—

Mr. Chairman: What is the point of order?

Mr. Sargent: How many times has the committee met this year?

Mr. Chairman: No, that is not a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Well he is not telling the truth.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Sargent: The House has no control over these things at all.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I must ask the member not to stand in his place unless he has a point of order.

Mr. White: I will deal with the point of order, if that is what it is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: How many times have you met?

Mr. White: The committee on government commissions has had some number of meetings, I do not know offhand how many. I do know that they were very badly attended.

Mr. Singer: Would you believe two?

Mr. White: And I do know that at some meetings there were no Liberals present. I do know—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: All right, all right. I will prove it. I will prove everything I am saying.

Mr. Singer: You cannot even keep a quorum in the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. White: Oh yes, I can prove these things. I would like to inform the hon. member for Grey North that it was only a week or ten days ago—

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Name the meeting that there was not a Liberal member present or apologize!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: I will do that. I want to make this further point. A week or ten days ago, I spoke to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon), and to the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald), at which time I said that the government Whips were quite prepared to encourage the committee chairman to hold additional meetings. We did not wish to do so, only to find we had large numbers of witnesses present, at some expense to the public purse, and a small number of members. I asked the leader of the Opposition, and the leader of the New Democratic Party, if the government Whips should encourage the chairmen to have a further series of meetings. The leader of the New Democratic Party said he thought the interest of the members lay very largely in the hustings. The leader of the Opposition said he thought there might be one further meeting of the education committee because of a certain brief that had been prepared. The way that conversation ended was that he would let me know what, if any, further committee meetings he thought should be held.

So I say to my hon. friend from Grey North, the number of committee meetings has been decided, not by the government—

Mr. Singer: Oh what nonsense, what utter nonsense.

Mr. White: —no, not by the government but by the members of the Legislature most able to attend them—

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. White: —and for these several reasons I suggest that the amendment is unnecessary at this time. I would ask my colleagues in the Legislature to vote against it.

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: State your point of order, please.

Mr. Ben: First of all Mr. Chairman, I challenge the member who just sat down, the government Whip—

Mr. Chairman: That is not a point of order. You may not challenge him.

Mr. Ben: All right. Then I will get on this point of order. When they have these meetings, they put a report on our desks here. We read them and then they make us listen for an hour to the—

Mr. Chairman: But this is not—

Mr. Ben: —commission reading the report, and we want to question the witnesses that they bring there. How can we question them when they will not let us question them?

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, it does not constitute a point of order. I ask the member for Downsview next.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: All right. The member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Peck: Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the standing committee on government commissions, the point of order I would like to make is that we have been meeting regularly every week since the Legislature—

Mr. Singer: Every week?

Mr. Peck: Every week since the Legislature opened until Easter.

Mr. Singer: You have not met for six weeks.

Mr. Peck: Mr. Chairman, last week we had the Ontario hospital services commission at the meeting. The hon. member for Bracondale has been on his feet saying that he did not have an opportunity to question anybody, and when the Hydro commission was here—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order.

Mr. Peck: —he questioned them for three quarters of an hour, and not one other member of the committee was able to get a word in edgewise, for three quarters of an hour.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member to wait his time please.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I purposely let the other members put their questions first because I knew—

Mr. Chairman: Order. We will eventually get back to our friend, the member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Speaking to the amendment, first let me whip away some of the red herrings that various people, particularly the member for London South, repeatedly try to drag across the trail to muddy it, so that no one can see what is going on. Let me first of all say that the committee on commissions, notwithstanding the remarks of the hon. member who says he is the chairman of it, has not met for a good five weeks.

Mr. Peck: That is not—

Mr. Singer: Has not met for a good five weeks, Mr. Chairman.

Let me say secondly this, Mr. Chairman, that when the member for London South says that there has been no demand for bringing the Niagara parks commission before the committee on commissions, he does not know what he is talking about. If he will cast his mind back to March 10, when the first wind began to blow from the Niagara parks commission, and the odour that emerged with it was not a good one, and when we demanded, and my leader stood in his place and demanded, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. White: On a point of order, I did not say, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Singer: That is the whole question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member has stood in his place on a point of order.

Mr. White: I did not say that there had not been a request to have the Niagara parks commission. I am sure that there has been, and, in fact, in previous years, we very often had them. If the demand came this year, after a schedule had been prepared, obviously—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: Oh, now listen.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. White: I did not make the assertion—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, surely to goodness these committees are supposed to function in relation to matters of public concern. When the story broke on March 9 that there was something very wrong in the Niagara parks commission, and when my leader stood in his place and said that this matter should be referred to the committee on commissions, and when we have tried to debate this matter in the House on several occasions, including this occasion, on each occasion we have been frustrated.

When the Prime Minister stood in his place and said, "I will not tell you if anybody resigned, it is none of your business, because we got a private and confidential letter," then the whole system was attacked. Mr. Chairman, by reasons of statements made by Mr. Tod Daley, a former occupant of those Treasury benches—

Mr. Chairman: I am asking the member if he will please stay with the—

Mr. Singer: I am, Mr. Chairman. Then I say, Mr. Chairman, that the nonsense that comes forth from the member for London South about how fair and democratic, and how—

Mr. White: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Oh, sit down with your points of order—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: You have exhausted every possible point of order.

Mr. White: On a point of order, the hon. member said there had not been a meeting called for six weeks. I now send to you a committee notice which reads:

> The standing committee on government commissions will meet on Thursday, April 20 at 1 p.m. in committee room number two, to hear the Ontario hospital services commission.

That is proof that the statement is incorrect.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected. There was a meeting on the 20th.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: There was one meeting in six weeks, Mr. Chairman. To that extent I was wrong, and the point, Mr. Chairman is—if you can stop the barracking over there—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Singer: The barracking led by the House leader, who is supposed to set an example, which he never does.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I ask the members of the House to revert back to section 2 before us, if you will.

Mr. Singer: All right, Mr. Chairman. The point of this amendment is that there be accountability of the Niagara parks commission to the members of this Legislature, and it all comes about because several mysterious and unexplained matters have happened in that commission. Try as we might, we have not been able to get a forum in which this matter can be debated.

Let me again review what has happened: the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) stood in his place and said, "I am not giving to tell you if there have been any resignations because they came before me in a personal and confidential letter."

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, that is not so. The Prime Minister said that he had received letters which were marked "personal"—

Mr. Singer: He would not tell us whether there had been resignations, so you just sit down—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, may I say this about—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would ask members if they would, please—now, I have listened to the member for Downsview and—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, this debate is ranging far beyond—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! I know that there has been considerable flexibility in connection with it and it was introduced by a point of order. I would ask the members if they would stay with the amendment and the section that is before us.

Mr. Singer: As I was saying before I was interrupted for the nineteenth time—

Mr. Chairman: Let us stay with this section and the amendment, please.

Mr. Singer: The history of this is, that on March 9 when we tried to find out if there had been a resignation, the Prime Minister—

Mr. Chairman: This is not—

Mr. Singer: Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman. This is why it is important that we have accountability.

Mr. Chairman: If you want to explain the reason for accountability, this is in order—

Mr. Singer: That is the only reason, Mr. Chairman. We are entitled to have accountability and I am telling why we have not had it and why this amendment is so important.

We have been denied information as to the resignation; we have been denied a statement from the Minister without Portfolio who will not stand in his place.

We have been denied any information from the member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) who sits on that commission; we have been denied the request made by the leader of the Opposition that this matter go before the committee on commissions and, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of public business.

If the government had nothing to hide, there are two ways in which it could have made this story open to the public and allowed reasonable inquiry. One would have been to allow it to go before the committee on commissions which was refused us, and the second would be to accept this amendment. Therefore if the government is not afraid of what happened in the Niagara parks commission, it will allow this amendment to go through so that there will be accountability and there will be an explanation as to what went on, and all of the unhappy things that happened there will be brought out into the public eye and allowed to be debated.

I challenge the government to vote this down, because if it does, they are keeping the lid on an unsavoury mess that happened in the Niagara parks commission which it is afraid to be allowed to be discussed publicly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough Centre was on his feet a few minutes ago on a question of order. He was out of order at that time but if he wants to make his remarks now—

Mr. Peck: Mr. Chairman, I was just trying to make the point that the standing committee on government commissions has been meeting regularly all through the—

Mr. Sargent: Three times this year!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: How many times—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! The member for Scarborough Centre has the floor.

Mr. Peck: Many members of the Opposition have not been attending—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I am asking if you will give the member an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Peck: In answer to the hon. member for Woodbine, the Minister representing OMERS did appear before the standing committee on government commissions last year, and the only members who were in attendance at that time were Conservatives.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey South.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, speaking for a moment to the amendment which is still before the House, I want to say that I am assuming—and perhaps it is a false assumption, but I doubt it—that the government is going to oppose this amendment. In opposing this amendment, to me it is saying that, "We as a government are not accountable for boards and commissions on the floor of this Legislature." This matter is one that I have discussed in this House dozens and dozens of times, and as a matter of fact, it is a matter that is very poignantly before the McRuer commission that is studying these matters, as my hon. friends know.

I want to make one or two comments. The member for London South talks about the committee on commissions. I suggest to this House that we will never have a proper and responsible relationship as between commissions and boards and the Legislature until we have in this House a Minister who is responsible for the administrative policies of those boards and commissions. It is not sufficient to say that you have the opportunity before the committee on commissions, not sufficient at all. The opportunity should be afforded to members of this Legislature to question a member of the government who has responsibility in this House for that board or commission, and then if the members are not satisfied with the explanations that are forthcoming from that Minister, then—and only then—I suggest should that matter be referred to the committee on commissions. That is what they are for!

Mr. White: Because they are a more influential group—

Mr. Oliver: Now just a minute! I think deep down in your heart, because in spite of the veneer you are a reasonable and responsible man—

Mr. Bryden: You have to scratch pretty deeply, though.

Mr. Oliver: I was just going to say that I have gone a long way in saying that!

I just rose, Mr. Chairman, to say that embodied in this amendment now before the House, is a principle of much greater significance than appears in the amendment itself. This amendment refers only to the Niagara parks commission, but if we say by our votes today that no Minister is responsible for the Niagara parks commission, and nobody has to explain its activities before this Legislature, then we are saying in the same breath that the liquor commission and all other boards and commissions are in the same position.

Mr. Bryden: And they are, unfortunately.

Mr. Oliver: In this House I say to you—and I echo the words of the member for Woodbine in this—gradually and persistently we are delegating the responsibilities that once belonged to this Legislature to boards and commissions throughout the length and breadth of this province.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Oliver: I am not against boards and commissions, because I understand that the complexity of government in these days is such that you have to delegate some of that responsibility, but never will I get to the place where I say that the members of this Legislature should not in some way, shape or form, have their fingers on the activities of those boards and commissions through a Minister of this government. I suggest to you that by voting against this amendment, the government will be turning its back on that proposition and to my way of thinking, that is democracy in action. To do it any other way is simply saying, "We set up a board or commission. Hands off that board or commission! You have nothing more to do with it." So I am certainly going to vote for the amendment and I think we all should in this House if we value democracy.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, may I say what a privilege and pleasure it is to hear the hon. member who has just spoken. Once again he contributed something to the well-being of this Legislature and to the people of this province. It is a great shame that he has not been afforded the opportunity of being the leader of the official Opposition over the years past so that his weight and great mentality and thinking ability could have been brought to bear for the benefit of the people of Ontario. I pay him that compliment because of all the members of this House I think he stands out very sharply with respect to his incisive ability to approach the subject. I put it that way—"to approach the subject."

But it remains for the government to resolve the ultimate situation and, of course—lest there be any misunderstanding about my remarks—there is quite a comparison between the hon. member who has just spoken for the Liberal Party and some of the other spokesmen who have not had quite the world-wide experience and the background, both in the rural areas and in government, that the hon. member for Grey South has had.

I would like to say this, that the government of this province is perfectly willing and able—perfectly willing, that is all I meant—to have all boards and commissions appear before that certain committee. So on the one hand we have the great demand for the committee to operate, and on the other hand we have those great practical problems. I put this to you—

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, after the interruption—I thought I was addressing myself in a reasonable way to the hon. member for Grey South but he does not see it that way.

There are some practical problems involved here and let us face them. There are some very practical—

Mr. Bukator: On a point of order, again, can this gentleman just get to his feet again after another speaker starts on the subject because he has another thought?

Mr. Singer: He sat down. He sat down as though he were through.

Mr. Chairman: I assume that the member had not finished.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, why did he sit down?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: You set the perfect example for that in this province.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There are some practical problems having to do with the attendance of committees and I would be the first to recognize them. Now, the question has been raised that—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, they are both in bed together now, standing up, which is all right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! The Minister from York West—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There are many practical problems which have to do with the attendance at committees; I am aware of them and I am sure many of the hon. members of this House are aware of those problems. Committees and attendance—those things raise many problems; the matter of convenience, the matter of duplication, all of these things. And we try to deal with these things and we dealt with this in one of the early motions when this House was convened in this present session. If there are any improvements that can be made, the government would be glad to hear about them. We would be glad to accommodate those arrangements to make it possible for all of these matters to be discussed.

Then we run into the problem of whether matters should be discussed in the House with the whole assembly or be referred to a committee, and there are various theories and arguments pro and con about those matters.

The fact of the matter is that the attendance at some committees is not at all that it should be. I just make that point and I leave it. If there is any way we can help to improve it we on the government side would be glad to do it. But I cannot overlook and ignore the reference to the delegation of authority to independent commissions. This point has been made with respect to the securities commission, where they want that set aside separately.

Against that you have the Niagara parks commission which is set aside quite separately from the Legislature itself. And so, as a separate entity, the Niagara parks commission would then come before this Legislature through the boards and commissions committee. That is the way it is set up and there it is. Now, have they been called? I think these are the questions. To put this thing in focus, have they been called before this committee, or not? I cannot answer right at this moment whether or not they have been. I would like to have an opportunity for 24 hours, or a couple of days, to just look into this thing and see whether or not they have actually been called, because the principle that is now being advanced is in conflict with some other matters that we on the government side are interested in resolving—we thought we were going ahead in a democratic way and putting right in this Act that section which is section 1, defining the Minister, and I was not permitted to continue my reading; I was stopped at the end of section 1. I wanted earlier to go on and read section 2 which says that the Minister is responsible for the administration of this Act. This gives a direct right for questions before the orders of the day to the Minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: All right, all right, now, this is all part of the transaction. The combination of the right to examine the Minister directly before the orders of the day.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh, yes, you can. You can pose these questions and you can thereby lay the groundwork and secure the information so that you can go before the committee.

Mr. Singer: But the Prime Minister says, "I will not tell you."

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh, come on, he did not say anything of the sort. What the Prime Minister said was that he was not going to reveal and disclose those letters of resignation.

Mr. Singer: He would not even say whether they had resigned.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Because the authors of those letters had marked them "confidential."

Mr. Singer: You cannot resign from a public position in a confidential way.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, then, they did not resign.

Mr. Singer: He would not answer the question. It is an evasion, a complete evasion.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This debate, Mr. Chairman, is now revolving around an amendment to section 2.

Mr. Chairman: Will the Minister stay with the amendment, please?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: If it is of any assistance and I have tried. Of course the Opposition wants to create confusion in these matters, but as far as the government is concerned there is no objection whatsoever to this board being called. And if you would like to have a meeting next week of this board and have them come before it, that is all right.

Mr. Singer: We asked them March 9; why do we not have some progress?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We will consult with the chairman of the committee; we will consult with the party Whip and see what the record is, and within a few days I will report back as to what I have found.

Mr. Singer: Oh, good, finally we are making some progress.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There is no secrecy about it. I urge the members of the government to vote against this amendment and support section 2 of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: Would the House leader permit a question, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What about?

Mr. Bryden: I will state my question. I would ask the House leader if he would be prepared to arrange through the government leader for the affairs of this committee to be discussed in the committee of supply as, for example, the Ontario securities commission which he referred to will be discussed when we come to vote 702 of the estimates. The Niagara parks commission will not be discussed unless there is a special arrangement made for it. Now, that is really all that is asked for in the amendment. Would he be prepared to do that?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I would be glad to take that under advisement and give an answer in 48 hours.

Mr. Bryden: Well, then, pass the amendment and it will guarantee that sort of thing.

Mr. Oliver: I was just going to say to the acting leader of the House that he will find precedent for the suggestion of my friend from—wherever you are from?

Mr. Bryden: Woodbine—where the horses come from.

Mr. Oliver: There is no estimate as I recall, in the estimate book which relates to the administration of The Liquor Control Act or The Liquor Licence Act, and yet for a number of years an opportunity has been provided to members of the Legislature to debate the policies of these two agencies. Now, my hon. friend need not break any new ground, he need just—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): You had a chance.

Mr. Oliver: Well, that does not make any difference.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It certainly does.

Mr. Bryden: I tried to discuss it this year and I was refused.

Mr. Oliver: What we want is the opportunity; whether we take advantage of it or not is our business.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not think you can have your cake 40 ways.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Let me remind the hon. member for Grey South that he has apparently forgotten what has gone on in this House.

Mr. Oliver: Oh, no, I have not.

Mr. Singer: The Minister was just telling him what a great fellow he was and how everything he said was so wise. He has changed his mind now. He cannot be consistent for five minutes.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Just let me go back to the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary when I stood up and gave a commitment on the part of this government that on the liquor licensing board and the liquor control board, provision would be made for a debate in this House, and that commitment still stands.

Mr. Bryden: When will it be? That commitment was given two months ago, and nothing has happened.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister without Portfolio): Did the hon. member ask in the meantime?

Mr. Bryden: As a matter of fact, I did not remember this specific commitment, but do we have to keep pestering to get the government to keep its commitments?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is urgent?

Mr. Bryden: It is urgent in my opinion. I was ready to deal with it right at the time, when we always used to deal with it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine realizes this has nothing to do with section 2.

The member for Bracondale, please.

Mr. Ben: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the dispute here on this amendment appears to be whether it is more reasonable or logical to have the reports of the Niagara parks commission submitted to one of the standing

committees, or whether we should discuss this matter in the House and that the Minister ought to be compelled to report it to the House.

And the government Whip tries to convince us that in the committee we have all the opportunity in the world to question and look into the matter of these operations. First of all, I would point out to the government Whip that there were five meetings of the committee on government commissions this session. I would further point out to him—and he can confirm this with the chairman of the committee—that I was present at each and every one of those meetings. I also believe that my colleague, the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith) was present at all these meetings.

As a matter of fact, the complaint of the chairman of that committee was that I was spending too much time questioning the members. The fact remains, you do not have the opportunity to question there because the people who appear, the representatives of these commissions, have a very bad habit of reading the report, which was put on our desks for our perusal, and then reading that report at the committee again.

Therefore, we do not have an opportunity to get into the meat of the subject because we spend a half hour or hour listening to the report which the Liberals, at least, have already read. If that were changed, perhaps I could find some merit in the argument of the House leader that there is an opportunity in another place to discuss it. But there is not, because time is too short. We have never brought anybody back. We spend the first hour listening to something read to us which we ought to have read before we got into the committee meeting and which a good many of us have read, so the only place left for a complete, frank and open discussion now remains in this House.

There has to be some method whereby we can bring it before this House and the only method that is before us at the present time, is this amendment, so therefore we have to support it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, when I said there were no Liberals present, I assumed that the hon. member was not a Liberal.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I really hesitate to add anything more to this debate. I say in my opinion it has been quite superfluous already, but in keeping with the principle of the amendment before us, and getting back to the comments of my friend, the hon. member for Grey South, I think he made an observation that should not go completely unchallenged.

His proposal, sir, to you and to the members, that failure of the government to support this amendment, by any stretch of the imagination, could be construed as being against the proposition that boards and commissions should be accountable to some extent, either through committee or to the Legislature as a whole, I think, cannot be accepted.

I point to his own observation, making reference to the McRuer commission, that it can only be accepted that the terms of reference assigned to this commission were precisely to determine the proper relationships between boards and commissions, and this Legislature.

The government, of course, established that commission and wrote the terms of reference for it, so I think, in very general terms, that the position of the government in this is well known. The particular vehicle that is being employed here, Mr. Chairman, the vehicle that is being employed here in an amendment to this section of the Act, in my opinion, is not the way to accomplish what is being debated here for the last, I would say, hour and a half. The hon. member for Woodbine says it is a step in the right direction. I say, for heaven's sake let us get on with the business of implementing this legislation.

Mr. Bryden: I said it is a halfway measure.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let us get on with it, it is moving in the right direction.

Mr. Bryden: Oh no, you can take a whole step this time.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I simply say, sir, that the proposition of the hon. member for Grey South on this is not an acceptable one, in terms of how the government responds to this motion.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, this Legislature put the people of this province to some considerable expense back in 1959, when it set up the Gordon commission to investigate the organization of government in Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: The Legislature did not, the government set it up.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member for Grey South, I think, was all in accord with most of what the committee reported. I bring his attention, as I bring the attention of the mover of the amendment, that on page 11, there is a section entitled "Financial accountability" and the writers go into some detail as to the relationship between boards and government, primarily in the very important field of financial accountability.

I think that if the Minister who brought this to attention, had been listened to, we would have saved ourselves an hour and a half because the report goes on to say:

> Later on in our report we shall have comments and recommendations designed to strengthen these procedures.

Now as to financial accountability.

> Here as a second general principle—we wish to give special emphasis to the need for preserving financial accountability throughout the whole structure of government.

Mr. Bryden: That is what we are asking for.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes; and here it is:

> This means that with the exceptions noted below, funds required by the various provincial agencies should be voted by the Legislature. Secondly, the principle also means that the Legislature will subsequently be informed about the expenditure of the funds voted.

Now as to: "Exceptions to the first part of this procedure—"

And this is the considered opinion of men —Mr. Gordon, Mr. Common and I forget who the third member was—

Mr. Bryden: Dr. Macintosh of Queen's.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Excellent members all—

Mr. Bryden: You sure are masking what they say.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Their considered opinion was:

> Exceptions to the first part of this procedure would be those organizations which—

Just as the hon. Minister pointed out—

> —generate their own funds. Such funds will not go into the provincial revenue accounts, nor will the organization requirement be voted from these accounts.
>
> The workmen's compensation board and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission are agencies of this type. Such agencies would, however, report annually to the Legislature on their operations and—

Mr. Bryden: Hear, hear. That is exactly what the amendment asks for.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Oh, no.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On page 63—

Mr. S. Lewis: We are not talking about financial—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You are talking about financial accountability. The minute you are pinned down, you zig, the minute you are pinned down again, you zag.

Mr. Bryden: Boy, the Minister should talk about zigging and zagging.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Allan) should be complimented because, in accordance with the recommendations of the Gordon commission, as set out on page 63 where they deal with the Niagara parks commission in specifics, they say:

> We believe that these agencies should continue to report to designated Ministers as they do now, but the Ministers themselves should report to the executive council and to the Legislature. The designated Ministers should assume responsibility for—

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis: I simply want to ask to what do we owe the support of the Minister of Social and Family Services?

Mr. Chairman: That is no point of order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I want to put you straight. When I pointed out the fact that they were not in the estimates, you set up a big harangue.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Humber, please.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, unless I am mistaken, on Bill 74, An Act to amend The Niagara Parks Commission Act, you have allowed us to drift far afield. We got into government commissions, we got into this, and my good friend, the Minister in the front row, has had another subject. But I would like to say to you, relative to government commissions, the last meeting we had was the standing committee on government commissions which was interviewing the Ontario hospital services commission.

I must inform this House that due to no Opposition members being in that meeting, 20 minutes before the due time for the finish of the meeting, it was adjourned. So, therefore, I cannot agree with the members of the Opposition that we do not have ample time in government standing committees.

Mr. Chairman: I would like the members to stay with section 2, please.

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I was present at that meeting and the hon. member for Humber knows well that I asked—

Mr. W. B. Lewis: You left 20 minutes before—you left early.

Mr. Ben: Oh no, I did not—you are right, I left—

Mr. W. B. Lewis: You left!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The Minister.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion and many words said which I think might be misleading. Before the amendment was introduced, I stated to this House that it was my intention to report what was going on at the Niagara parks commission. You would rather gather, from the discussion here today, that there was everything to hide in connection with the Niagara parks commission.

Mr. Singer: It appears to be.

Hon. Mr. Allan: As a matter of fact, there is nothing to hide, there is a great deal to talk about. It is one of the finest operations in the whole province and I have great hopes that it is going to continue to be. Rather than to be forced to stand up in this House and give an account of the operations of that commission, I want to stand up in this House and give an account of the operations—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, let me say this. There are two things at issue and I think there are alternatives and I think we should have both. I think first of all there has to be an examination before the committee on commissions and I do not think that it should be sufficient just to put one person in the chair. I think that committee should have the right to call before it all competent witnesses, and when this committee goes, in accordance with the House leader's undertaking, it will not be sufficient, merely to have a statement from the chairman. There should be authority to the committee to call the hon. member for Welland and the Minister—

Mr. Chairman: The procedure of the committee is not before us for discussion.

Mr. Singer: The second aspect is the question of accountability in this House, which is a different thing entirely, and I think that has to be clearly established. We have to have an ability to debate what goes on in that commission as a matter of government policy, and that is why I am so surprised when the Minister without Portfolio stands in his place and says he would like to say it but he does not know why he should be forced to tell us what has gone on. Now, Mr. Chairman, I—

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is a misleading statement.

Mr. Singer: I cannot understand this at all. We have had some very fancy footwork here this afternoon trying to prevent us from finding out what has gone on in the Niagara parks commission.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this being committee, I think I may make another comment. I am not suggesting that there are any designs of any particular kind. I am, however, a little puzzled that the government is unwilling to state in the law a principle which it claims it accepts in practice. The Minister without Porfolio, who is the chairman of this commission, said, as I understood him, that far from having to be forced to stand up in this House to account for the activities of this commission, he would welcome an opportunity to do so. All we are asking for in this bill is that it should be laid down as a matter of law and a recognized procedure that such opportunities will exist both for him and for all members of the House as a matter of course.

I will say of the government members opposite, and I think it is fair to say of them—

I am now talking about the current administration—that they have given a good many opportunities for the affairs of boards and commissions, which do not have to come to the House for funds, to be discussed as a sort of adjunct to committee of supply proceedings. I got a little alarmed, this year when I assumed that was the normal right and suddenly found myself cut off. However, I looked back in *Hansard* and I do see that the House leader gave the assurance that he said he gave.

But I thought it was a matter of course that when we came to the end of the estimates of a particular Minister, we could then raise matters relating to any board or commission for which he is responsible. Naturally we would not raise all of them. There are a great many of them.

The opportunity exists but the Opposition does not necessarily take advantage of the opportunity. There are many votes that go through without comment. We have the opportunity to discuss them, but we choose not to, because we do not think that there is anything important relating to them at the time. This is all we are trying to do. This is the principle we are trying to establish, that this sort of thing should be regularized.

I am very happy that my friend the Minister of Social and Family Affairs saw fit to quote from the report of the committee on government organizations, because from that report, in his extracts, he quoted precisely the distinction that concerns us. There are some boards and commissions—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is the exact wording of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: That is right, and it is precisely the distinction we have been trying to make all afternoon. We have not got through to the Minister, I can see that, and neither has the Gordon committee got through to him. But the point is that there are some boards and commissions, as we all know, which do not have to come to this Legislature for funds. We say that it should be laid down in the law that they nevertheless have to come to account for themselves.

Surely that is a sound principle. The government tells us that it accepts the principle in practice. Then why does it object to putting it in the bill? It should not only put it in this bill but put it in every statute relating to a commission which does not have to come to the Legislature for funds. That is all we ask for and that is all that is involved in the proposed amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of the amendment? The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, if anyone has in fact the right to speak on this bill, I think—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: On the amendment.

Mr. Bukator: On the amendment by all means.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Not the bill, the amendment to the section.

Mr. Bukator: Right.

Mr. Singer: Thank you very much.

Mr. Bukator: I am very happy for the legal advice of the House leader. He can send me a bill for service rendered, I would be only too glad to pay it.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria): He will on election day.

Mr. Bukator: Just to stay with the amendment, section 2 clearly states:

> The Minister is responsible for the administration of this Act.

The amendment indicates that he should not be responsible for the administration of the Act, but he should report to this House on what has taken place in that commission for the previous year. Am I staying within the confines of the amendment to this point?

Mr. Chairman: So far it is completely in order.

Mr. Bukator: As one who sat on that parks commission for five years—and I have the minutes of the meetings of that commission intact in my office—I find very little, if anything, wrong in the minutes of those meetings in the way it was administered. I would not have objected then and I do not object now if the commission would report to this House and tell us what it has done.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: You are out of order with that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Having accomplished something to this point, Mr. Chairman, we can go on. For five consecutive years I sat with this parks commission. Six of the members resigned.

Mr. Chairman: This, of course, is not before us at the present time.

Mr. Bukator: They must report to this Legislature on their activities and this is part of what has happened in the parks commission. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the Minister and members of this House, that the men who have resigned ought to have an opportunity to speak their piece.

Mr. Chairman: This is not, of course, in the section at the present time.

Mr. Bukator: Is not that remarkable that you should be so difficult at this stage when one speaks of the issues at this stage and is so well acquainted with the problem there? I thought maybe this government would like to clear the situation up and I think, Mr. Chairman, through this amendment the situation could be cleared up, if they would annually report to us and give us an opportunity to discuss what took place in that commission annually since 1956 when I quit the commission voluntarily.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bukator: It is remarkable that we should get back to order again.

However, I want to speak to the amendment because I think it is a good one. I do believe that we ought to know what is taking place. I do agree with this section as amended, simply because we ought to know and we owe it to the people that we represent.

I come from the very area where this is taking place, and I cannot tell the people what is taking place simply because we know not what takes place in the commission. Because of the chips falling where they do politically, the commission is picked through political affiliations, and when the chairman of that commission says, "This is the policy of the government, this is what the government would like to do," his wish is their command. He immediately gets a resolution to adopt what the government wants. This is the procedure in that commission and I suppose in all commissions of government.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is about time that this was brought out into the open and I am sure that everyone who is affected, everyone who is employed, would like this brought out into the open and this can be done through this amendment. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that this House cannot do anything but support a simliar amendment or bring one in itself, because I know that you and that we on this side of the House want to know what is taking place. That is why we are elected, and I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that we have no other choice.

Mr. Chairman: On clause 2 before us as amended, those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye." Those opposed will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair the amendment is lost.

Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment moved by Mr. S. Lewis, which was negatived on the following division:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 18, the "nays" 55.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the section carried.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to section 3. I move that subsection 2 of section 3 of Bill 74 be amended by adding thereto, paragraph (e). Paragraph (e) to read as follows:

> The member from time to time of the Legislature for the riding of Niagara Falls shall ex officio be a member of the commission.

I believe that the member for the riding in which this park is located should, by virtue of being a member of the Legislature, be a member of that commission.

Mr. Chairman: The amendment is to what section?

Mr. Ben: Section 3, subsection 2.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before you put that amendment, I believe one of the members would like to ask another question relating to the section. Would you permit questions relating to the section to be raised before the amendment is disposed of, because if the amendment is defeated, as we know, the section is carried?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Follow the rules!

Mr. Bryden: I am asking the Chairman if we may do this.

Mr. Gisborn: The question is, that if the amendment is defeated then the section is disposed of, and no questions can be raised?

Mr. Chairman: That is right; it has been the policy of this committee.

Mr. Gisborn: My question, Mr. Chairman, is a minor one and will not take up too much time, but section 3 as it starts off, reads:

> The commission shall be composed of not fewer than nine and not more than 11 members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council—

My question to the Minister without Portfolio, who is in charge of this commission, is why did it vary between nine and 11 members; why cannot he indicate that he wants either nine, ten, eight, or 11 members, rather than not fewer than nine or more than 11 members?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this, of course, is for flexibility and administration. Someone might die or resign and if you had a stated number, this would render the commission inoperative until that person had been replaced. This is a very reasonable procedure.

Mr. Chairman: The amendment is before us for section 3. All those in favour of the amendment of subsection 2 of section 3 by the member for Bracondale, will please say "aye." Those opposed, will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment is lost.

Sections 3 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 74 reported.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

House in committee on Bill 77, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

On section 1:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, at the time the bill was read the second time, the leader of the Opposition asked, or made a comment to the Provincial Treasurer and the Provincial Treasurer at that point, if my memory serves me rightly, said he would comment at the time the bill came through the House on clause by clause reading.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I did, Mr. Chairman, and I subsequently had a discussion with the leader of the Opposition. I think I am safe in saying I explained the matter to his satisfaction but nevertheless, for the information of the House, and without the precise detail to support it, the increase in the aggregate amount of money that can be raised against the credit of the consolidated fund this year, is occasioned largely because of the fact that the funds accruing from the Canada pension fund, are being borrowed by the government for the purposes of the ensuing bills, which you will see following on the order paper.

As a consequence, the limitation in the statute, as of a year ago, of $400 million, is simply not sufficient. I think, Mr. Chairman, while probably in broad terms, as effectively as I can, the need for increasing the limit. On the other hand, if there is any further specific information that is required, I will do my best to explain it.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just on that, I am interested in the reason which the Provincial Treasurer gave in his reference to the two subsequent bills and with a little bit of flexibility I would like to ask the Provincial Treasurer whether he intends to use all of that increase for the purposes of the two subsequent bills, or is part of the increase simply the normal increase which, I believe, it has been customary to include in the increased amount?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It simply means this, that this is the total amount of borrowing against the credit of the consolidated revenue fund that can be outstanding. I think it should be understood by members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that there are funds borrowed from time to time, and, of course, there are funds repaid from time to time.

The one example I gave—and of course there are others—simply means that the development and the growth of population, everything that is associated with the development of the province of Ontario, requires this limit to be increased—but one specific example, of course, was the one I used.

This is the basic purpose of the bill, and I think it is fair to say to the House that these increases will be sought, probably year to year, for rather obvious reasons. The total amount outstanding requires to be increased if we are to have any flexibility of the use of the credit of the consolidated revenue fund for purposes which, I am sure, are well known to members of the House.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 77 reported.

THE ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES CAPITAL AID CORPORATION ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill 78, An Act to amend The Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 78 reported.

THE ONTARIO EDUCATION CAPITAL AID CORPORATION ACT, 1966

House in committee on Bill 79, An Act to amend The Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1966.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 79 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

Resolved:

That the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario may purchase, acquire and hold debentures issued under this Act to an extent not exceeding, in the whole, $20,000,000 at any time, and pay therefor out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill 94, An Act to amend The Tile Drainage Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE TILE DRAINAGE ACT

House in committee on Bill 94, An Act to amend The Tile Drainage Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 94 reported.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report one resolution and certain bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one resolution and certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 15th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR
(Continued)

On vote 1003:

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, on the amount of money being spent on conciliation services, I notice they are down $10,000 from the year before. I wonder if the Minister might tell us—we have always been pressing for an increase in not only the salaries but in the calibre and type of men employed, and I wonder if the Minister could give us—

Mr. Chairman: It is difficult for the Minister to hear the member.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am commenting on vote 1003, the total amount of money being spent, the fact that it is down $10,000 from last year, the fact that everything else in the department seems to be up quite high, that the size of the department is increasing, and that its services are increasing.

We have always felt that conciliation is one area where the conciliation officers should be very well paid; they should be men of high calibre, with good training. Therefore, we feel that this department is one that should not be decreased in size nor in the amount of money available to it. I wonder if the Minister could give us some explanation as to why the amount of moneys available for spending, is less than last year.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, the number of conciliation boards in the past year has declined quite substantially, and this was in line with the department policy. But the overall decrease is because of that and it is just down $10,000.

In actual fact, we have increased certain items within the range, but in reference, for example, to our conciliation officers, the level of salaries has increased there, I may say, and is now in the $8,000 to $12,000 range for the individual officers. We are endeavouring to upgrade this section substantially, but because of the reduction in the number of boards there is a decline in the total amount allocated.

Mr. Braithwaite: If I may ask, has the number of officers been increased, or is it static, or has it gone down?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We have at the moment 13 officers with a total complement there of 15. One more is coming on staff within the next month's period. In addition to that, of course, we have the assistant director and also the director.

Mr. Braithwaite: How does that compare with the number available last year?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is an increase, I believe, of one, as compared to a year ago, but we have made substantial changes within the group and we are upgrading the staff. As you appreciate, a year ago, a new director was appointed for the conciliation branch.

Mr. Braithwaite: Is there any possibility, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, of the salaries being upgraded to the level of say a senior executive, since these people have to deal with senior executives on both sides of labour and management? It would seem that $8,000 to $10,000—is eight to ten the figure you gave me?—does not seem to be sufficient for the type of work that these people would be doing. I am suggesting that the salaries should be in the neighbourhood of $15,000. Does the Minister have any comments with reference to that?

Mr. Chairman: I should remind the member that as far as salaries are concerned, they come under the civil service commission.

Mr. Braithwaite: I would like to get the Minister's views on that. I think this has to do with the conciliation department.

Hon. Mr. Bales: They are part of the negotiations with the civil service. There have been some adjustments upwards in reference to this in the past year and a half, and I anticipate there would be again in the future. I appreciate the point you are making.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1003 agreed to?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what is his opinion in regard to the policy of continuing the compulsory conciliation provisions of the Act? I have raised this question several times and it seems to be the wishes of those that are involved in management-labour negotiations. I wondered if the Minister has any strong feelings as to the continuation of the provisions of conciliation services in the province?

I feel there has been good argument that the provisions could be made completely voluntarily, and be given only where both sides agree that a conciliation officer or a board would be of some help in bringing about a settlement of the dispute. I think it is about time we had a new look at this situation and I would ask the Minister to give me the feeling of his department as to whether there is some merit in continuing this request, or whether there are some real advantages in continuing the type of compulsory conciliation services?

Hon. Mr. Bales, Mr. Chairman, I think that I am glad to have the member's views, but there are strong views, on both sides of this matter. The conciliation board and the conciliation procedures have been beneficial in a number of instances. For example, you make the point that it should not be compulsory. We are both familiar that in the construction industry, for example, if either side says to me that it does not want a conciliation board, then there is not a board in that instance. In the last year, the department has used a flexible system as to conciliation boards and in my statement yesterday, you will see there is a great reduction in the number of boards that have been appointed. I think that this is a good procedure and I really cannot accept the member's view on it.

Mr. Gisborn: I would just like to make one or two comments. The Minister has indicated that this has been helpful, in the construction trade—and of course we both realize that they work under a different section of the Act—there is a difference in that approach.

But when he says that even in the construction trades, where one of the parties requests conciliation, it is granted. I think this is where the situation difference arises.

One party in the dispute may feel that the services of a conciliation officer would be of advantage to him in his dispute, in relation to a time lag and a delay in carrying on negotiations, and the other party in the dispute might feel that the conciliation officer or board would be of no help, because they had gone through all of the real hard term bargaining and it was time they made up their minds and got the thing over with. When one man can make up his mind that they should have conciliation services, it can be of disadvantage to the other side, and, of course, drag out and delay negotiations.

Certainly, I cannot see any objection to it being granted only where both sides agree that the third party could be of some help.

Of course, there would have to be some changes made to bring about termination of negotiations, by a fixed date, for the right to strike, and, of course, this has been asked for. I think that shortening up the negotiations and setting a fixed date where the one side could walk out—management could walk out, or the union go on strike—would put pressures on both of them to get down to

work and we would not be faced with this indecision for weeks and months, sometimes more than a year, where the public is confused, business is undecided, on what to do and, of course, the employees are frustrated as to what is going to happen.

My contention is that some method must be found to speed up negotiations, to put pressure on both sides to get down to business, and therefore have some control over the length of period that they are able to negotiate.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1003 agreed to?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, before we leave 1003, would the hon. Minister let me know how many boards of arbitration were appointed under The Hospital Disputes Arbitration Act during the past fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I do not have those figures available immediately, but I will be glad to get them and present it to the member.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1003 agreed to?

Mr. Renwick: Would the Minister care to comment about the operation of The Hospital Disputes Arbitration Act, having regard to the short time it has been in operation, whether or not, through his department, any assessment has been made as to the betterment of the conditions of labour, conditions of work, in the hospitals as a result of the operation of that Act? I think that this is the only department, and the only estimate, and the only place in the estimates, where there is an opportunity to get some assessment of the way in which the very bitterly contested matter finally had to end up in the statutes of the province.

I would like to have an assessment from the Minister as to how he believes it has functioned and to what extent the Act is performing the function which it was intended to perform. It seems to me that one of the keys to it, is the way in which these disputes have had to go to arbitration. Or is it the case that there are not very many hospitals organized and therefore the Act applies only to a few hospitals? To those that it does apply, is it the case that very few of them have gone to arbitration?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, there has been some fairly strong indication that the present arrangement has resulted in increased union membership in these hospitals. We have had indications from some of the executive officers that they are in favour of this general situation. I think it has raised standards generally in the hospitals, but I must say to you, that my own personal assessment of the situation has not been completed, but it is a matter that I have made some study of, and will continue.

There has been a definite indication from, particularly, the building service employees' union that they have felt that the situation has improved so far as the membership in the union is concerned.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, under this particular item, just to sketch in the ambit of what the Minister believes his responsibility to be. Does he consider, for example, that he has any obligation to review the results of the collective bargaining process, and the results of arbitration boards—should the boards be necessary—from the point of view of the overall level of the wages paid in hospitals for various classifications of employees, and for the general conditions of labour, or does he consider only that his department acts mainly as the department under which funds are provided, if the arbitration is required?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I believe my particular responsibility is to review the process of arbitration. I do not feel that I can go into the results and questions in each case.

That is why the arbitrators are there, but certainly the procedures and the fact that they are carried out properly is my concern.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. Sopha (Sudbury): I wanted to say to the Minister in the simplest, most respectful way possible, that the longer I view this conciliation service in industries, where a large number of workers are involved, the more disillusioned with the conciliation process I become.

It seems to me that there are presently just too many stages in it, and particularly too many antecedent stages before the parties get down to hard bargaining. When the union notifies the company, at the termination of the current collective bargaining agreement, that they wish to bargain collectively then it appears to me that a certain formula of behaviour is set in motion. The company makes an offer and, unhappily, experience has shown that the offer made at that stage by the company, is not only well below the demands of the union, as those demands are known to the

rank and file, but the offer is totally unacceptable to the union and to the membership.

When the Minister is called upon to appoint his conciliation board, or the conciliation board is appointed in the way provided by the Act, it seems to me that the proceedings before that board are merely a replica of what has gone on at the collective bargaining table between the parties theretofore. That is to say, the union presents its demands and sometimes they are a very protracted length. The company replies by making substantially the same offer as it made, when face to face with the union.

It is only when the Minister appoints his intermediary, or his conciliation officer, and in the recent history of negotiations which I have in mind, I do not think the person appointed even fits that category that is provided for in the Act—conciliation officer, but it does not matter what label is put on him—the hard bargaining only begins, it appears, when large unions and large companies are involved and when some person in the capacity of a mediator, specializing in his special talents and experience, comes into the picture.

One gets the impression at that stage, that the Minister of Labour is not far in the background. If you go through the lobby of the Royal York hotel when they are down to that climate, to that environment of hard bargaining; if you want to sit in the lobby you will see Mr. Eberlee go through, he will not be far away, and that other very capable gentleman, Mr. Dickie, an outstanding man in the field, you will see him go by—and, no doubt, there is a hot line to the hon. Minister at that stage, keeping him informed of what is going on.

It is out of that environment, created by people of special skills, that the collective agreement, through the art of compromise and the willingness to compromise on the part of the bunch, eventually emerges. Then why do we tolerate this earlier stage where little is accomplished? I could believe that in the case of small industries, and small bargaining units, that the conciliation board might very well accomplish the end result of a collective bargaining agreement. But in my own community we have had two strikes in the last nine years, one of them legal and the other illegal.

Each of them occurred, mark you, after the conciliation board stage, and each of them was settled at the point where the mediator was brought into the picture and brought the parties together. In each of them, there was a marked participation, and I choose the word very carefully, a very marked but very real participation of the officials of The Department of Labour.

Let me say at this stage, just for the record, that I give every credit, plaudit and accolade to the predecessor of the present Minister in his participation in settling that Sudbury labour situation. When the history of the time is written, generous statements will be made about him and his participation.

But I would think, and the point I make is this, that this bargaining process has got to be shortened. You cannot permit a pall of uncertainty and anxiety and frustration to hang over a community week after week after week, and see that uncertainty in the hearts and minds of people who do not know what the months ahead are going to have for them; whether there is going to be work or whether there is not going to be work. And to watch the departure of heads of families, fathers, to other parts of the province and the country in order to earn enough to keep the family going as a viable unit.

You are dealing here with people who are accustomed to work and you must never lose sight of that. These people are accustomed to work, they are accustomed to paying their debts, and they are accustomed to bringing home the provender to their families, and to supplying them with the necessaries of life.

These are people who are put in situations of indignity because there has been a surcease of their normal activity and in their behaviour. And I would plead with the hon. Minister and his research department, whatever it does—I am going to go down some day to have a look at that research department and just see what is going on down there, and I hope I do not catch anybody playing cribbage or anything. But I am going to have a look, and a study might be made of some of the statistics to determine in bargaining units—say, where there are more than 1,000 workers how many times the matter has been settled at the conciliation board stage. And I would be willing to venture a guess that there would be a paucity of occasions when it has affected any substantial measure of agreement.

The trouble with that statute—and it has been said many times—is that it is so general in its terms that it applies when there is a bargaining unit of five and it applies when there is a bargaining unit of 15,000, when the situations are entirely different. They are worlds apart and in an intelligent, sophisticated society you would think that allowances

would be made for different sets of circumstances as they are encountered.

By using the empirical and pragmatic method, we try to ameliorate things in society and get rid of the dislocations and the kinks, and with that approach we are sophisticated enough to re-arrange our devices so that they meet the needs.

I say simply this, that if major labour contracts are settled by the intervention of the Deputy Minister of Labour—and he came on the scene in Ontario, because he went down and settled a strike that had been bothering everybody in the province, if not in the whole country, as that organization that has eaten very sumptuously at the public trough in the history of this country since its inception in the 1870's—I refer to the almost divinely inspired Canadian Pacific Railway—exhibited a very hard heart down at the Royal York hotel. And if intervention of people like that bring about collective agreements, then I say all power to them. Let us get rid of the earlier stages where experience has shown us that not a great deal is accomplished.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a somewhat different subject than has just been under discussion, although it still comes within the ambit of this vote. The only comment I would make with regard to the conciliation procedure is that it has been made considerably more flexible in recent years than it previously had been, and I would hope that the government will continue to make it still more flexible.

I do not think that there is any doubt in the world that the conciliation procedures have to be tailored to situations. I think in the case of what I would call the large contract negotiations—that is, the contract negotiations affecting large numbers of employees in extremely involved contracts—there has to be an earlier opening of those contracts than there is now. I believe also that the government should, if necessary, be prepared to intervene at almost any stage along the line, wherever it appears likely that such intervention would be fruitful.

We should bear in mind, however, that the overwhelming majority of contract negotiations are settled without intervention of public authorities—at least, I think I am right in saying the overwhelming majority. The Minister of Labour would not be able to accumulate a staff large enough if he had to intervene in all of them. The unfortunate fact of life is that the minority which are not settled are the ones which always make the headlines in the press. The great majority which are amicably settled after some hard bargaining in many cases, but without them even coming to the notice of the public, do not get any publicity in the press.

I would simply repeat that the trend toward flexibility which has become manifest in the last two or three years, after two decades of total inflexibility in the approach to the problem, is an encouraging one and I hope that the present Minister will see fit to continue that approach and expand upon it.

The matter to which I would now like to direct the attention of the Minister for a moment, Mr. Chairman, relates to the question of collective bargaining for professional groups. A week or two ago—I am not quite sure when, but not too long ago—the Minister, in answer to certain questions, gave the good old stock answer of the government opposite, that "this matter was under consideration", and that "a statement of policy would be made in due course."

Unless I missed something that happened in this House—and I am usually here, although not always—no such statement has yet been forthcoming. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I have been in this House for approximately eight years and my recollection is that in every one of those eight years the government stated—certainly in the last five or six years—as regularly as clockwork, that the matter was under consideration and that a statement of policy would be made in due course.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Or "in the fullness of time."

Mr. Bryden: There was a predecessor of the present administration who favoured the phrase, "the fullness of time," but whether it is "due course" or "fullness of time" is really not the point.

My point is that that answer is legitimate in some situations. When the government genuinely has something under consideration and genuinely intends to make a statement, then it is legitimate for it to say so, and it is perfectly reasonable to expect that the Opposition will wait until the government has sorted the matter out in its own thinking and is prepared to make a definite statement.

The answer is legitimate in those circumstances. It is not legitimate as a means simply of stalling the matter off for another year, and that is all that the answer has ever been used for on this issue in my experience in this House. The government says it has the matter

under consideration. I do not think that it has it under consideration at all. If it has had it under consideration for all the years that it claims, then why is it not prepared to make a statement of policy?

The professional groups find that The Labour Relations Act, as it stands, does not fit their situation satisfactorily. This has come to light very markedly in the case of registered nurses. They have been trying to avail themselves of the provisions of The Labour Relations Act, and they have found a real difficulty, particularly in relation to the definition of an employer's "agent". The application of that principle, which is most necessary and legitimate in regular industrial employment, has an adverse effect in the case of defining bargaining units for professional nurses.

Surely to heaven the government can recognize representation by the registered nurses' association as a legitimate one, and one on which it should take action. I do not know why it has to keep stalling on the matter. The number of professional people who work for salaries and wages is increasing all the time and it has now become quite a large number. Therefore, I think we have to face the fact that these people are entitled to the benefits of collective bargaining if they wish to avail themselves of them, just as other people who work for salaries and wages do. But if they are to avail themselves, they must have legislation which fits their particular situation.

I would point out that no one has ever proposed any kind of legislation that would compel them to engage in collective bargaining if they do not want to. All that has ever been asked for, to the best of my knowledge, is simply legislation which would make it possible for them to go through regular, recognized procedures by which they can be recognized for purposes of collective bargaining and then to proceed from there to bargain; something that was granted in the industrial field 25 years ago.

Why can we not now take the next step and recognize that there are a great many people who are professionally qualified, who are working for wages, many of whom would like to avail themselves of the opportunity to bargain collectively?

Is the Minister going to make a statement on this at this session? Or is it just the old stall of the last session, the session before that and the session before that, almost ad nauseam? Are we going to get a statement? I would like to know from the Minister if we can have any hope on that or are we just going to get the same old stall?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, earlier this year in the course of my becoming familiar with the work of the department, I had meetings myself with representatives of the nursing group as well as representatives of the striking committee who represented a variety of professional groups. In this connection I would say that the nurses have, I think, one point of view and the steering committee have a different point of view.

This was a new problem for me when I came to the department and I have given it a good deal of personal study. In the preparation of the estimates it has been set aside for the last few weeks, but when the estimates are complete I will be pursuing it again. I would hope that I can in my own mind resolve the different problems that have arisen and that I can come to final conclusions on the matter.

I would say in reference to the nurses, quite a number of groups have now been before the labour relations board and their applications have been dealt with. In looking at a sheet before me I see that eight to the present date have been certified under the present Act.

Mr. Bryden: I am glad to have that figure. I knew that some had been certified, but I understand from reading their publication that they are not satisfied with the manner in which their applications are dealt with under The Labour Relations Act. There is no criticism of the board; the board has to administer the law as it is written.

Hon. Mr. Bales: But they want a different procedure.

Mr. Bryden: They want what essentially is a different method of defining what is an appropriate bargaining unit for their group. It seems to me that their representations are most reasonable, and surely it should be possible to accommodate them either by amending The Labour Relations Act or by having a separate statute.

I recognize one of the problems the Minister refers to, that there is not necessarily a single voice in this field. Still, to a certain degree the differences in the representations made are a reflection of different situations, and it seems to me desirable that our law should take cognizance of different situations. We should not put one group into the framework of legislation that was devised for an entirely different group of people. It may suit the needs of the latter group but not of

the first group. Surely we can adjust our law to meet reasonable requirements of varying groups.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I recognize that—

Mr. Chairman: I do not want to get into the labour relations section other than certification of the unions at the present time. Maybe the 1005 vote—

Mr. Bryden: I am sorry, I may have jumped the gun.

Mr. Chairman: I did not want to get ahead of that particular vote, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Bryden: One last point on 1003, Mr. Chairman, if no one else has anything to raise. I think this point properly comes here since it deals with arbitration and so on. As we know, it is illegal in Ontario for a group of employees to go on strike during the currency of a collective agreement and there is a compulsory arbitration clause in The Labour Relations Act providing for the arbitration of disputes that arise during the life of the agreement.

The only problem is that this arbitration procedure required by statute is pretty strictly confined to disputes arising over the interpretation of the agreement. We all know from observation that more and more in this era of rapid technological change, new matters come up during the life of a collective agreement.

This whole problem was looked into by Mr. Justice Freedman and he recommended what I think is sensible, that matters not covered by an agreement, but which come to the fore after the agreement was entered into, should be negotiable *ab initio*. The employers should not then rely on antiquated management-rights provisions to say "this is none of your business; I will arbitrarily determine what will happen with regard to important technological change which may affect the livelihood of thousands of people." This matter surely should be dealt with by negotiation.

Our law, I submit to the Minister, is out of date. It is one thing to provide for compulsory arbitration and no strikes if all you are dealing with is just an interpretation of the provisions that are in an existing contract. But to say there will be no strikes when an entirely new matter comes up which vitally affects the welfare of the employees concerned, and on the other hand there is no provision for negotiation either, much less arbitration, is a totally unsupportable position.

This matter has been brought before the government by a great many more eloquent persons than myself, including the Ontario federation of labour which speaks for the vast majority of trade unions in this province. I would think that it is time the government started to do something about it. It may require a considerable revision of The Labour Relations Act, but surely we cannot say that, when an employer decides to make major changes in his technological procedures which may throw half of the staff out of work, it is not a matter of any interest to the union and that it should have no right to intervene in the matter and negotiate with the employer about it and use whatever services the department may have available for the purpose.

I think the government has got to get cracking on this problem and it would appear from anything that is said or done that it is not blissfully unaware—it could hardly be unaware of the problem. But it is quite indifferent to it. I would like to see some evidence of something other than indifference. Does the Minister have any comments on this problem?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I recall the report that the hon. member is referring to and I have endeavoured to look into it and the problems involved. I think it deserves a great deal of study and I am endeavouring to give it that. I have not had an opportunity as yet; I must be quite frank with the hon. member. But I shall have the occasion in the coming months.

Before we leave this vote, Mr. Chairman, if I might, the hon. member for Riverdale asked a question, and while I realize he is not in the House just at the moment I will provide it to him; perhaps others would like the answer as well. The question was, how many hospital arbitration boards have been established in the last fiscal year? And the answer is 35.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, going back to the question of the negotiability of matters arising during the life of an agreement, I am bound to agree with the hon. Minister that it is a problem that requires considerable and very hard study. On the other hand, I would suggest to him that it is an urgent problem and one that is getting more urgent all the time. Even though it requires study it also requires urgent attention.

The situation is now arising where technological change can reduce collective bargaining as we have understood it to a nullity. Our whole Act and all the procedures provided for

in it become meaningless. The whole situation can be totally changed by major changes in technology. I know that the hon. Minister is not a man who wishes to act until he feels that he has fully canvassed a problem, and I am certainly not suggesting that is not a good trait. But I am suggesting to him that he should give top priority to this and get down to a most serious study of it with a view, I would hope, to even preliminary action at this session of the Legislature.

Vote 1003 agreed to.

On vote 1004:

Mr. Singer: On 1004, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to compliment the Minister on the efficiency of the civil service in this particular branch and in so doing just tell him a little story of what happened. There was a gentleman who communicated with the labour standards branch about a claim for vacation credits and he wrote to them making that inquiry. I will not mention his name, I do not think that is important. He got back a letter from them saying, and I quote:

> We acknowledge receipt of your claim for vacation credits dated January 9, 1967 under The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act from the above noted employer. An investigation will be undertaken on your behalf.
>
> Yours very truly,

And it is signed by one of the officials of the department. A few weeks later he got a second letter back:

> Dear Sir or Madam:

They had already written to him and they were not quite sure whether he was sir or madam.

> During the recent investigation of the payroll records of X Company Limited, we found that you apparently did not receive your vacation pay under the provisions of The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act. If you will print your name and address on the lower part of this letter and return it promptly in the enclosed envelope you will in due course receive our cheque in the amount of $6.36, the sum of the credit collected on your behalf.

And it is signed and there is a little form down at the bottom allowing this gentleman to print his name and address.

I just wonder, Mr. Chairman, in the usual efficient manner of our civil service, how many times they go through this fascinating procedure? The gentleman complaining wrote to them and they must have had his name and address because they wrote two letters back. Then finally they made a study and they found he was entitled to $6.36 and then they wrote him another letter saying, "If you will print your name and address on the bottom of another letter, we will know where to send the $6.36 and we will send it to you."

It seems rather peculiar, Mr. Chairman, and I only bring this forward to ask when you last brought the organization and methods people into your department and had them examine what really goes on and how many useless pieces of paper are being shovelled about in this department. Because this is a very simple story and it does not amount to very much, but it just points up the uselessness of so many civil service procedures.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I appreciate the point you make. I would say, though, I think it is done so they can check and see that the cheque went out to the proper person. I appreciate your point.

Mr. Singer: They wrote to him and they said, "send us your name and address and we will send you the cheque."

Hon. Mr. Bales: We will look into it.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some comments on this vote, but before I do so, may I say how grateful I am to the Minister and his staff for working with me on a number of problems relating to their department. I do congratulate our new Minister of Labour, who has proved already that his capabilities and dedication are going to be very helpful to the working men and women in this province.

The Industrial Standards Act, I think I am correct in saying, was passed in the 1930s and was primarily intended as depression legislation. Now I am going to qualify that. It is the kind of legislation which I think must be on the statute books of an industrial jurisdiction, because when supply exceeds demand in unbridled competition it is possible for the price to be cut to the point that all of the persons in a trade are virtually destroyed economically.

We remember, Mr. Chairman, during the depression the price of haircuts fell from maybe 50 or 60 cents to ten or 15 cents. None of the barbers in the province could make a living and nearly all of the barbers and their families were in danger of ending up on the public dole.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): I did not.

Mr. White: That is the kind of thing that happens. There are bound to be exceptions and very vigorous men will undoubtedly succeed in the worst possible conditions, but of course we have to legislate for the great bulk of the citizens of the province.

The Industrial Standards Act has a very important role to play in depression days and recession days and if there were some kind of recession a year or two or three from now, which I do not anticipate, this will be very valuable legislation in the construction trades, for instance.

The role of The Industrial Standards Act at times other than depression is quite different. It does empower the government to attend to critical problems which may exist in one trade and one locality. I am told that only a few years ago in Toronto there was a problem of this kind in the bricklaying trade, in the masons' trade, and that the powers of this Act and the regulations made possible by the Act were utilized to pull up the average wages paid to the masons, many of them newly arrived in Canada, and that some very bad situations were thereby corrected.

Therefore, sir, I think there is room in this province for an Industrial Standards Act and its schedules in good times and bad.

Having said that, I want to point out the restraint with which the legislation must be used in prosperous times. It has been said to me that nothing could be more democratic than the procedures established under the Act, whereby a number of tradesmen may petition the Minister for a conference and having done so, the Minister may sit down with these representatives and develop a new schedule. There are a number of points in each schedule, but the important things are the hours of work and the rate of pay.

It has been said to me that philosophically this is a most democratic procedure. In point of fact, this is a twisting of a philosophical concept. It is not democratic, Mr. Chairman, if 51 per cent or 61 per cent or whatever, of the bricklayers in the town of Guelph can impose an inordinately high rate of pay—let us say $10—or an inordinately low number of hours—let say 25 or 30—on the 40 or 50 or 35 per cent of the men who want to work longer, or who may wish to charge less.

It is not democratic either that 51 per cent, or 65 per cent of the members of the trade can impose some high rate of price, or some low number of hours on the community at large. Let us use the barbering industry. It would be unthinkable for the barbers in Kingston, let us say, to impose a minimum of $3 a haircut. I do not think that a Minister or a government would be responsible to let that request into law even if 60 per cent, or some substantial majority of the tradesmen in the trade put that request to the Minister.

In point of fact, the government must assume the responsibility directly for the schedules developed under this legislation and in so doing they must have in mind, not only the needs and wishes of the tradesmen, but the needs and wishes of the community.

Now let me deal more specifically with a situation which exists in London, Ontario.

In London, Ontario, there are five or six very large plumbing houses with several hundred employees. All of these houses are unionized and each has a binding contract with the plumbers' union which establishes a rather high rate of pay, perhaps $3.75 an hour. This group of employees and employers has been asking the department for a conference and their expectation, rather their hope, is that at such a conference they will be able to impose hours of work and rates of pay determined in their union agreements upon the trade in general. There are several reasons for this.

These large firms are competing at the margin with perhaps 150 very small firms. When I say they are competing at the margin, I mean this: none of the large firms would put a bathroom in a private house, nor would any of the small firms put the plumbing in at the new Ford Motor Company plant at Talbotville. But nearly all of them would be interested in providing the plumbing for a small manufacturing industry or a small apartment building. And so they do come into competitive situations in that middle area. If the large firms—now I am talking about the employers—succeed in having the hours of work and the rates of pay imposed on the industry in total, they will have eliminated a great deal of competition brought to bear on them by the small independent plumbers.

This is not economically fair because the larger houses have certain economies of scale in their purchasing, in their administrative and overhead costs and so on. And so, if the large employers were to impose the terms of their union agreement on all of the industry, they would find themselves now at a very important competitive advantages over the 150 small plumbing houses in the area.

The large employers, the five or six that I am talking about, having signed their union contracts, have bound themselves in one of the latter clauses of the union agreement to support the union's strive for a new

schedule. This, I have to say, Mr. Chairman, seems to me, to be out of keeping with the intent and the nature of the legislation. In order to accomplish labour peace, the large firms have signed union agreements, a section of which promises that the employers will join forces with the union to try to impose the union contract concerning hours, wages and so on, on the trade as a whole.

So the first of my suggestions, Mr. Chairman, is that some thought be given to eliminating this practice. I am not expert enough in the field of labour to be able to comment any further and while what has been done is correct, it seems to me that it "ain't right". For that reason, I ask the department to take a look at that.

The government must ensure, in prosperous times like these, with some degree of inflation created in part by government, that it does not accentuate the problem of inflation by legislation such as this. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be unthinkable for the government, in these highly prosperous times, to impose new schedules under this Act which would increase costs to the community as a whole. And more specifically, I think it would be irresponsible for us, as a government, to agree to new schedules which would increase the cost of housing. I therefore suggest—

Mr. Singer: Are these absolute suggestions the member is making?

Mr. White: I am not answering that question before I know what is behind it.

Mr. Singer: The member seems to just close the door.

Mr. White: No, no, listen to me now, do not be anxious, I am almost finished.

Mr. Singer: I just want to understand the member.

Mr. White: I would like to suggest that the solution to the London problem, and perhaps to similar situations in other parts of the province, may be to divide a number of these trades into two branches. That has already been done, I think, in one or two trades in Toronto.

I think I am correct in saying it has been done with the sheet metal trade, where there is an industrial branch, so to speak, and where there is a house-building branch. I think this precedent could be applied in the London area. I think we could very well have two schedules for the plumbing trade, and for the electrical trades, and for one or two other trades which are now being affected. I think this would be in keeping with The Apprenticeship Act which does in fact divide the electricians into class A, I believe it is, industrial and commercial, and class B, which is small commercial and house-building—so there we have a further precedent for the suggestion I am about to make.

In London, Ontario, there should be a schedule for the half dozen large plumbing houses and their employees, and I think that the rates of pay so established, should be something approaching the union agreements, thereby establishing a floor under which those prices could not fall if there were a sudden recession. The benefits to the trade are obvious; the benefits to the community are less obvious. In point of fact, the greatest difficulty in recessionary times is to keep aggregate demand buoyant, and legislation like this, with minimum rates of pay such as I am suggesting, do contribute very substantially to sustained aggregate demand and to an upturn in the economic cycle.

The second schedule would apply to the house-building trades. It would be substantially less than is paid in the industrial branch and this would enable 150 entrepreneurs in the plumbing trade in London, to go out and charge what they thought was a reasonable amount of money.

If the amount shown in the industrial branch schedule were $3.75, and if the independent plumbers were quite content with $3.00, having all of their costs, having the resources of their customers in mind, they could very easily go ahead and charge the $3.00.

I might say, sir, that that would not set a limit on the amount which they could charge, and if some men were more efficient, or if their services were, for some reason, more attractive, there is no reason that they could not charge $3.25. I should make it clear, because I see a head being shaken, that I am not recommending these amounts, I am simply using them by way of illustration.

I think, sir, that so far as hours of work are concerned, two schedules are very appropriate. If a firm has a plumbing contract at Ford Talbotville, and has a 40-hour work week, this is entirely different from a small plumber with one or two craftsmen imposing a 40-hour work week at certain times of the year. Let me develop that idea for a minute.

The plumber working for the large house on the Talbotville job goes to work at 8 a.m.; his tools are there on the premises; his job is exactly where he left it; he can to work

and presumably he can work for a full eight hours on that job.

There will be labourers and others to bring tools and supplies and such like. Contrast that with a small plumber putting a bathroom into a house. A bathroom takes the average plumber about eight and a half hours to install. But the independent plumber has to go to his office in the morning, open his mail, maybe pay some bills and make a few phone calls for supplies and such like, so it may be 9.30 a.m. before he gets to his job with his tools and his truck.

Unlike the big contractor, he cannot leave his tools in the unfinished building because there is nobody there to guard them. He has to load his equipment and tools up every morning, and take them away every evening. By the time he gets to work on that job it may be 9.30 or 10 o'clock. I think, sir, it would be a very great mistake to insist, as these schedules have done, that this man stop work eight hours after the nominal starting time of perhaps eight in the morning. If he wishes to continue on that job until 6.30 or seven when that bathroom would be finished, I think that is the way it should be.

Let me use a seasonal illustration—

Mr. Singer: How do you apply that last argument?

Mr. White: I am asking that the smaller contractors be given the opportunity of establishing their own wage rates with a relatively low minimum and be given considerable freedom to set their own maximum hours. Do not forget that the large numbers in the big companies offer an alternative place of work always for the one or two tradesmen working for the small plumbing entrepreneur, and if the wages fall too low or if the hours get too long, the tradesmen working for the small plumbing house can find work, if work there is, in the large plumbing concern. And that provides a continuing safeguard for the rather small number of employees in a large number of small enterprises.

I want to apply this recent idea to those aspects of house building which are seasonal in nature. Let us take landscaping, for example. It is self-evident to members of the Legislature that from late in the fall until early in the spring no landscaping can be done. Men who drive bulldozers and small garden tractors and such like in doing this type of work, find themselves with limited numbers of hours of work for four or five months of the year.

On the other hand, from early spring until some time in the fall, there is a tremendous amount of work to be done. Would it not be incongruous for us as a Legislature, to say to a man, "Granted you only work 20 hours a week for five months of the year, but now you can only work 40 hours a week for the remaining seven months of the year, even though there is 50 hours of work available to you and even though you are willing and able to do it."

Mr. Singer: Surely, the schedule can be adapted.

Mr. White: I am suggesting that we do that. So in summary, Mr. Chairman, and to reiterate my suggestions to the Minister, I think that in these house building trades affected, and more particularly the electricians' trade and the plumbing trade, there should be two schedules, one governing the industrial builders and one governing house builders. I hope the Minister will find it possible to implement my suggestion, and I think in so doing that the tradesmen in the London area and, indeed, in other parts of the province where this situation is current, will be well protected and well satisfied, and that the consumers and the community at large will not be in any way adversely affected.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the hon. member's remarks because we have been hearing a bit about this ourselves and I do not know if there is any solution. Hopefully, I was waiting for the member to emerge with a solution that seemed to make some sense, but certainly the ideas that he—

Mr. White: If you were listening you would have recognized the sense of my suggestions.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry, I missed that.

Mr. White: If you had not been so busy talking to the member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton), you might have recognized the good sense that I put to the House.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think that the member is getting a little touchy about this and his House leader is touchy about the same sort of thing. He should let us worry about what we listen to and we can decide for ourselves just how many words of wisdom fall from his mouth from time to time.

I listened very carefully to what the member said and I am able to listen to him and talk to my colleagues on the other side and absorb everything that he says at the same

time. I am disappointed in his suggestions because I think they open the door to a lot of very serious danger.

The first danger that impresses me is his suggestion that a level be arbitrarily fixed. I asked him that question and he said, "Wait, I am not sure whether you are trying to trap me or not." I think that is what he was saying, but he said that we would not want to do anything in time of inflation which would raise prices. Is he suggesting—and I think it must be that he is suggesting—that we limit plumbers' wages, even though he says that it is the minimum; it is often the maximum, very often the maximum, while other wages and prices—food and other commodities—are allowed to be controlled in another way.

Mr. White: I am not suggesting that, and if you had been listening you would know that I did not suggest that.

Mr. Singer: At the point I asked you if you wished to be that arbitrary; you refused to answer me. And the member will recall that. If he did not mean that, I would like after I am through to have him get up and explain what he did mean. He said that he would not want to add to the inflation and the level should be there.

Mr. White: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has accused me of wanting to restrain prices in one trade while costs and prices in other areas go up. I did not say that. What I did say is that in the two branches which I am suggesting, the price in one branch, the wages paid to industrial plumbers could be established at a level equal to or approaching the union contract rate, and this would automatically establish a floor if there were a sudden recession.

I suggested that there be a minimum in the house building branch and that this minimum, at the request of the entrepreneurs concerned, could be established lower than the rate in the industrial branch. I did not recommend, and I could not recommend, that any group of citizens make a disproportionate sacrifice in the society by curtailing their prices while other prices were left free to rise.

Mr. Singer: I do not know how that statement ties in with the fact that he said we cannot allow the price of houses to increase, because the two things—

Mr. White: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, he spoke and I listened patiently.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member spoke previously but he is now standing in his place—

Mr. White: The hon. member is now asserting that I said the government should keep the price of houses from increasing. I recognize the impossibility of doing this when federal fiscal policies and—

Mr. Singer: Now is that a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. White: —and, indeed, world conditions make it impossible.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, all he is doing—

Mr. White: And I was only saying that the Ontario government should not by legislation increase the cost and the price of houses.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, all he is doing now is explaining what he expressed badly—

Mr. White: You do not understand it, that is all.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: I think the member did make his point of order that he did not say what you said he had said.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, be that as it may, I fail to understand all that the hon. member proposes to deal with this. He has the big plumbing firms who are going to be paid union wages, and then he takes the small plumbers—the "entrepreneurs" he calls them—150 of them; and they are going to get a lesser scale of wages.

And he talks about all these people as though they were running their own business, not as though they had to bring in people to employ, not as though they were employers of these individual plumbers—we are not going to take advantage of what was in the schedule—not as though, if there were an ability to extend those hours we would be back to the sweat shop in plumbing that these schedules are designed to avoid.

So I am very sceptical, Mr. Chairman; I am very sceptical, indeed, of the solution put forward by the hon. member. This Act serves a very useful purpose in preventing the exploitation of labour in the province of Ontario, and I do not think that there is anyone who can doubt that, and there is a problem. The member again contradicted

himself when he said that these two groups are in competition. How can you allow people on one wage level to compete with people who have a lower wage level and expect the competition to be reasonable?

Mr. White: I explained that in detail.

Mr. Singer: No, you did not.

Mr. White: You were not listening.

Mr. Singer: I wish the hon. member would not be so sensitive. This is sensitive day on the Tory benches. They are embarrassed about the things they say and all the answer they have is that we were not listening to them. Unfortunately, we listen to them at too great length; we just do not understand some of the peculiar or unusual ideas they put forward, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: It is unparliamentary to accuse another member of not listening.

Mr. Singer: The fact remains, Mr. Chairman—very briefly, in summary, I recognize that there is concern about the enforcement of The Industrial Standards Act in London and in other parts of the province of Ontario. The member, however, has put his finger on where the responsibility lies. It lies with the government, in this department, because the government puts its stamp of approval on each one of these schedules.

It may be the schedules are inflated or are not high enough from a wage sense, or that the hours of work are not adaptable enough in dealing with his problem in landscaping. But these schedules are amenable to change. They are adaptable to working conditions in particular industries or in sections of industries. The unionized people really do not need the kind of protection that the hon. member is talking about. They protect themselves through their collective bargaining and it is highly unlikely and unreasonable that people working in a unionized shop should be paid a higher rate of pay than the people who are working for these entrepreneurs, as the hon. member refers to them.

I commend to the Minister's attention a very careful examination of the whole problem before he likely interferes with the present procedures under The Industrial Standards Act, as imperfect as some of the schedules may be. This Act has gone a long way in preventing the exploitation of labour, in preventing sweat shops, in so often preventing new immigrants, who bring with them particular trades but who do not understand methods in this country, from being exploited, being forced to work long hours at very low rates of pay.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Good Tory legislation.

Mr. Singer: I am defending a piece of legislation against a series of impractical suggestions put forward by the member for London South.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Is the Minister going to reply, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I am sure if he feels so inclined, he will reply.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring up a completely different topic, so if there are others in the House that would to carry on with this particular topic, I would let them have the floor.

Mr. Chairman: Is there further discussion on this particular topic?

Mr. Sopha: People will not listen.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that I think we all recognize the value of this statute and the results it has achieved. The important thing is that the schedules are the result of a conference between employers and employees, and that that must be taken into account.

We want flexibility in these schedules just as far as we can, but on the other hand, we want to see that the people are protected.

From the department's standpoint, sir, this is but one element in the labour standards system in this province, and, personally, I feel that it plays a very positive role in protecting the interests of the working people. We are working for personal flexibility, but we do not want to destroy the main purpose of the Act.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, if I might just ask the Minister, with reference to one-man barber shops, for instance, or the single plumber shop, just one man working for himself. I wonder whether this is not one area where these regulations and these standards might be reviewed. It seems to me that a person, if they want to work on their own behalf, should be able to work when they like and for the rates they like. Has the Minister given any thought in that area? I am not talking about employers and employees.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is talking about a single—a one-man barber shop—if we want to take an example.

It is a matter I think we might consider and take a look at, but on the other hand, even though it is a one-man barber shop, you may have the next barber shop two blocks away, with two or three men. I think we have to appreciate the effect on this whole area.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he is considering increasing the minimum wage? The minimum has been in effect now, for approximately two years, and the average hourly wage has gone up about 25 cents an hour during that same period of time.

I think those on that minimum hourly wage at $1.00 and $1.25, should certainly get some consideration so far as an increase in the minimum wage is concerned. Does the Minister have this under review and does he plan on increasing the minimum wage?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I would say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, that the matter is under review.

Mr. Newman: Can we expect an increase in this coming year, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is a matter of policy, it will have to be announced separately.

Mr. Newman: Has there been any limit at all set, as yet, in the Minister's studies, does he plan on raising it to $1.50 or $1.75?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, that is part of the review.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I have two or three items I would like to deal with under this question. After I completed my opening remarks on a general basis, the hon. member for Woodbine asked the Minister his opinion on three or four of the areas I covered, and I believe the Minister indicated he would like to deal with them under the specific votes.

One of them I wanted to ask the Minister his feelings on, was the union security provisions in The Labour Relations Act. I must admit there is no specific place, but under the labour standards branch which deals with some of the legislation, I would take this opportunity to ask the Minister just what has been the consideration of The Department of Labour, in regard to a minimum provision for union security under The Labour Relations Act.

I would ask the Minister if he has, himself, in the time he has been the Minister, given any consideration to this question, or if he has had an opportunity to discuss with the previous Minister, or officers of his department, as to the justification now, at this time, for provisions in The Labour Relations Act providing for a minimum type of union security such as the revocable voluntary check-off.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I am content to deal with these matters, although I think they really come under the labour relations board.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to the member that he hold it until the next vote.

Mr. Gisborn: I will just leave it at that point.

Mr. Chairman: Is 1004 carried?

Mr. Gisborn: No.

Mr. Chairman: We could deal with that question under 1005 if the member wishes.

Mr. Gisborn: I still have some questions on this vote.

Mr. Chairman, during the estimates of The Department of Highways, I raised a question of the department's policy of turning a contract over to a firm to look after the salting of the highways during icy and snowy weather. This contracting firm was bringing in workers from Newfoundland and when we raised the question as to whether they were working in keeping with the terms of The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, we could not of course get that answer from the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme). We were told it would come under The Department of Labour.

So I would ask the Minister if, through his officers, he could inform the House as to what was the result of their investigation into that situation. Just to recall the situation, investigations were made and we found that the men were on duty for 24 hours a day for six days, which is a total of 144 hours. One article in the press tells us that they were getting $70 a week, which is something below 50 cents an hour, and of course, the statement by one of the employees in another press article said that when they figured it out they were making about 33 cents an hour. I remember the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Kerr) briefly taking part in the debate, and saying that he had requested The Department of Labour to investigate this situation as to whether or not they had violated The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act.

Hon. Mr. Bales: In dealing with the matter that the hon. member has raised, I think it is, the nature of the type of work involved, in that they had to stand by on the sanding operations and be available in case of inclement weather. So that while there were times, perhaps, when they were on duty they were not working all this period of time.

Some of these people came, as the hon. member has said, from Newfoundland, but the matter really has been resolved, in that the men have gone back to Newfoundland, and I think that the company has engaged, or did engage, other people here.

They were able to obtain their proper staff and recognize the difficulty, and I think that the difficulty has been overcome.

Mr. Gisborn: I thank the Minister for his answer and I anticipated this would be the result. The point that I am concerned with, and I certainly think that it is a pretty loose interpretation of the hours of work and minimum wage provisions, whether this might establish a precedent in the province.

So I would put this question to the hon. Minister: Is there any incident of this nature, in the province, that the department knows of, where someone is on 24-hour call in a similar nature and receives in total payment, something below what would be in keeping with the provisions of The Minimum Wage Act?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The only other analogous situation that I could think of at the moment, is that of ambulance drivers. They might be in that same group, but it would be of an emergency nature, but I do not think that this is going to become a precedent.

I think the matter has been dealt with and it will not likely arise again.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, this has raised another question for the hon. Minister. I had occasion, on February 13 of this year, to request the director of the labour standards branch, Mr. Campbell, to make an investigation for me in regard to several service stations in Hamilton.

I gave him a list of the addresses. All I want to ask at this point, is why I have not yet received the information—the hon. Minister does not have to give it to me at this time, but I would like to have an answer to my request, because I have been badgered by the people who made the complaint and I would like a detailed report on the results of their findings.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, we would be glad to give the hon. member the detailed information. The matter is not yet finally resolved, it is still under consideration by the industry and labour board, and I will see that the report comes to the hon. member.

Vote 1004 agreed to.

On vote 1005:

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind the Minister that he was going to, under this vote, give me his opinion in regard to the provisions of a revocable voluntary check-off in The Labour Relations Act.

Hon. Mr. Bales: In reference to the voluntary check-off, I think Mr. Justice Rand in his report, and in his considerations, may well deal with this matter, and that there will be some recommendations in the report in connection with this point.

It is one of those problems on which I think there are two sides, and I appreciate the point the hon. member made both last night, and in his remarks earlier today. At the present time, this is the procedure and we would not want to make any changes, or consider changes, until that report comes in from Mr. Justice Rand.

I anticipate that there will be discussions. I know there has been discussion on it and, while I have no idea what will be in his report, I think it is one of the matters that he will take into consideration.

Mr. Gisborn: Just on that point, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's concern, but I have not noticed, and I might have missed it—I have not noticed representations being made to the Rand commission in regard to this situation.

But I would say that usually legislation comes about through precedent. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, almost every province in Canada now has some minimum provisions, and almost every industry that is under collective bargaining agreements in the province, has certain types of union security.

The reason I have raised it so strongly this year, is that the only holdout in conceding to this type of union security, seems to be the mining industry in the gold and silver mines. Of course, we know that over the years this has caused a great deal of antagonism in negotiations with those groups, and surely, if the government provided the legislation, it would make negotiations much easier with those two groups.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, in my opening remarks, I made some reference to the coming problem of Canadian union autonomy. I thought that the Minister might like at this time, to perhaps let the House know his views on the subject, and what, if anything, his department is going to do, or is looking into. I wonder if he could tell us how he feels concerning Canadian membership control over policy making and administration, of international local unions in Canada, just for a start?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, in this regard, I am interested in the hon. member's views on this. He raised the subject—I do not know whether you have formulated your views on it yet or not—but I would appreciate yours. I have been trying to pursue the subject in Professor Crispo's book, but I would appreciate your views on it.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I can only say the football season is over. I am not the person who is here to answer questions. The hon. Minister, told us about his research staff. I know he is the type of person who is interested in preventing things, as his opening remarks indicated, and not waiting until after a situation develops. I thought that he should, perhaps, be able to give this House some of his thoughts.

I am not asking for government policy, but I should think that this is something on which the hon. Minister might want to let the House know how he feels.

We look upon him as a bright new star in The Department of Labour, and I would like to see this star shining.

An hon. member: You have got the ball.

Mr. Sopha: Myself, Mr. Chairman, I would rather see a study made of the influence over the activities of Canadian corporations, by the head offices in the United States.

Mr. Chairman: Just how does this come under the legislation?

Mr. Sopha: I merely stated my preference.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am asking the Minister a question. I would like to get the Minister's views on this. He did not answer. If the Minister recalls, just after the opening remarks of both the Opposition parties, he commented on some of these matters and he said he would leave others until we arrived at them during the estimates. I thought, perhaps, this might be an appropriate time to bring this up.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I have not formulated any final views on the matter. I think this is one of those general type of problems on which I think there is room for exchange of views, and careful consideration. Quite frankly, I have not formulated final views on the matter at all, and for that reason I am not, at this point, in a position to give them to you. When I asked for your views on it, I was not being facetious, and I am sure you appreciate that. I think it is a matter on which we should give careful consideration, and I honestly would appreciate your views on it.

Mr. Braithwaite: Has the Minister any thoughts on meeting with some of the union people or having someone in his department meeting with some of the union people, both on the international and on the Canadian side, to get their views, so that you might start a study? I am very interested in a study being made. I would not expect the Minister to have a concrete proposal to put forward in a minute or so, but the Chairman seems perturbed. Is the time 6 p.m.?

Mr. Chairman: No, I was just wondering if, from the standpoint of your study, it would more properly come under 1008, under research branch?

Mr. Braithwaite: All right. I will bring it up then. Thank you.

Vote 1005 agreed to.

It being 6 of the clock, the House took recess.

No. 84

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Estimates, Department of Labour, Mr. Bales, concluded 2927

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued 2950

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 2967

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR
(Concluded)

On vote 1006:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, under 1006 could I ask the Minister if the inspection of amusement rides could come under this vote?

Mr. Chairman: Unless it could be considered under prevention of industrial accidents—

Hon. D. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, that is really a municipal responsibility rather than a Department of Labour responsibility.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I understand that, but some of the municipalities do not have the capable staff to actually check on whether the amusement ride is in a safe condition or not and I just wondered whether The Department of Labour could see fit to undertake such studies, to undertake to examine amusement rides.

Hon. Mr. Bales: We will consider looking into the situation.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister how many municipalities or counties do not have their construction inspector appointed?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, all municipalities on the county level, and the larger centres, have construction inspectors.

Mr. Worton: What about the counties, sir, is this the counties as well as the cities of the counties?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is right. I think it is 253 altogether.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, if I might ask the Minister, not long ago in Don Mills, little Wesley Watson, a ten-year-old boy, was killed playing in an elevator and at that time the chief elevator inspector said that The Department of Labour was having trouble—

Mr. Chairman: Would the member wait until I see if there is anything in advance of that particular section?

Mr. Braithwaite: We are on 1006.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, on that same vote, is anything in advance of the elevator inspector branch? On the same vote?

Mr. Braithwaite: Oh, yes, I have a few other things, but I just wanted to ask the Minister, as I was saying, the chief elevator inspector said that they were having trouble recruiting elevator inspectors because of poor salaries. That was a couple of months ago and I wonder if the Minister can tell us what they are paying the elevator inspectors, and secondly, whether this condition has been rectified?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That has recently been under review and the new salary schedule is now in effect, which is $7,200 to $8,600.

Mr. Braithwaite: What are the qualifications for an inspector?

Hon. Mr. Bales: They must be qualified as elevator mechanics so they are fully cognizant of the working of the elevator and so on.

Mr. Braithwaite: Yes, and how many elevator inspectors would the department have and how many would be operating out of Metro?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I think we deal with it on a provincial basis and our complement has been increased now from 37 to 52.

Mr. Braithwaite: In Metro, how many did you have last year?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I really cannot answer that question now but I will be glad to get the information for the member. I just do not have it before me at this point.

Mr. Braithwaite: All I wanted to do was point out to the Minister that particularly in the suburbs of Metro we have quite a few

high-rise apartments going up, particularly in my riding in Etobicoke. I am concerned that we do have adequate elevator inspectors and I should have thought the Minister should have a figure like that available.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, in reference to this particular matter, I think the hon. member will appreciate we have increased our complement. I appreciate the member's concern. He and I have personal knowledge of this situation in Metro and in other municipalities in this province. But the main thing is the complement has been increased so that we can have more inspectors available on the job.

Mr. Braithwaite: In my opening remarks I made a few comments with reference to construction safety and I want to ask only one or two questions. There were 10 safety inspectors with the department last year and I am wondering if the Minister could tell us how many there are now and what plans he has for strengthening that area?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We have altogether, Mr. Chairman, 18 now; it was increased more than a year ago.

Mr. Braithwaite: And what are the qualifications of these people, are they professional engineers?

Hon. Mr. Bales: They are really journeymen construction people, they are not professional engineers.

Mr. Braithwaite: In view of the intricacies of the job, and the difficulties—I spoke about them during my opening remarks and I will not go into them now—has the Minister given any thought to having some sort of graduate or undergraduate course at the university to see if they could train a higher calibre of inspector?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well, really, I think the experience on the job would mean more. I appreciate the member's remarks last night and the question of training of inspectors in their duties is a matter of continuous review in the department. Actually, all of the inspectors bring to the position their own personal experience and knowledge of many years in the construction industry, and that includes periods in supervisory positions. That, of course, is groundwork to the work they will be called upon to do later, and from time to time professional engineers have been used in an advisory capacity.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, we have sort of ranged over the various subjects in this vote. I kind of thought we were starting to talk but the hon. member—

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I was wondering if there was something in advance of this section, but there is nothing to prevent the member from carrying on now.

Mr. Gisborn: First, Mr. Chairman, under the operating engineers branch, I say to the Minister that somehow I have lost track of just what is going on in this particular area. I would ask the Minister, has the review been completed by the special committee studying The Operating Engineers Act, to the point where you are ready to complete the new Act and revise the certification of operating engineers? What is the situation in this complete department?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That was the committee under Dr. Ross Lord and the report was finalized in the last month to six weeks. That is now before our department with a view to incorporating these into regulations. We hope the revised regulations will be finished within the next two to three months at the outside. But the report came to us in the late winter or spring of this year. It really took longer than was anticipated but I think it was a complex subject and Dr. Lord worked for a long period of time with the whole committee so that they could come to some practical solutions and recommendations.

Mr. Gisborn: In the construction safety branch, I imagined we would have had a little more detail from the Minister in regard to construction safety across the province than we have had. I heard the Minister's answer to the hon. member for Etobicoke in regard to the number of inspectors in this branch, and am I right to assume that the number of 18 the Minister mentioned includes these persons who are in liaison with the inspectors appointed by the municipalities across the province, or are they involved in direct inspection themselves?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The inspectors really are supervisors over the municipal inspectors, and they go out with them at times to help them bring up the standards of the local inspection.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, I would think the Minister is well aware of the many complaints from the municipalities based on two facts—that they have not been able to afford the cost of supplying the number of inspectors that are necessary in their particular areas, and some municipalities which can afford it have taken the position that this kind of

an imposition is forced on them and they are just going to comply with those provisions of The Construction Safety Act. I think I am correct in saying that it provides that a municipality with over 50,000 would have to appoint two inspectors.

In the city of Hamilton, of course, where our population is close to 300,000, we still have only two inspectors—a senior inspector and one assistant. At the present time there is a recommendation from the board of control to the council to add two more. In all justice, four will not be sufficient to do the kind of a job that has to be done in the Hamilton area.

I would like to point out to the Minister that even though we have not had a great degree of fatalities in the Hamilton area there have been some very serious accidents that could have caused many deaths. We were really fortunate in one particular accident at Dominion Foundries where a whole building shell collapsed just when men were on a coffee break and we were fortunate to get away with just some injuries. But the record in Hamilton in 1963 and 1964 was one fatality in each year, and in 1965 we had two, and in 1966 we had four. I understand from the report there were 15 serious accidents and I have not been able to find out how many minor injuries or serious injuries were involved, but I am convinced that there were many broken limbs and broken backs and loss of limbs and all of these sort of injuries that go with minor accidents.

I would like the Minister, when he gives us his report, to make it more complete. Fatalities mean something and, of course, one fatality in one particular area is one too many. But we should also have a detailed report on the seriousness of other injuries that are involved in the construction safety field. In 1965 the two inspectors, I understand, made 2,225 inspections, although at the same time there were 3,361 buildings completed that did not have a visit by an inspector because of the lack of time to get around. And the 1966 record was—

Mr. Chairman: I think the member is now talking about municipal inspection, is he not?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes. Under The Construction Safety Act. In 1966, our record, I understand, was worse, but we have not had a compilation of the statistics as yet. In 1965, I understand they issued 120 stop work orders, to comply with the construction safety —rather, 120 orders to comply with construction safety under the regulations but there were 40 cases of stop work orders in that case.

What happens when two inspectors get around as well as they can and they find these violations of the regulations and they take legal action? They then have to spend a lot of time going through the legal procedure which again takes them away from the real work they are supposed to be doing. I think it is about time the department revised its approach to construction safety in the province. I do not think the municipalities are ever going to take the kind of approach to it that is necessary to say that we are all doing the best we can do in regard to construction safety. A mandatory position by an Act of the province that just provides a minimum in this field is not enough. Minimums in some cases will work all right, but when it comes to safety, a minimum provision is not enough.

I think it is about time the government took one or two steps—either make mandatory provisions strong enough that we will have adequate and efficient inspection, that is, the raising of the mandatory inspections necessary in a given area, or else take over the job of inspection as a provincial function.

I cannot find any reason why the department or the government will not take this point of view. Certainly you have 18 inspectors, as the Minister has said, who are supervising the Act and giving the kind of assistance to the municipal inspectors that is necessary, but this does not seem to be enough. I would urge the Minister to give full consideration to doing one or the other, making sure through the statistics that we have now compiled since the Act has been in force, or taking over the job as a provincial function so that we can make sure every construction site is getting the kind of visits necessary and that the contractors are living up to the provisions of the Act.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could just assist the hon. member for a moment. He dealt with statistics from Hamilton itself and I just mention, as I said before, the number of inspectors in the province is 253, the number of inspections carried out is 118,327. There were 337 informations laid, 159 convictions, and 72 fatalities. The number of orders to comply, 22,128, the number of stop work orders, 4,501. Just carrying on in the positive side of this whole matter, we have a number of seminars for municipal inspectors in the province; this year, 1967, we have carried out four seminars in different parts of the province already, and these are

meetings lasting over a period of two to three days for the municipal inspectors in the various areas to help bring their standards up to date and to assist them.

Mr. Gisborn: I am sure when we get the picture of a thriving municipality like Hamilton, where they make 2,225 inspections and then they tell us there were 3,361 buildings completed in that same year that they could not get around to inspect, that there is something wrong. I would think this kind of situation would prevail across the province. It is all right to have the figures on the number of inspections that were made and the number of stop work orders, the number of legal proceedings in regard to violations of the Act, but when that is taking place how many were not visited? I think this is the important thing, how many were left without inspections? And I would hope there would be some improvement in the near future.

On the elevator inspection branch, of course, we know that the government has made some improvements in the provisions of this particular Act, but I wonder if the department has figures on accidents that have happened in regard to elevators across the province. Do we have any figures? First, is it necessary in all apartment buildings and all industries where elevators are used that when someone is injured because of the faulty operation of an elevator, that it be reported to the department, so that we can finally arrive at the most positive and best mechanical elevator use that is possible?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Just quickly looking at the figures here, for the period April 1 last year to January 1 this year, in reference to elevators, there were 142 accidents. One of those was fatal.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, just pursuing this question, I would think it would be a good idea to post with the elevator inspection, which is in each elevator, or in some type of notice, that any establishment that has elevators should report all accidents that occur on the premises.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I think that is carried out now, but your suggestion will be considered.

Mr. Gisborn: In the industrial safety branch, could the Minister briefly tell us just what the situation is? This is a little different than construction safety, because we have now devised a system. Inefficient as I think it is, sir, personally, it is different to that of industrial inspection. Industrial inspection is strictly under the jurisdiction of The Department of Labour, and my latest inquiries—particularly in Hamilton, and from some of the people involved in industries in other parts of the province, is that they are becoming a little concerned about the lack of routine inspection in the industries at the present time.

They find this lack of concern is because of the growing expansion and increased production in industry, where they are putting the pressure on and using most of their available space, and they are finding that hazardous conditions are existing, from both equipment and conditions, dust and fumes and this sort of thing. Could the Minister tell me just what has taken place in Hamilton? For instance, how many inspections have there been in Steel Company of Canada, how many in Dofasco and the National Steel Car plant, for example? Could we have some idea of what has taken place as far as inspections are concerned in those three industries?

Hon. Mr. Bales: You asked for Dofasco, National Steel Car and the Steel Company of Canada? We would have to get those exact figures for you because they are from one municipality. We would be glad to get it and I will have it sent to you. I do not have those broken down by plants here.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, what is the subsidy you pay on county safety inspectors for mileage and for salaries?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The department does not pay any subsidy.

Mr. Sargent: May I ask the Minister, when you set up the safety inspectors across the province, is this mandatory in every county, city and town, or what are the mechanics of that?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It was a mandatory requirement in counties, cities and separated towns. I think that covers the whole range. It is a requirement by the province of the municipalities.

Mr. Sargent: So the government in effect sees the need for a safety programme in Ontario, and making big fellows of yourselves you say, "We will have a safety programme across Ontario." You say to the municipalities, "This is law; you do it and you pay for it." Is this right?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has to bear in mind that the province pays a good deal of money to the

municipalities, that is to cover a wide range of services and this is but one of the municipal services to be provided.

Mr. Sargent: I do not want to flog this. We know the grants we get are eaten up on many other things, but the point is that municipalities are opposed to the fact that you make a law, make it mandatory, and you set the specifications and you tell the municipalities that they must pay the freight for it. The counties across the province are sending in petitions asking the government to subsidize this and there is one here from the county of Victoria, endorsed by the county of Grey, that the provincial government be asked to pay a subsidy of 75 per cent on the salary and mileage costs for the county's safety inspector. You say you are not paying any subsidies whatsoever?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member appreciates that this has been a requirement of municipalities for many long years.

Mr. Sargent: You told them they must do this. You made a law that they must do this and they must pay the whole cost of it.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes, but many municipalities have had these inspectors for some time.

Mr. Sargent: Not the smaller ones, they did not at all. That is all on this point.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I doubt whether there is any municipality that has not passed a recommendation that The Department of Labour take over the costs involved in such safety inspection. My municipality has done that. I would like to ask of the Minister if as a result of the inquiry conducted into the death of one Hop Wong Lee —a 72-year-old retired laundryman who was killed in the city of Windsor when a barricade blew over and injured him, damaged his brain and he died some hours after the accident— the Minister has any recommendations that he can report to the House that have been brought about. I asked this one year ago, Mr. Chairman, and I did not receive a reply then, even though I was told I would get one.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with the case at the moment, but I have made a notation of it. We will look into it and I will send word to you.

Mr. Newman: Will the Minister supply me with the information?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I would be very pleased to.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, I understand the results of the inquest and investigation into the Heron bridge collapse last year was completed without any convictions for blame under The Construction Safety Act. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there was a fine against the company. While I am not sure of the extent of the fine, I think it was quite substantial in thousands of dollars—about $5,000 —but I could not be positive as to the exact figure.

Vote 1006 agreed to.

On vote 1007:

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise a question which I think is very important under the human rights commission. I have in my possession some correspondence from the united brewers warehousing workers provincial board. That is the heart of the union of the international united breweries, flour, cereals, soft drink and distilleries workers of America. They outlined to me that they have a signed collective agreement with their employers which provides that a temporary employee, having worked 500 hours in a 12-month period, would then have the opportunity to be upgraded to a potential regular status, and that means he would take his position in the regular work force according to their seniority agreement.

But they then allege that the employer has introduced a unilateral 40-years-of-age limit on these people being considered for this position. If you can remember, on September 12 there was a shut-down of all the beer distribution stores in the Toronto-Hamilton-Oshawa-Barrie-Belleville-Kingston area, resulting from the fact that they did refuse one employee these rights under the agreement because he was aged 44. Subsequently they negotiated the return to work of the employee during that stoppage with a memorandum of settlement and I would like to put that memorandum of settlement on record, because I think it is very important and I think the decision should be made to rectify it, unless there are some very good answers coming from The Department of Labour in this regard. This is the memorandum of settlement between the Brewers Warehousing Company Limited and the united brewers warehousing workers provincial board:

> The company has unilaterally decided to change its policy with respect to age requirements by adding an additional sentence as follows: "And no applicant

will be considered who is more than 45 years of age at the time he achieves the point of 500-hour status." The union still maintains that the company has no legal right to establish any such age requirement and proposes to submit the matter to the appropriate tribunal under The Age Discrimination Act for a ruling.

In the meantime, in view of the amended policy of the company, Mr. A. Might will be accepted for potential regular status retroactive to the date he achieved 500 hours, and with such additional advancement in status and wage rates and the additional hours his work justifies. The parties have agreed to establish immediately a joint committee of two industrial psychologists, namely Dr. David Jackson, nominee of the union, and Mr. A. L. Ferguson, nominee of the company, for the purpose of evaluating the relevant jobs and the range and combination thereof and to produce an appropriate test to be taken by temporary employees whenever employed who achieve 500 hours of work within 12 consecutive months, in order to ascertain whether or not each such employee has the potential job qualifications to become a regular employee of the company.

I am not going to read all of that memorandum of agreement, but the first part of it sets out the concern of this particular union organization and of myself—that is that the company still insists that if a person is of the age of 45 years, notwithstanding the collective agreement that sets out provisions to acquire permanent status, he will not be considered.

Based on that contention, the union laid charges under The Age Discrimination Act in two cases and they are both similar. I will read one, and this is the case of John W. Reid, of Main Street, Picton, complaint against the Brewers Warehousing Company Limited, 42 Charles Street, East, Toronto, on or about July 25, 1966, through C. Bonetta, Belleville group manager. The particulars are:

I was born September 21, 1912. I was first employed by Brewers Warehousing Company Limited as a temporary employee on or about June 28, 1965. On July 25, 1966, I was denied potential regular employment status with the company for the reason I was 54 years of age and therefore not acceptable to the company. Please send copies of all correspondence in relation to this complaint to myself and to Mr. Norman Wilson, executive secretary, united brewers warehousing workers provincial board, Suite 5, 15 Greenholm Circuit, Scarborough, and to Jolliffe, Lewis and Osler, barristers and solicitors, 85 Richmond Street West, Toronto 1, Ontario, attention P. E. Armstrong.

I would say to the Minister I am not aware as to whether or not at this particular time these statements have been adjudicated by the human rights commission or whoever is in charge of enforcing The Age Discrimination Act, and I would like to know from the Minister just what has happened in these particular cases in regard to the whole problem.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member appreciates that we do not have the actual files with us tonight so I cannot go into all of the details, but I can tell you that I think there have been some further developments since your correspondence. Two of these men have been upgraded and the other cases I think have been settled. Further than that the company's policy is being reviewed. I would be pleased to send you a complete memorandum on this up-to-date information.

Mr. Gisborn: Cannot the Minister, through the officers he has with him tonight, make a firm statement that in regard to The Age Discrimination Act, this is a violation of the Act, to discriminate in employment because of age, and particularly within the age limits set out in the Act.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I would make it quite clear there was a violation. This was a case before the commission and it has been dealt with and as a result two of these men have been upgraded. But I will send you a complete memorandum, setting out all of the latest information in reference to this particular case. This is one of some large number of cases that the commission has dealt with in the last year.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Minister can tell us if his department has given any attention to amending the code so that families might be protected with reference to those seeking apartment accommodation. I would be the first to admit that there are many parents who do not care about the premises and allow the children to do things they would not be allowed to do in their own homes. Then there are many other families, Mr. Chairman, who find it most difficult to secure accommodation because of the fact that landlords, as soon as they see children, or as soon as they hear the family is probably going to be increased because of an impending birth, are given notice.

The other thing I would like to bring to the Minister's attention, Mr. Chairman, is that very often there are other pretences used by a landlord to make certain that families with children either do not have their lease renewed or they have the lease terminated. The thing I am wondering about, Mr. Chairman, is, has the Minister or his department given any thought to an amendment of the human rights code to protect families—I am talking now about *bona fide* families, the type that ordinarily no landlord would have any complaint about. Has the department given any thought to protecting these people?

I think that the fact that they have to come up to Queen's Park and make a complaint about something like this, is a shame and a travesty as far as I am concerned, and I do not think it speaks well for our way of life. Because a person has a family, I do not think this should in any way prevent him or his family from securing accommodation. I would like to hear the Minister's thoughts with reference to that.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, we have given a good deal of thought and consideration to this problem. I think we have to start really on the basis that the basic principle of the code is that discrimination on the basis of race, creed, religion and so on is absolute—that no one should be barred because of these things, under any circumstances.

Turning for the moment to the matter of accommodation, I think that all of us will appreciate that in some instances discrimination not on those bases, but refusal of occupancy or otherwise, might be legitimate because there would not be space for the family that might want to occupy the premises. In essence it comes down to the fact that I do not think that the human rights code is the most practical answer. It may be on the surface a good way to deal with the problem, but in the long run I do not think it is the best way to deal with the matter, on the simple basis that here in the code there are certain rights that are absolute, that should be available to each and every one of us and there should be no deviation from that whatsoever, whereas on the basis of occupancy, it does depend to a great degree on the space under question, the number of people who will occupy it and a number of other factors. After a good deal of thought and consideration of this matter, I can appreciate the difficulty and it has my full sympathy, but I do not think that this is the best way to deal with it.

Mr. Braithwaite: First of all, Mr. Chairman, if I might say through you to the Minister, the Minister has said what he does not think is right, but he has not given us any suggestion as to how he thinks the problem should be attacked.

Mr. Chairman: I must remind the member, of course, that at the present time we are dealing with the estimates of the department, and of this particular—

Mr. Braithwaite: The human rights code, that is right.

Mr. Chairman: —and he has no money in it for this particular item.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am saying there should be money in there, Mr. Chairman.

The point that I want to make is that to me, and to the members of our party, I should think it would be an absolute right of an individual to be able to have a roof over his head if the accommodation can be paid for and if the family is acceptable in every other way, except for the fact that they might have two or three children. I think that these people should be protected.

As I said, I would be the first to admit, Mr. Chairman, that there are many people who have no sense of duty at all when it comes to somebody else's property, and I am not particularly interested in protecting these people—although one sometimes wonders about the children, they are only products of their own parents. In any event, I am talking about a family that have lived in an apartment for some time and have been good tenants and suddenly the landlord hears that there is going to be another child, an adopted child or otherwise, and they get notice right away because the regulations say that you cannot have so many children in this particular apartment block.

I will go a step further. Sometimes the landlord uses any pretence at all to say that you must vacate; you are given notice and the fact is not mentioned that it is because of children. But the real root of the problem is that there are too many children in the family. I must disagree with the Minister when I say that I think this is a human right, the fact that a person is entitled to accommodation if they can afford it. They should not be denied this because of the fact that their family may be too large for a particular landowner, and I do think that the Minister should give some consideration to the problem. That might not be the Tory way of looking at that but we Liberals do look at it

that way, and as far as I am concerned there is a family and the family should be able to—

Hon. Mr. Bales: I did not say that.

Mr. Braithwaite: I will let you speak in a moment, I am almost finished. All I want to say is, if that was the Tory attitude long ago, I think times have changed and I am a little surprised to hear the Minister talk like that because I look at him and I see—as I said earlier—a star. How bright it is right now, I do not know, but I think he has the type of outlook that is needed in The Department of Labour. I think you are going to go places if you are in government for any length of time.

Anyway as far as I am concerned, I do think the Minister should reconsider that statement because he is the one who has to face the housewives when they come up here complaining of the fact that they cannot get accommodation. The Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) talks about his HOME programme; I am talking about apartments that are already there, about people who want to get accommodation. As far as I am concerned, I think the fact that you are denied accommodation because of the size of your family is a denial of your civil rights and it comes under the human rights code. I cannot see how the Minister can slough that off. He should look into it and he should do something about it. I am talking only about the *bona fide* cases, not about the people about whom a landlord can say, "They destroyed my property; they are not good tenants." That is all I have to say on the subject.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister for a little explanation of the education programme study that was carried on in the human rights commission as shown here in the public accounts. Roughly $50,000 has been spent on it, sir.

Hon. Mr. Bales: In reference to this figure, you will appreciate that we put out a half yearly bulletin concerning human rights and there is a whole series of pamphlets and other information brochures that are put out publicizing the code and the rights and privileges incorporated under it. I think each member of the House receives the half yearly bulletin that goes out. It has wide distribution.

Mr. Worton: Do you have a permanent staff on that?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes, we do; we have an educational officer and his staff and they number five or six people altogether.

Mr. Worton: May I have their names?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, is it all right if we go on to the next question? I will come back to this one.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: This may not be the place to bring this up, but I will find out anyway. Last week I brought before the House the case of a citizen who made charges about jury tampering—

Some hon. members: Out of order!

An hon. member: Give him a chance.

Mr. Sargent: Under human rights, the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) was going to have an answer for the House about what the story was on this.

Mr. Chairman: That would come under The Attorney General's Department.

Mr. Sargent: You do not think it concerns human rights at all?

Mr. Chairman: I am quite sure that it does not come under this vote.

While the Minister is getting some information the member for Scarborough West may have the floor.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Perhaps it is partly relevant to the information. I wonder if the Minister could give us some idea of what lies next for the human rights commission. Where are the next fields it intends to conquer? I am reminded of the speech made not so long ago by Herbert Sohn when he indicated as an active member of the commission that the commission was gradually coming to the end of the line in tackling the overt acts of discrimination which fall directly within the code. Not that they would not continue to be relevant in dealing with infractions, but that the spectrum of infractions was now known, and they were capable of dealing with these areas and that they were spelled out and could be responded to. What Mr. Sohn was advancing, as I recall, was the area of non-overt discrimination; the area of contained bigotry and discrimination; the unsettling influences in some of the high schools—the quiet behind the scenes feelings and sentiments which were entirely

unpalatable in this society and which obviously distressed Mr. Sohn greatly.

I wonder, therefore, what areas the commission would be venturing into; what kind of education, particularly at the secondary school level it might be undertaking to attempt to defeat this more subtle but equally damaging kind of discrimination in the field of human rights, which is apparently prevalent and known to senior members of the commission.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I think that there is a great deal of work still to be undertaken by the commission, I think particularly at the present time with reference to the Indian community in this province. There is a great deal of work that must be done there and, as a matter of fact, this work is already underway particularly in northern Ontario. Our peoples have been in those communities working through our human rights officer, Mr. McPhee, out at the Lakehead. There is much more to be done. With reference to the educational field, we are working very closely with The Department of Education in this same area and there has to be, over a long period of time, a far greater educational programme carried out in this whole field.

Since I am on my feet, I refer to the question from the hon. member for Wellington South. The employees of the Ontario human rights commission are Doreen Jacobs, Dr. Hill, Mr. Sohn, Mr. McPhee, Mr. Marentette, Mr. Lewis and Mr. Parenson.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell us, first of all, if his department has given any thought to an inquiry into the status of women in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I think the federal commission has just started and we will assist them if we can, but we are not thinking of starting another in competition with them.

Mr. Braithwaite: One more question, Mr. Chairman. Does the Minister, further to the question asked by the hon. member for Scarborough West, have any idea of where the commission is going in places like Metro? It is commendable to hear about what the Minister has in mind for the Indians and the Eskimos. However I would like to know if he has any particular amendments in mind or has he given any thought as to what he can do to assist the people who live right here in places like Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Since there are a great many new Canadians here in Metropolitan Toronto, we have been working, and will continue to work, particularly in the settlement houses and other centres, wherever we can work with the new Canadian people. I think there is much to be done in that regard.

Mr. Braithwaite: Does the Minister have any particular amendments in mind as far as the code is concerned in accommodation and things like that?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The member will appreciate that presently before the House, I think the bill has reached almost third reading, we have added new amendments to the code in reference to accommodation here, and also removing the matter of exemption of the five employees in business from the effects of the code.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to try and engage the Minister in some kind of a dialogue about the question of human rights. I am under the impression, as my colleague the member for Scarborough West has indicated, that the particular philosophy or outlook which animated the government—indeed the province of Ontario, and was reflected in the government introducing the original legislation about the Ontario human rights commission—while it still has many areas in which that philosophy can still be put to work, still can accomplish a great deal, as the Ontario human rights commission has accomplished in the past. There is a new area and a new field which requires the attention of the human rights commission, but particularly the direction and the perspective of the Minister, a new Minister in this department. Let me try without making a speech about it, to engage in the kind of dialogue indicating this kind of a problem.

If you accept the proposition that by and large we are in an Anglo-Saxon dominated society with an ever-increasing number of people who have a right to share in that society from many other racial extractions other than the Anglo-Saxon, I am concerned about whether or not within the Anglo-Saxon establishment of the province of Ontario—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Oh, nuts!

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, read Porter then if it is nuts.

Mr. Renwick: I am concerned about whether or not within that Anglo-Saxon establishment of the province of Ontario, we should not now direct the focus of attention on the discriminatory aspects of our society toward that segment of our society which, while in

aggregate number and in influence is still a predominant one, yet it is within that area where I sense that the Ontario human rights commission is not making any impact. Or let me put it this way, Mr. Chairman, that by and large we are still accepting the proposition one way or another that we who have been part of this establishment—if I may possibly include myself in it, reluctantly as I do—in our way are the ones who are providing the basic atmosphere in which discrimination flourishes.

What is of concern to me is that the Minister's answer this year, as it was last year, is that this society as such is really not concerned with the breeding ground of discrimination which is that society, but is more concerned about the other aspects of it—that is, how you ease the way for other groups to acclimatize themselves into that established community. I am not engaged in trying to provoke a fight between the member for Russell who believes that the Anglo-Saxon community as such is a totally non-discriminatory one. I am simply asking that the human rights commission, with whatever philosophical background can be directed toward this problem, but under the leadership of the Minister would say to themselves, "All right, where is the discrimination in this society now? How are we going to combat this kind of situation?"

A man who is very much of the Anglo-Saxon background in our society, when confronted in the firm in which he happened to be a senior person with a coloured person who applied for a job, did an automatic double-take on the proposition. He did not want to have that person in his firm and yet he said to himself in this sort of double shuffle, "Well, if we have her in here, then we will save ourselves from any criticism which can possibly be levelled against us for discrimination." That is an overt way of saying what in fact went on in his mind, so that firm has the coloured girl as an employee. It is commonly referred to as tokenism or symbolism or an acceptance of the non-discriminatory part of our society in a discriminatory way.

It seems to me that this province should be able to devote the time and the money to the basic kind of psychological study which would provide a direction for that kind of reorientation of values, so that the children and the young people and the older people who are in the dominant culture in the society, will have a better acceptance of persons who come from diverse cultural backgrounds, for persons who have difficulty in accepting the kind of values which by and large we tend to accept.

I am suggesting again rather in the interest of having a dialogue, and not suggesting for a moment that the Minister may need respond in the sense that either he knows all the answers or I know all the answers. We do not. But I think it is important in this Legislature that we have the kind of dialogue which recognizes the problem and at the same time says, "Well, all right now, we have made substantial progress in these areas, we are now going to direct our attitude and our philosophy and the thrust of our work toward this other problem."

The member for Etobicoke, for example, complimented the Minister about what we are doing about the Indian, what we are doing about the people in northern Ontario of the Indian race who are filtering down into our society, and that seems to me to be an odd way to express the problem. What we really are saying is: "What are we doing in the Anglo-Saxon community in order to enable the Anglo-Saxon community to absorb those persons who have been severely disadvantaged by hereditary cultural disadvantage, educational disadvantage, employment disadvantage, all the other disadvantages which flow from being an Indian in the Ontario community? What are we doing, what is the Ontario human rights commission doing about the basic culture in our society which is making it so difficult for Indians to be absorbed into the society?"

It is very easy to pose the antagonism between the Anglo-Saxon community and the Indian community in a sort of black and white extreme, but I am suggesting to the Minister, and I would suggest to the Minister of Citizenship (Mr. Welch), had he been in the assembly this evening, that it is basically the same problem which we are faced with and which we must solve in every other cultural group which exists in our society and on which we pride ourselves. In, as I say, this Anglo-Saxon community, the dominant culture, what is the direction and thrust of the human rights commission to alleviate those circumstances within that culture which pose barriers to others coming into the group, coming into the culture? What can we do to open up this culture to accept other cultures—not in the sense of a common uniformity or conformity to one culture, that is not our point, but to open up our culture so that it will be more receptive to those values which are in other cultures, and to enable other

people more easily to come within the ambit of the established community without having so overtly to join the community, without having so overtly to adopt all the characteristics of that community before they are accepted?

I think we all know what we mean by that when I say that whether it is an Indian person or a person from other cultural groups, by and large in this society we still tend to say, "Well, that fellow has sort of made it because he has become Anglicized in his attitudes and in his viewpoints." I say this with a great sense of my sincere impression of our society, that in many ways this is what has happened to the French-Canadian culture in the province of Ontario, in the face of a dominant Anglo-Saxon culture. Those who have in one way or another come within the framework have had to pay the price of joining in a very clear and precise way, to the point where they are almost indistinguishable from those who are indigenous members, if one can say so, of that Anglo-Saxon cult. The strange thing which has hit me forceably in the short time that I have been in this Legislature about, for example, the Ministry of Citizenship under the former Provincial Secretary, and I presume it will continue under the present Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship (Mr. Yaremko), is this undue emphasis on the belief that if we can just solve the language problem, this solves all the problems of the citizenship branch of the government.

In a very roundabout way I have been endeavouring to communicate to the Minister that I am profoundly convinced of the proposition that the orientation, the direction and the thrust of the human rights commission—having regard to the very successful things which they have done in the area in which they have operated so much that they have had to deal with them, and that is, as my colleague from Scarborough West has said, the overt forms of discrimination—have been more or less met, and that we must now deal with this other fundamental aspect of the need which is required in our society to open up our own dominant culture, to make it an open one. I think it is fair to say that it is both within the philosophy of the Minister and within the philosophy of our party to say that what we are really after in the province of Ontario is an open society, in many respects, but one of the profound ways in which we require an open society, is in the openness of the society to its ability, not to absorb in the sense of integrating and destroying, but to open our society so that other societies and other cultures within this community, when faced with this dominance that we have achieved in the province of Ontario, will be able to live and thrive in an open and safe and secure way.

Let me mention one or two other matters. I think it is a matter to me of profound regret, and I speak in no partisan sense tonight. I think it is a profound regret to me that the Italian community in the province of Ontario, and mainly in the city of Toronto, which is about the only area that I am intimately connected with, seems unable for one reason or another even to have a representative within this assembly. Yet it is one of the largest groups of people with a different culture and a different background who have been within this society for a long, long time. I for one would like to know why it is that no Italian person, who has come from Italy—I am not talking now about the formal business of a Canadian citizenship, I am talking about a person of Italian extraction as distinct from other extractions—is in this legislative assembly.

This does not cut across the proposition that we are representatives through constituencies, I am simply saying that it seems strange to me that there is not a representative from that community in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: On the vote, please. I think the member at this particular point is straying from the vote.

Mr. Renwick: Well in what—

Mr. Chairman: We are getting beyond the human rights commission. What you were trying to do was expand the function of the commission. I do not know how you can expect the commission to be responsible for the presence or the absence of elected members of any racial group.

Mr. Renwick: Well, I must say, Mr. Chairman, if you feel I am beyond the—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed the privilege of advising you sir, that the Leafs are leading 1—0.

An hon. member: There goes national unity.

Mr. Renwick: I will not go on at any length. What I am trying to do is to engage the Minister in a dialogue about the problem. The Chairman, I know, realizes what I am talking about.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Why do you not do it outside?

Mr. Renwick: Despite what the member for Russell has said, he believes, of course, that the Anglo-Saxon community within their own particular characteristics are the chosen people, and he believes there is nothing wrong with them, and the only persons who have anything wrong are those who do not belong.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, I know what I believe and I do not need to have the member for Riverdale tell me.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well your interjections reveal what you believe.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: It is just such silly chatter, and I do not see that we have to put up with it indefinitely.

Mr. MacDonald: You consider it chatter because you disagree.

Mr. Renwick: Well perhaps Mr. Chairman, if the member for Russell would go out and watch the hockey game, he would enjoy it more than he is enjoying this debate.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: That is for sure. So would we all.

Mr. Renwick: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is prepared to engage in this kind of a dialogue, despite what some of his colleagues may feel about it. Now, is there any indication that perhaps there has been consideration given by the commission to a redirection of its philosophy? A consideration of those problems, in my view, is an integral part of developing the kind of open society which I think we all wish to have?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the hon. member. May I simply say that I think that here, particularly in Toronto, but throughout the whole of Ontario we have many new Canadians, and I do not think in any way we should be trying to assimilate them directly into our own Anglo-Saxon culture. Rather, there should be integration of the whole group into this province. It is a changing province, and we recognize that over the period of time.

Now, in the commission, this is a broad subject and I could go on for some time, but I would say to you only this, that the commission is already going out and working with a fairly large number of ethnic groups in their own associations. We are working with them in their own language. We are not expecting them to take on the Anglo-Saxon ways or the English language before we can deal with them or assist them. We are going into their own languages, to work with them in the language they will understand.

Personally, I feel that there is a great deal yet to be done among the people of this province in the basics, as I referred to it, among the coloured people, and the Asian and the Indian people. There is still a great deal to be accomplished there. But also in this new Canadian element. And quite frankly, the Ontario human rights commission I think is one of the very positive sections in my department, and one that I take particular interest in.

But being very brief, basically this is my philosophy and I hope that we can do much to assist the new Canadians and go out and meet them on their own grounds, not ask them to come to us.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well Mr. Chairman, if I may pick up on my colleague's remarks, I think that is precisely what my colleague was trying to avoid. I think this is precisely the kind of partial wrongheadedness which worries us in this group and which is the reason we wanted to try to facilitate this exchange.

It is not simply a matter of working with the minority groups in their own languages for purpose of adjustment. That is an important function of The Provincial Secretary's Department and a reasonable one, it is an important function of all government departments, but to see it as a preoccupation of the human rights commission would be a condescending attitude on the part of the commission and not really the proper direction of the commission.

Surely what the commission should be doing is also dealing with the dominant majority in this society, the Anglo-Saxon majority and beginning to acclimatize them to the reality of the nature of the melting-pot nature of this society; to have the dominant part of the population recognize the difficulties of adjustment, all the inherent discriminatory values which are so obvious in this society in a subtle way, but in no less a pernicious way than if they were overt, and begin to educate the majority. It is not—and this is frequently true—it is not the minority that needs the education, it is the majority that needs the education, because that is where the discrimination lies.

You know, Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to pinpoint the examples. I am sure they exist day in and day out in one corporate firm after another, in one educational establish-

ment after another. I am sure they exist, even as my colleague pointed out, in the constitution of this Legislature, in the facts and figures produced by Professor Porter in the vertical mosaic, in the way in which the Anglo-Saxon establishment dominates the community in all its aspects and makes it very difficult for an open society to function. But it is also very subtle.

I want to read into the record something, Mr. Chairman, that may seem rather foolish to some of the members but struck me as an appropriate area for the human rights commission. If ever there were a better example of the majority group than this, I do not know what it would be.

I am reading from the Canada Trust bulletin, and this was their New Year's message, Mr. Chairman, the season's greetings, New Year's message of the Toronto Trust bulletin, and I would just like to read it into the record. To some members it may mean nothing, to those of us in this party it meant a great deal:

> Recently we lost one of our stenographers. Surely an everyday occurrence. She has gone to have her first child and we wish her well. Her departure has left its impact on fellow workers who remember her unfailing smile and quiet good humour, her competence in dealing with the most difficult assignments, her boundless energy in the face of heavy work loads, her initiative and pride in her work, her simple dignity.

Now I ask the Minister to lend an ear to this last paragraph:

> There would perhaps be no great significance in her leaving were it not for the racial turbulence which has affected so much of the world in recent months, for this young woman is not of Caucasian extraction yet holds a place in the affections of all of us.
>
> A credit to her race, she reminds us of the folly of prejudice and the warmth of human kindness.

The Minister knows exactly what the member for Riverdale is talking about and what I am talking about because that is pretty subtle reverse discrimination, is it not? It is entirely inadvertent, I am sure, entirely unintentional, but it is perverse in its thrust, it is perverse in its content and it is indicative of the very subtle, very difficult to contend with, very harmful in a sense, strains of some of the society. In particular, of the majority group in the society.

And as I say, there is nothing one wishes to put in this interpretation which would be considered malicious or antagonistic, I am just saying that this is a very genuine problem.

You know, you have reputable organizations who are capable of the extraordinary condescension of saying: "yet holds a place in the affection of all of us, a credit to her race," and so on, and distribute this kind of material to large groups of people and convey this kind of mental attitude to large groups of people.

What we are then saying is, if this is to be a genuine open society, it is important that an agency as vital as the human rights commission does a great measure of its work in the majority community, amongst the Anglo-Saxon majority community.

We would be delighted to see under "education, programme studies and conferences" the budget increased tenfold at the level of the high schools, as Mr. Sohn pointed out, and at the level of all the other community and corporate agencies, so that gradually to the involvement of all the new groups that are coming to this society would be facilitated. Those of us—and it is true, I am sure, of all us—who are inadvertently given to these kinds of social attitudes, could recognize the fallaciousness and the unwholesomeness, dare I use such a word, of that kind of view.

That is what we are putting to the Minister and I expect that he probably understands it. I think it is a little more—and I do not mean to be patronizing, I am sure he understands it—it is probably a little more critical than one can convey it in a Legislature. It probably works some pretty unhappy damage for large numbers of people in subtle ways and it is that subtlety which the commission should now direct some of its very able energies towards.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave that vote and not with any attempt to endeavour to drive home any point because that is not the purpose of the dialogue at the moment, but I am very much concerned, without having any specific direct knowledge of the problem, about the extreme example in our society of discrimination in all its forms and that is with the Indian community. I am sure it is equally pertinent with the Eskimo community, but I do not even know as much about the Eskimo community as I do about the Indian community.

I think the point is very clearly driven home by the recognition of the fact that if

you spend any time talking with the Indian in our community, what you really recognize is that there is such a degree of antagonism that it would not matter if the human rights commission spent all its time with the Indian community, they would never be able to persuade the Indian community of the goodwill of the Anglo-Saxon community.

Until we are prepared to recognize as a salient barrier to the solution of that problem —and it is our problem, not the Indians' problem—to recognize the barrier, that our problem poses for us in lowering those barriers and overcoming that antagonism, then there is no way, as I can see it, that we are going to solve the problem of whatever term you use, whether it is integration or acceptability or acculturation of any other term.

We are not going to solve the problem by directing on the Indian the focus of the established methods by which we believe that people in our own community manage to get ahead one way or another within it. What we are going to have to do is direct the focus of our problem to persuading, by law if necessary, because this is one of the great persuaders. We are going to have to persuade people that they must accept the Indian community and the Indian within our society. I say to the Minister that during the course of the tenure of his office, I would like to have the opportunity, as I am sure he would, to spend time just looking at that aspect of this problem of relationships between cultural groups in our society.

He would recognize that the Indian does, in fact, dislike intensely the Anglo-Saxon and if we face up as a society to that antagonism then we may be able to, in one way or another, begin to begin to solve the kind of problem which so far is a total road block to us, even if we have the best of intentions toward that community.

I am suggesting that out of that kind of study, out of that kind of black and white situation—if my hypothesis is correct and I believe it to be—you would learn much of the tremendous value in the other antagonisms part of European continent or the Asian conwhich exist by nature in cultural groups who come, for one reason or another, to this society. Not because the streets are paved with gold, but because it provides relatively more opportunities and more choices than the culture which they are prepared to leave. Their experience certainly indicates that their acceptance within that dominant cultural group is a difficult fight. It is a difficult problem. Some people still tend to class that in the traditionally accepted view that in some way or another this is character building. In other words, it is character building to leave your own culture, poor as it may be in some poor part of the European continent or the Asian continent, and to come to the province of Ontario. Therefore your character is developed by learning a new language and working your way from relatively menial occupations up to an acceptance of the moral values and all the other values of that community.

I happen to disagree with that view. I think that the obligation on a society such as ours, which inhabits a sparsely settled but richly endowed part of the North American continent, is to make a conscious and deliberate effort to make certain that we relax the barriers of our culture, that we relax the control which we have over the power structures of the province of Ontario to make it more readily available to people who come within the ambit of that society. We have a profound obligation. This, in my view, a profound moral obligation on our society. Surely the Minister accepts, as I do, that the impetus and the initiative for the Ontario human rights code was, in its inception, a moral impetus. Within the context of this particular attitude which I have and which I share with many other people in this province, there is a very real obligation to those persons who come within the framework of this society to release our barriers and to make their world an easier world for them to see, they do not have to pay an unnecessarily high forfeit in order to come within that society.

I would hope that those who represent this party and those who represent other parties in this House a year from now or two years or three years or four years from now, see each year a fundamental redirection and reorientation of the philosophy which is driving the Ontario human rights commission to the solution of that problem.

As my colleague, the member for Scarborough West has said, we are prepared to spend 10 times the amount of money. I am suggesting that if we are prepared to spend $4 million or $5 million because of the ranking of alcoholism as the third ranking disease —or whatever the particular characteristic term one wants to apply to it—we should be prepared to spend many more dollars usefully on developing the basic studies, philosophies and attitudes which will permit this human rights commission, which has been a beacon in North American society—and none of us here would disagree with it—to move on to a new field and to a new area of

achievement which would be a challenge to the government of the province of Ontario and to the people of Ontario, and which would be tremendously rewarding in the results which it could achieve.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister if the human rights commission is considering discrimination as a result of physical disability? I do not think that in certain types of professions physical disability has anything to do with ability to carry on the job. Yet quite often we hear of individuals who, because of some physical disability, find themselves handicapped when it comes to getting employment. I could refer to white collar employment where there may be leg disabilities, a person requiring a wheel chair.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The department deals with these matters and we endeavour to refer them over to the proper agencies, but we assist them as we can. We interview them and carry on from there.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to advise you that the score is 2 to 0 for Toronto, and I think it is quite appropriate to say that the last goal was scored by Stemkowski.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, pursuing this same item one step further, an individual who has graduated from university and has taken post graduate courses, is fully qualified for certain types of occupations or certain professions, and yet when applying for a position finds himself, because of a physical handicap, turned down. What does an individual do? Can he apply to the human rights commission for redress?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It may not be technically covered under the Act, but we interview them gladly when they come to us and do all we can to assist them. Then we try to persuade them that there is not discrimination, or should not be discrimination, because of their affliction. You and I both know many people who may have some physical handicap, but that does not prevent them from doing their job in their own particular field.

Mr. Newman: May I tell the Minister to be prepared because I am going to present to him a case, if I cannot get redress from the proper department of government.

Hon. Mr. Bales: We will be glad to do what we can.

Mr. S. Lewis: I want to follow on with something which is relevant to what the member for Windsor-Walkerville raised, and then I want to come back to something which my colleague mentioned. I would like to know whether applications for employment which contain peculiar clauses ever come before the Minister? Does the human rights commission normally take a look at applications for employment? Are such things brought to their attention?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes, they are.

Mr. S. Lewis: And must any of the features which are unusual fall directly within the areas as set out by the commission in order to be—

Hon. Mr. Bales: May I suggest that perhaps you are referring to employment agencies for example?

Mr. S. Lewis: Or application forms for major companies and—

Hon. Mr. Bales: Oh, yes. These come before us.

Mr. S. Lewis: Let me read what I have here, Mr. Chairman. The industrial cartage association has a new standard application for employment, and in addition to the standard employment form questions, they have added the following—let me read them to you:

> Have you ever received workmen's compensation? If so, describe.
>
> Have you ever had a back injury? If yes, describe.
>
> Have you had any condition for which an operation or hospital confinement has been advised or is contemplated?

All the present employees are also asked to complete this new form. The new employees are asked to complete this form and answer those questions. Would this be the kind of situation which could viably be brought before the human rights commission?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I would think that that is not covered by the code. It could well relate to the type of work that they were going to undertake.

Mr. S. Lewis: Alternatively, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister recognizes, it could automatically exclude someone who had been on workmen's compensation being considered for the job, simply by involving the employer in an anticipated payment for eventual benefits if there were a recurrence. I wonder a little about this method of adding questions to an employment form.

Hon. Mr. Bales: It seems to me Mr. Chairman, that this has to do with the physical ability to do a job, which is important.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has indicated it is not covered by the code.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, if it is not covered by the code, then there may be a more appropriate place to raise it.

I have one or two specific questions before the vote goes through, Mr. Chairman.

What exactly is the kind of work which the human rights commission is doing with the Indians in Ontario to which the Minister earlier referred? What exactly is the nature of the programme?

Hon. Mr. Bales: They are dealing at the present time in reference to, I believe, six reserves, and they have carried out conferences, four in number in Fort Frances, Fort William and Port Arthur, in the Indian community and the grand council of Couchiching reserve, the northwestern Ontario Indian conference at Fort William and the northwestern Ontario association of Indians last December.

Our people have been in the areas talking with various groups, and these have been in Cochrane, Dryden, Fort Frances, Fort William, Manitoulin Island and the Port Arthur area—there have been a large number there—at Sibley Park and also in Timmins.

There have been a number of complaints from the Indian people—or in reference to Indian people—a total of 16 I have been advised by my staff and those have been dealt with.

In the Indian community itself, our people have been directly involved. One is the Indian band on Manitoulin Island and the other is the Indian youth centre at Port Arthur. They have been very active in both of those situations.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1007 carried?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before we leave that question of the human rights commission, is the commission considering the general proposition of exclusions on the basis of the traditional terms—race, creed, nationality, religion—from private clubs of one kind or another in the province of Ontario? Or are we going to continue one way or another to take the position that what a group of people together in private clubs decide to do is their own business, even though it results in discriminatory practices?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mainly the commission deals on a basis of education. Perhaps we need to concentrate, as you indicated earlier, among our own people, at least the Anglo-Saxon people. If, as you say, there is discrimination in private clubs, I know nothing of it.

Mr. Renwick: May I ask the question, Mr. Chairman, whether the human rights commission is intending to extend its studies or its concern into the area of private clubs, be they golf clubs, or other kinds of social clubs in the city of Toronto and in the environment of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No—no immediate plans to extend it into those areas.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, does the commission consider this a discriminatory situation, about which they should be doing something, either in the way of investigation or study? Or is the commission, under the Minister's direction, taking the position that it is still to be within one of the myths of our society that a private club can exclude whomsoever it wants, regardless of the policy of the government of the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I think it is a matter of priorities, really. We feel that there is much more important work to be done in reference to employment and in other fields. If there is discrimination in reference to private clubs, I personally would not approve of it, but I think we should concentrate on where the need is greatest.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I wish to bring a matter of discrimination before the Ontario human rights commission in the discrimination of clubs, would it be a useless operation, or would it be a matter which would deserve the specific attention of the human rights commission and a matter which they would consider and be in a position either to do something about it, or recommend that something be done?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, if you or anyone else brought a specific case to us, we would gladly look at and use our best offices to help rectify it. But as I say, I would not regard it as our first priority.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, does it have any priority—

Hon. Mr. Bales: I said, Mr. Chairman, that we would gladly look at it and look at it seriously.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have asked on two or three occasions whether or not the human rights commission in cooperation

with the liquor licence board of the province of Ontario and The Department of Tourism and Information would consider very seriously, with public relations facilities available to the government and used so obviously in other areas, using the facilities of the licensing procedures of tourist camps and other bodies subject to licence by the government, and of the liquor outlets and the beer establishments, to conduct a very effective public relations campaign about the non-discriminatory policy of the government and people of Ontario?

It seems to me that if you have got annual licensing arrangements it provides a wonderful opportunity for the government, in a proper way, to bring to the attention of all such persons that it is the policy of Ontario that there be non-discrimination in their establishment.

It seems to me that I am not the first one to have asked, but it seems to me that this is a matter which could, by cooperation, be readily dealt with by your department through the Ontario human rights commission in those two fields, and perhaps in many other fields in which the Minister is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, while I was not here at the time, I believe it was done some three to four years ago and recently, when the human rights commission appeared before the standing committee on commissions in this House, I think this same undertaking was given to you at that time. This will be carried out.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, how many people are actively engaged in the commission work?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We have seven professional staff and the necessary clerical staff to go with them.

Mr. S. Lewis: May I make this obvious suggestion, Mr. Chairman, from what has emerged tonight? We all on this side of the House regard the commission and the man who heads it pretty highly, Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that. None of us would object to your coming back next year with $1 million in this estimate and with an entirely new programme under his direction and a considerably increased staff so that you could begin to do effective work, not only in the areas of infractions of the code, but with the various communities you talked about, both minority and majority, and all the other ancillary features that are beginning to develop as the society becomes a little more sophisticated in its analysis and its response.

It is unhappy that we are left with this picayune sum when obviously the human rights commission has such a job to do.

So feel free, Mr. Chairman, at least on behalf of this group, in this one area, to raise government expense. I am making the assumption, Mr. Chairman, that there will yet be another round of estimates while this Minister is still in his place.

Vote 1007 agreed to.

On vote 1008.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, very, very shortly. Just before the dinner hour I was asking about this question of Canadian union autonomy. Now I realize that there is a need for research constantly in the field of domination of corporations by American head offices and it is just as important as the question of unions. I think that as I suggested in my opening remarks, the Minister might want to look into this as a joint problem. He might want to bring in The Department of Economics and Development and other departments. I make the suggestion—the Minister has already given his views on that, he has not done any deep thinking on it—that perhaps the Minister might want to look into the whole area including the management side of it as well as the union side.

Then, perhaps, by the time we have a chance to go into estimates again and we are on that side of the House, he may have an opportunity to ask our Minister of Labour and we may be able to call on his research staff to provide us with some of the answers which we will be able to give him.

Now, the other thing I want to ask—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Braithwaite: That is all right. You know, Elvis Presley got married yesterday. They said it would never happen, so just do not be too confident over there.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: You have been panicked right out of an election.

Mr. Braithwaite: Yes, anything could happen.

Mr. S. Lewis: This government is very unhappy.

Mr. Braithwaite: By the way, Mr. Chairman, for those on the other side who are too old, Elvis Presley used to be a star.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, just one last question. I am wondering, can the Minister give us his views on wage parity? This is something I believe the member for Windsor-Walkerville and others have raised in many years past. In view of the Hydro and Johns-Manville—another strike which we have with us right now—and the problems we are going to have with the auto workers, I think it behooves the Minister at this time to make some sort of statement as to what his brain trusts have come up with in the last year because I am certain his department must have done some looking into this area.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are going to have a good example of this in the coming months, particularly with the auto pact coming up for review. I have some thoughts on it, but I think it is a very complicated matter which we will have to work through in the coming months with these agreements, and I leave it at that for the present.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, one year ago I asked the department to get into a study of wage parity and its ramifications. Surely that year has been sufficient time for them to draw some conclusions. I would like to hear from the Minister now the conclusions of the study that they undertook one year ago.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I was not aware of the member's request of a year ago. I am not sure that we have a study at the present time. I will look into the matter.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister in close communication with The Department of Economics and Development because they, likewise, were alerted to this a year ago. Surely they have seen the signal and the handwriting on the wall and should be prepared at this time to state definite views.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on this question of wage parity and the strange paradox in which we find ourselves in the province. I know that the Minister of Labour is only one of the Ministers who is involved in the intricate economic problem as we have been taught to believe that this poses.

My understanding is that—I am sure the Minister can correct me if I am wrong—in fact the steel industry in Canada has achieved wage parity certainly over the last five to 10 years. So the workers within the steel industry in the province of Ontario, in fact, have wage parity or better than their counterpart in the steel industry in the United States. I do not pretend to know all the reasons why this should be either economically sound or otherwise, but we are now faced with the proposition where Canada has made a very substantial concession in the field of the automotive industry for the purpose of assisting in the rationalization of that industry, and for the purpose of ultimately providing for a relatively assured share of that automotive industry business for Canada.

Now, 95 per cent of that business is centered in the province of Ontario. I hope that the Minister in whatever part he has to play, Mr. Chairman, in this continuing discussion which is taking place, and to the extent that he may or may not be involved in the negotiations between the united automobile workers in Canada and the Canadian automotive manufacturers, will not fall for the liberal paradox which has been tossed upon the community. It runs somewhat this way, and we all quite familiar with it, that we cannot really expect to have an independent Canada or a significantly different society in the north half of the American continent without paying an exorbitant economic price; that we must somehow or other suffer as the price of that independence a lower standard of living in Canada. On the other hand, if anyone in the community dares to suggest that they are entitled to receive parity in wages because after many years they now have an effective bargaining position within the Canadian economy, that somehow or other this is going to disrupt the whole of the Canadian economy.

I simply point out to the Minister—I hope he will bear it in mind and if the facts warrant it, keep in his mind—that the wage levels and the other benefits of the steel industry which is an efficient, modern, up-to-date industry in the province of Ontario, in fact has reached the wage parity and has not significantly affected adversely the Ontario economy or the economy of Canada.

I am suggesting to the Minister that to the extent that he has any voice to play in the question of wage parity in the negotiations between the united automobile workers and the automotive industry that he should come down very forcibly on the proposition that the aim and object of the pact was to provide for price parity and for wage parity, and that in his view on the best economic advice which he can receive, either from his

own department or from The Department of Economics and Development, is such that it is not only something that is to be bargained for, but is something which is highly necessary in the Canadian economy.

Wage parity in the automotive industry must be established as rapidly and as quickly as possible not only for the benefit of the members of the united automobile workers, who would benefit directly from it, but because of the absolute necessity of raising the general level of wages throughout the province of Ontario.

We accept, Mr. Chairman, the proposition of the leader in industry establishing the pace in the field in which that industry is involved. This government accepts it without question. We are suggesting that the correlative part of that philosophy should be the acceptance of the position of the leaders on the conditions and wages under which people work in the province of Ontario, and the leaders happen to be the united steel workers and the united automobile workers.

Leadership in those fields will provide in the province of Ontario throughout the levels of employment which do not have the benefit of any leadership quality, except that which is provided for them outside, great benefits from the impetus which would be given to our economy if the government came out, as we have urged it to come out, with some definitive position on the United States-Canada automotive agreement. If they came out very forcibly and effectively in favour of the proposition that it is not something that we need to back into with fear and concern, but is something which we should automatically embrace as one of the necessary ingredients of that United States-Canada auto pact. I would certainly like to have the Minister respond to the question as to what are his views; if his department has any views; what is his attitude; what is his philosophy; what his position may be on this question of parity in an industry which is aimed at an equality of the distribution of that particular industry over the United States of America and Canada. If that is the aim and object of the exercise, I think the Minister should have some comment to make which would provide leadership and a guide for the debate which is certainly going to take place between the united automobile workers and the automotive industry in Canada.

This is, of course, very important when we consider that of all the industries, this is the industry about which we have less information than about most. The place where we usually get our basic financial information about the three leading automobile industries is if it happens to come before the Congress of the United States of America. There appears to be no public place in Canada where we can get the kind of information that is required to form an informed judgment on this problem.

I am sure that the Minister does have access to all the basic information about the operations of that pact, and I am sure the Minister, in consultation with his colleague, the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) should be able to formulate an Ontario position on this matter which could be conveyed to the federal government, and which could be conveyed to the automotive industry, having regard to the simple fact that we have about 95 per cent of the automotive industry manufacturing capacity in this province.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chirman, I am sure that the hon. member appreciates that this will be a very important phase in the matter of mediation with the auto groups in the coming months, and the department and all its officers must be in a position to mediate properly in this particular matter.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister under this branch, if the department has made any studies as to the number of industries making a product and are paying the minimum wage provided by the laws of this province. I think this is the kind of information that is going to be necessary to the department in their consideration of revising their minimum wage laws. When the federal government introduced the federal labour code which provided $1.25 an hour for all those employees coming under federal jurisdiction, their statement was that they hoped that their federal code would be a pattern for the provinces to adopt.

I do not agree that it is enough, but at least it is higher than what we have established in Ontario. It sets a discriminatory provision in regard to provincial employees, but if we are going to talk about increasing the minimum wage, we should have some idea through research about what now prevails.

I feel that there are many industries which are only abiding by the minimum wage in this province and who could very well afford to pay more. But because of their location, the particular wage area they are in, they seem to get away without too much public pressure to raise the rates.

I would have thought that immediately the federal government brought in their federal code it would have inspired this government to at least match the code in all areas—the 40-hour week and the minimum wage, the statutory holiday provisions and holidays with pay which are, at the present time, better than those provided in this province. The Minister on being questioned during his estimates in the last two days, informed the House that he has many of these areas under consideration.

If this is the case, I would expect that through the research branch that we should, at the present time, have some of the statistics that are necessary to give us a picture of just what is happening across the province.

We know that the minimum wage is being exercised in a lot of the services, but what I would like to know, and what I think would be pertinent to any consideration, would be what is happening in industries as such, those industries that are operating and producing a product to be put on the market in Ontario.

Does the Minister know if any work is going on in this field in the research branch?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, it is part of our review of the whole problem, and it has been and is being carried on by our research section.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister if he is making a manpower survey?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We are not taking a manpower survey. We are working with the federal department of manpower with reference to this particular field, but we are not taking a separate survey ourselves.

Mr. Newman: Has the department any information to relay to the counsellors and instructors in the various high schools so that they, in the course of their duties, could direct students or point out opportunities to students in various fields of endeavour so the youngster could be selecting as a trade something that will not be phased out in the immediate future, and would select some type of trade or profession in which he could foresee a future?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member that in cooperation with the federal government, these studies will come out and will be made available, and this information will certainly be provided to our people in the guidance field.

Mr. Newman: Thank you.

Is the department undertaking any studies concerning summer job opportunities for both the high school and post high school individuals this summer, especially in my own community? Because of the slump in the automobile industry, we find that university students—there are about 700 of them—will not be able to find employment in the automobile industry. They certainly would like to have some means of employment so that they can further their education.

At present they are going to be handicapped, and there may be some who will not be able to get sufficient funds to pursue their education. This is very serious if it involves a student in the senior year of his university training.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I think that this is really an area for the Canada manpower centres. We are not a job placement area. I think we are working, you will appreciate, in a broader field.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before we leave vote 1008, would the Minister outline for us what the research and special studies are that his department has projected for the coming year?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, the plans for the future include a further $10,000 contribution to Queen's University for work in reference to dimensions and determinance of the bargaining unit structure, labour arbitration in Canada, the union structure, examining the wage drift in six Canadian industries and also the legal status of collective bargaining agreements in Canada.

We are carrying out another series of studies and we have—it was published last year—a book under the heading of *Methods of Forecasting Manpower Requirements*. That was a basic one completed by the department, and we are carrying out further studies at the present time as a follow-up to that in conjunction with the federal department.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister proposing to have any research work or any special study devoted to the contrasting attitudes and philosophies which are mirrored in the Freedman report and in the proposed Domtar joint committee agreement as to how one deals with the question of residual managerial rights in industry? It seems to me that the two reports certainly put into focus two possible opposing views on this matter. It seems to me that this is a matter which in some way or other the Minister should be

vitally concerned as a matter of research and study.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I should say that our area of research is on the broad range of technological change rather than confined to any one particular group. You will appreciate that we have collected the various collective bargaining agreements in the department. These are being analyzed and a good deal of information taken from them. The categories of provisions have been analyzed and these include advance notice and consultation, income protection, preferential employment and transfer rights and the whole broad range of such allied matters.

Mr. Renwick: Is there any indication from the department as to any view which they may have on this question about whether or not matters not covered by a collective bargaining agreement can be the subject of unilateral change by management in the exercise of that management which in many cases considers it to be their residual right, or is the department just simply letting this problem drift along for settlement in any specific industry without dealing with the fundamental problems raised by the Freedman report which had a broader application than the specific run-through problem with which he dealt? On the other hand, do they think that, shall we say the automation insurance scheme of the Domtar arrangement, is a satisfactory and effective way of perpetuating the residual managerial rights and providing in return for that protection; or continuing protection, some kind of the usual form of insurance benefits to the people employed?

Or does the department have no view on this? Is it simply putting this major problem to one side to take its course as the industrial dispute and conflict in Ontario develops in the coming summer?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, we are trying to carry out our research on a broad basis and take in this aspect, not confining ourselves too closely.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, the member for Windsor-Walkerville asked the Minister a question as to whether or not the department was making a manpower survey and the Minister answered in the negative. I assume that the member for Windsor-Walkerville meant a manpower-needs survey.

This concerns me because if the Minister will remember the select committee's report on manpower training and apprenticeship, one of the most important points—and of course the report was developed because of the anticipated shortage of manpower in certain skilled and unskilled jobs—was a projection, at least on a five-year basis, of what we would need as far as manpower in certain skills.

If the Minister tells me that they are not making surveys in this direction, he is saying one of two things; they are not carrying out one of the main recommendations in that report, or the need for skilled or semi-skilled workers in various trades is not as serious as we were led to believe in the last year or two. Could the Minister explain just what he meant by the negative term that they are not making a survey?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I used a negative term. I said that we were not doing it ourselves, we were working in cooperation with the federal department. But when we deal with manpower in this important matter, I have some information here and I might just make it available to you by simply saying that the department recognizes the need for more information on manpower.

This includes more facts in such fields as labour force projections, classification of the labour force by occupation and industry, employment training and also job vacancies. We are actively pursuing steps designed to provide needed information in concert with the federal manpower department which is, or will be, the principal source of such data.

For example, our officials have met with the officials of the federal manpower department and have discussed those areas in which the federal department will shoulder the responsibility to provide the service to the provincial agencies. It should be recognized that Canada as a whole is a labour market and that the federal government already has in existence a number of agencies, such as the Canada manpower centres and the dominion bureau of statistics, which will be the main source of the information.

These agencies have been developed by the federal government for this purpose.

In reference to the current problem, I would advise you that the shortages of skilled labour have concerned the government and industry for the past few years. Information about these shortages is needed by employers, persons seeking employment, placement agencies, the administrators of training and mobility programmes and others concerned with the labour market adjustment.

The Canada manpower centres collect information on the supply and demand for labour throughout the province and prepare somewhat impressionistic reports that might be said to be based on numbers rather than statistics. This sort of information has been assembled for some time but arrangements are being made that should improve the service.

One important improvement is the fact that labour market information analysts are being placed in the more important manpower offices across the province. Accurate information on job vacancies has been difficult to obtain, but a new federal programme underway should result in the start of a regular production of extensive and reliable vacancy data within the next few months.

Such data is not essential to our own on-the-job training programmes in any case since industry comes directly to us to meet specific shortages problems, but it will be helpful in indicating the direction in which our promotional activity should go.

Dealing with the long term matters, meeting longer term needs fro manpower information is an even more complex task. Now, this implies making projections of manpower requirements and fully adequate techniques for doing so. These have not yet been developed anywhere in the world.

One project of the research branch was the study and analysis of existing techniques and the exploration of the best means of carrying out this matter. I referred to this a minute ago, in reference to a booklet published last year.

In order to do a satisfactory job, we must have complete data on the current occupations within the labour force, their nature, numbers, skill content and also their location.

To make a comprehensive inventory is an expensive and a highly technical activity and at the moment the decennial census is the only inventory carried out in Canada. In any case, before we are part of a national labour market, this responsibility must rest principally with the federal government.

The research branch in our own department has made a contribution towards rendering census data more valuable for manpower analysis purposes. The work done presents the data by occupation and industry for the Ontario labour force and for both male and female workers.

The study gives an inventory of the skills available as they are reported to census takers. The information has already been used extensively within our own department and by others of the Ontario government. Our own use of it is to make broad projections for indicating long term training needs and as a base for more precise studies for particular occupations. This is the best comprehensive occupation inventory that can be constructed at a reasonable cost for the province at the present time.

This sort of inventory is being supplemented by information obtained from employers, unions, and recent reports that deal with segments of the labour force. By this process we can develop a sound base from which to estimate some of the manpower requirements in which we are most interested.

The manpower department in Ottawa also has plans for developing inventory-type information and obtaining it from employers. This method of collection is considered likely to produce more reliable occupations and skill information than would a household survey, such as a census.

A major problem in developing effective manpower information at present is our lack of one Canadian-oriented occupation classification. This is being rectified by the development of a new classification that will be used in the 1971 census and will be widely adopted by other government agencies.

Up to the present, we have made do with the United States international or specially devised classification system for census purposes.

Vote 1008 agreed to.

On vote 1009:

Mr. Worton: In previous years we have had a report from the compensation board and we have had some of the officials before the committee. I think at the present time, are we not undergoing a commission to investigate into the compensation field?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, at the present time, the Royal commission under Mr. Justice McGillivray is sitting. They have not yet presented their report. I have met Mr. McGillivray just briefly since my appointment, but I have not discussed with him just when his report will be submitted. The officials of the workmen's compensation board have come in case there are any general questions you will wish to put after the other matters are dealt with, but I would point out that the workmen's compensation board did appear before the standing committee on commissions earlier this year and I attended with them at that time.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, the question I have is related to the workmen's compensation board and to 1009. I wonder if the Minister could tell us if he has any plans for changing the billing system of the board, inasmuch as we do have the systems and data processing equipment now?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Vote 1009 deals with The Department of Labour, and you will appreciate that the workmen's compensation board is not within the department. I simply report for it.

Mr. Braithwaite: I would ask the Minister if this equipment, the computer and so on, is available to the workmen's compensation board so that they might make use of this in their billing?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The workmen's compensation board has their own computer equipment.

Vote 1009 agreed to.

On vote 1010:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): I would like to ask the Minister if there is any possible way of changing the means of payment for vacations with pay? What I have in mind is this: I believe that a worker is entitled to 2 per cent, but if he works 36 months he is entitled to 4 per cent of his pay. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Bales: After he has worked for three years—

Mr. Trotter: If he has worked for three years he is entitled to 4 per cent. The problem is this. The employers have to keep the records and I believe the vacation with pay money is paid every June, and there is a problem in our business community with some people who hire a number of transients.

For example, I know of one firm which prepared T-4 slips and sent out 5,427. Of that number more than 4,712 came back. In other words, these people had moved. They were strictly the type of person who would be on welfare. The type of work that these workers do is taking hand bills from door to door.

The difficulty with the present system is that employers do not object to paying the extra 2 per cent. In fact, when a worker is paid at the end of the day, instead of keeping his records for months and then deciding whether they are entitled to 4 per cent, some of these employers say that they would rather pay them 2 per cent extra at the end of the day. One man put it up to me this way: "Instead of paying the extra 2 per cent, we would rather pay the extra 3 per cent, because it is so costly and records seem to be absolutely no use whatsoever in literally thousands of cases."

This is a firm that had 4,712 forms returned. They sent out 5,427, but because of the turnover in labour, it is useless to keep records. I think under this vote, employers have to keep their records going back for a period of 9 years. You can imagine that a man hiring hundreds of transients in the course of the year has all kinds of storage and office space taken up with useless records.

What I am asking of the Minister and what I am asking this department to consider, is that in certain types of labour, particularly where it is transient labour, they receive their vacation with pay money on the spot. Not if they are a permanent worker, but if they are a transient worker. They are paid their vacation with pay money when they are paid for their day's work, not just the 2 per cent, but the extra 2 per cent which they are entitled to get if they are there 36 months.

In other words, give the employer a choice; keep the records, or if he does not want to keep the records, pay the employees now on the spot. Today in modern business, depending on the type of business you are in, in hiring these transients it is ridiculous what some of these offices have to go through—the office routine, the paper work. It is just silly, for this 2 per cent.

I am not saying that the worker should not get this extra 2 per cent, but I think that certain types of workers should be paid on the spot. Give that option to the employers and in this way they can save a tremendous amount of paper work.

You can imagine saving paper for years of transients and you do not know where they are.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I appreciate your dealing with the itinerant worker. If there is a specific problem of this nature we would be glad to look into it.

Mr. Trotter: I wonder if the Minister could be informed from the staff who have been there for some time if this problem has come up, and if there is anything planned to do anything about it. I know of one or two complaints I received and this seemed a ridiculous situation. Surely the department can come to grips with a problem like that.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I am not familiar with the problem, nor do I know whether it has been raised in any great volume at all, but since the member has raised it tonight, we will take a look at it and see what the situation is.

Vote 1010 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Labour.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
(Continued)

On vote 807:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, before we adjourned from these estimates, we were taking these hospitals page by page under this vote and I had, at that time, finished discussing the hospitals on page 66. I have no more remarks to make on that.

The next one I would like to speak on is on page 69. Perhaps someone has something to say before that time.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, under vote 807, I would like to ask the Minister if homes for the retarded would come under this vote?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, which homes?

Mr. Newman: Homes for the retarded. My community has intentions or the Metro Windsor association for retarded children has plans to construct a home that would accommodate approximately 20 youngsters—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this comes under the social and family—

Mr. Newman: This does not come under the Minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No!

Vote 807 agreed to.

On vote 808:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Can the Minister inform the House precisely what the position is at the Lakeshore psychiatric hospital in the extension of the adolescent wing? How many beds are presently occupied, how many beds are presently unoccupied?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There are eight beds now occupied and the renovation of the unit is going forward to provide 40 beds.

Mr. S. Lewis: When do you expect the additional 32 beds to be available?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I can only say as quickly as possible.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, is there no speculative date at all?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is no estimated date apparently at present.

Mr. S. Lewis: Is it likely to be ready before the end of June, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not fully ready for occupancy by the end of June.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right! I just wondered.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on page 69, the Toronto mental hospital. We have heard over the years that this building is going to be completely reconstructed and completely redone and I know there are plans in existence. I would like to get some information from the Minister, if it is at all possible, as to how soon they are going to begin serious construction.

I have said on many occasions, and I repeat it again in these estimates, that the old part of that building on Queen Street is the part that went up about 1847, is still fighting the battle of the cockroaches and despite all the modern disinfectants and everything else, that building is so old they are fighting a hopeless battle and we know that it is an eyesore to the city of Toronto and it is a disgrace to The Department of Health.

I say it with all due respect for the staff there—I know they do their best and I do not think we treat our staff there well in allowing this building to exist as it does today. I mentioned an article written about two years ago by Gerry Anglin, a writer for the Toronto *Daily Star*, setting out in detail what 999 Queen was like. Recently I checked to see if there was any substantial change and really it is the same old story that has gone on for years, except that there are 100 less patients than there were a year ago.

They removed, I think, 380 patients from the Toronto hospital into homes for special care, but because of the influx, and because of the location of the Toronto mental hospital, they have a great demand for their services.

Their out-patient services, which are so important, simply do not have the proper facilities to cope with the numbers of pa-

tients they are called upon to serve. So I am wondering, can the Minister give us any indication at all of any firm date of doing any serious reconstruction on the site at 999 Queen?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The building is to be completely replaced in a phased programme. The master plans are ready now and are before the department. My notes here say they will be ready by the week of March 15 for consideration by The Department of Health. They were approved by The Department of Health and I am advised that they expect to call for tenders this year.

Mr. Trotter: They are doing this by phases and they say they are calling for tenders. Is this just one particular section they are going to build? And if so, how long is it going to take to get all these sections constructed? I understand it is going to be on a sectional plan.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is to be done in two phases. We cannot get rid of the patients, knock the place down, to make way for building the new hospital, so we will have to continue to occupy part of the hospital while part of the new one is being built.

The whole programme is laid out as one programme to be built in two stages and the total construction time is expected to take three years. That is for the total hospital. Total replacement.

Mr. Trotter: In other words, if they are calling for tenders now, can we expect construction to start in the fall of this year?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well I would hope so. I am not positive of the tendering programme of Public Works, but I would hope that if tenders are called this year that it will be possible to begin construction this year, unless they leave the tenders to the very end of the year and that has not been our experience with The Department of Public Works.

Vote 808 agreed to.

On vote 809:

Mr. Trotter: No, Mr. Chairman, you are a bit optimistic on that one being carried.

On this particular vote, Mr. Chairman, we come to probably one of the most important votes in this whole department and it is one section that in many respects is in by far the worst shape of any vote in the entire government's estimates.

The whole background of OMSIP has had a strange birth. It has been in more less fits and starts as we have fought this legislation through over the years here in this House. But there are a number of basic principles wrong with our system here. I think that basically the trouble started in the original conception of the government of what OMSIP was to be.

We know perfectly well that the government was, at the beginning, opposed to having anything to do with the Ontario government being in medical services. As a result of the mincing and half-hearted steps it has taken, this department, or this particular department of The Department of Health has been tied up in red tape.

Just to give you an example, I know that the health committee had the pleasure of hearing the officials of OMSIP discuss the problems of our computer system not working properly. But I have here an example that I think typifies the difficulty and the complaints that the Ontario public have had with this system that we have had in force for the last year or so.

I am using this letter that I have received, it sets out the facts of the case very briefly, Mr. Chairman, but it is a problem that, when I was talking to the person involved the other day, still had not been solved. Yet it has gone on literally for months. This is just an example.

This is a letter, Mr. Chairman, from a Toronto businessman, Mr. A. T. Sanders, who is in business here in Toronto on College Street. He wrote to me as a result of a telephone conversation because his story seemed so strange and sometimes so amusing that I asked him to put it down on paper. The letter is dated February 9, 1967. This is what he says to me:

> As you have suggested after my telephoning you this morning, I embark on summarizing my lengthy correspondence with OMSIP. Amusing perhaps to an outsider but certainly unpleasant and time consuming for the involved taxpayer. October 18, 1966: I notified OMSIP in writing that both my wife and myself changed our names legally from Szekely to Sanders. At the same time, I notified scores of other government and private organizations of the change.
>
> All of them made the necessary adjustments within a week. Sent me new membership or credit cards, etc. Our social security numbers have also been arranged at the time. The old numbers there remained unchanged. Our OMSIP numbers are the same but I did not hear from OMSIP.

The middle of November, 1966, I phoned OMSIP, talked to a lady. All she understood was that my wife and I have separate contracts. She told me they will have to change that. I gave permission to her for this change but asked her to change the names at the same time, but again nothing happened.

December 9 I sent OMSIP a registered letter stating all the above. The middle of December a lady from OMSIP phoned me and promised all would be arranged to my satisfaction. My wife will be on my contract.

At the end of December, they sent us four new membership cards. Now my name is Andrew T. Sanders; my wife's name is Mrs. Judith Sanders. The four new cards are addressed as follows: one for Judith Sanders but still with her old number; one for Mrs. J. Sanders, and again her old number; one for Mr. A. L. Sanders, wrong initial, but my right number; one for Mr. Andrew Sanders, with a completely wrong number.

Beginning of January, 1967: I phoned OMSIP, tried to explain about the new cards. They did not understand but promised to look into it.

The middle of January, 1967: OMSIP sent us an official notification addressed to a Mr. J. Sanders. Of course, neither of us is called quite that. He was told that his wife's contract was cancelled and she will put be on his contract as of July of the previous year or possibly he will be put on her contract, although "wife" must have meant someone of feminine gender, but the non-cancelled number was that of my wife.

The next day I phoned their contract change division who had signed said letter and talked to a Mrs. Hamilton who promised to look into the matter.

January 25: On this day I had a most interesting conversation with a lady from OMSIP. Her name sounded like Mrs. Beckford, but I am not quite sure about that, and first of all she told me that I wanted to have one contract instead of two separate ones for my wife and myself. I told her no, it was they who wanted it that way. She said it is easier for their administration. Mind you, they have an electronic computer, as she told me. Then she said that they had cancelled my contract by mistake and put me on my wife's contract. I said they certainly made a mistake and please correct it.

She said: "Of course." Did I want then to be on my wife's contract as her dependent? I said: "Certainly not, I want her on my contract." So she said in that case they will reinstate my contract, cancel my wife's and put her on mine, effective July 1 of the previous year.

What is more, they will refund all the money we have paid for her insurance for the last seven months and will demand the same amount of money as addition for her insurance from me. I begged her not to complicate the matter further. Why not do all this change as of this day? She said it would be kind of nice to do it the other way, but if I insist there is no reason for not effecting this change on January 25, or it might have been January 27.

We agreed and left the matter at that. Later that day, the same lady phoned me and told me indignantly that they had just discovered that I had originally applied for OMSIP membership under a completely different name, the name Szekely. I explained the matter patiently; she calmed down and after complaining slightly that "everything is so mixed up", promised me she would arrange everything as we had agreed.

January 31: We received in the mail two new membership cards. I had my old number on mine; my wife had her old number on hers and they welcomed us as new members and it was specifically typed on the cards, "Effective July 1, 1966."

That is how matters stand at this moment.

That was last February:

> OMSIP has had a great number of opportunities to make errors and they have not let one slip by. I am also very much afraid of what will happen when the bills from our several visits to doctors in the last half year come up for processing. Our doctors complain OMSIP is many months behind in payments and mix up everything possible. I hope your questions in the House will help bring some order finally.

I phoned this gentleman the other day—he is a business manager in the city—and he thinks it is almost settled, but he still does not have his card. So you can see how this has gone on. Despite the explanations we might get from the men from OMSIP before our committee, this type of thing still remains outstanding. If you would like the gentleman's telephone number and address, I have them here; he makes no secret about it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: What is his contract number?

Mr. S. Lewis: Which one? Leave the poor man alone!

Mr. Trotter: Yes, I have even the contract number.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 809.

Mr. Trotter: I am still on my feet, do not be in a big hurry here.

This, of course, has been typical in many respects and in a good percentage of the contracts that have gone through. I know from my own contract I have had difficulty understanding the payments that have come in. I think they are improving now. I must admit that, but I know that as of three months ago, I do not think that any relative of mine had had a proper return on his or her contract. Admittedly, things are improving, but still it is a pretty sorry mess. One of the main reasons for that has been the whole approach from the very beginning on a system the government really did not want to get into, and finally it developed a system of insurance which has become tremendously costly here in the province of Ontario.

In this department under this vote, we have seen the costs go up at a tremendous rate. I know there are many oversights that have embarrassed the government. There has been the oversight of the whole mess in processing the accounts; there has been the very embarrassing situation because there is no means of negotiating payments with the Ontario medical association; the costs are up 15 per cent. We have no control over the situation whatsoever, and these many oversights have come unaided in the raise that went through on April 1, 1967.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe there are approximately 1,800,000 subscribers signed up with OMSIP. This means that an additional government subsidy of at least $10 million is going to have to be put into the scheme because of the raise the doctors have taken. They did not ask for it; they literally took it, and the government made a decision to see that this extra amount is covered and simply, I am sure, because we are on the eve of an election.

In other words, this money was not budgeted for, it was planned for. But because the doctors have done what they have done and we are in the midst of the beginnings of an election whether it be this spring or next fall, this money is hurriedly thrown into the scheme.

Mr. Chairman, if the whole population of Ontario, 7 million people, had been enrolled in OMSIP, the increase would have cost the government about $40 million. This is just too big a price to ask the taxpayers to pay, even though it is only $10 million today under the present numbers in OMSIP. Even this $10 million is just too big a price to ask the taxpayers to pay to save the political hide of the government that is now in power, because that is all that payment was made for.

In the first place the scheme was developed more or less at the behest of the doctors in order to try to curry to them. When the doctors did not play ball with the government, the government had to bail itself out at a pretty high cost to the taxpayer.

This situation is going to continue and this estimate is going to increase at an astronomical rate every year that it comes before this House, simply because of the basic setup of this plan. We know full well that a few years ago when PSI tried to have an open plan in the various communities they got into financial difficulties. What we are doing here in this plan by keeping out the groups is literally taking from the insurance companies the older and sicker people, and those people on whom the profit is made we leave to the private insurance companies, because the profit is made on the group plans. These are the working people and we, as taxpayers, running the present setup of OMSIP, are subsidizing the large insurance companies.

This is not fair to the taxpayer nor, by and large, is it fair to the people who are in the group plans. There is no doubt in my mind that if we have in this province an overall compulsory scheme, bringing in everybody so that the risk is spread among the lame and the halt and the well and the strong, we will have a good medical scheme in this province.

I see no hope of expanding the present scheme under the present set-up into dentistry, or into drugs, as long as we keep making the government scheme look sick. It need not look sick, but it looks sick now simply because of the basic principle on which it is organized, and on the really poor businessmanship that the government is showing. It is unfortunate, because people are always saying, well the government is inefficient and cannot handle the scheme in a proper manner.

Well, if the government takes risks, if you want to use the hard boiled insurance term, that are going to do nothing but cost money, obviously this scheme is going to be run into

the ground, and believe me this is what the insurance companies want.

They want the Ontario government to look stupid, they want the Minister to look stupid, they want The Department of Health to look stupid. And Mr. Chairman, under the present set-up, this is what is happening. It is a tragedy for this province and for the population as a whole, which could benefit tremendously from a properly government-operated compulsory scheme.

In November of 1966, I believe the present Minister said OMSIP had programmed its computer to process about 60,000 claims per month. This is $150 for a family, a premium which is high for the working man, but low in comparison to what PSI is offering, or what Medicall is offering. Instead of having 60,000 a month, he suddenly found he had 300,000 a month.

Well, this number, which is normal for 1,500,000 persons covered in the summer months, increases by about 400,000 per month in the winter, and with these increases we are going to find that we are just going to be swamped with huge bills that are completely beyond the ability of the average taxpayer to carry in the form of taxes. Simply, the money must be raised somewhere and the unfortunate part about it is that the gravy in a scheme such as this is going strictly to the private firms.

It is up to us as legislators to see that this stops and it is my fervent hope that when the Minister make his arrangements with the federal government, that they do not try to farm this scheme out to make a private firm or private insurance companies the agents of the government.

We have said time and time again that profit should be taken out of health insurance. But what we have done is put more profit in it for the insurance companies and ask the taxpayer to bear a crushing burden which he should not have to bear. It is the old story, that the rich are richer and the poor are poorer and this has been government policy. It will be a black mark when the history of these times is written, it will be a black mark on this particular administration for the way they have implemented the OMSIP scheme. Our worst fears are being realized. A very heavy deficit is arising and not only is it a deficit arising, but essentially the organization of the scheme has been very, very poor.

I read that letter, Mr. Chairman, from Mr. Sanders. He is a business man and it is obvious he cannot have a very high impression of government organization. This simply need not be, because the Ontario medical services plan can hire able men. No doubt they have hired able men, but they are operating under such rules and regulations and guidelines that they have an impossible situation.

I do hope that this government, when making its arrangements with the federal government, will accept the scheme, the overall health scheme in this province, as originally laid down by the Minister of Health, Mr. McEachen and not be taken in or not urged upon the federal government or itself this business of creating private agencies.

Even at a time when we try to get a scheme in this province, the government itself turned its own employees over to a private group from London, Ontario. This is the type of group, the civil service employees, that could easily be the beginning of a hard core of a proper medical insurance scheme here in the province of Ontario.

But this is just one more blunder it made, again currying the favoured, the private insurance companies. This is having a disastrous effect upon the budget of the Ontario medical services division and it is going to become worse as the years go by, unless a radical change is made in the set-up of this particular arm of The Department of Health.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could, just before the Minister replies, offer one or two tentative observations? First, I would simply put this forward: There is no doubt that the government literally catapulted into OMSIP and foisted upon the shoulders of the civil service involved in the medical services insurance plan an almost insuperable job.

Mr. Chairman, as I sat through those committee meetings and listened to the presentations made, I emerged with the very strong sensation that things were coming under control. I may be expressing a degree of naïveté here that should not normally be given to this Opposition party, but I want to put it on the record that I was personally exceedingly impressed with the efforts being made at bringing OMSIP under control and dealing with the computer problem and overcoming the kind of case which the member for Parkdale introduced this evening.

I, at least, had the sensation that it will probably be possible for the Minister, if not now, then in the near future, to say, as was implied at that time, that compensation is paid quickly, that in fact there is not the

same delay and that there is probably simply the normal percentage of claims which go amiss or are processed in the unfortunate, almost supernatural, other-worldly manner as that which was described this evening.

I think it is important that the division not feel oppressed because there is no question that it was the government policy of hurtling into OMSIP at the last moment which put the division in such a very difficult position.

They have, it seems to me at any rate, done a yeoman job. I hope they will come through it all right. But what worries me, Mr. Chairman, what profoundly worries me, is the possibility that this division will again be catapulted into a universal scheme and whether the computers can possibly handle the transition from 1.8 million population to seven million, without precisely the same barrage of complaints, mistaken claims, and unhappy circumstances. That is something which one would not dare to predict.

Unless the government is prepared to anticipate its own plans and to introduce them on an orderly basis, we will once again have chaos. But the chaos that did exist and which I understand is presently corrected, or being corrected, is something that was by no means a part of those who were responsible for the division. That was the responsibility of government for doing it in such a precipitous and unplanned fashion, and I repeat, it was an enormously impressive contribution at those two committee sessions in the overall.

It was highly detailed, it was not policy, but it was indeed impressive, and I have the sensation that things were under control.

This brings me, Mr. Chairman, to the second point. What is unfortunate about vote 809 on the medical services insurance division—and I think something about which one would worry a great deal more than the precise procedures of the operations branch—is this question of the money which the government is paying in order to finance a scheme which should be universal but because the outer limits of the Tory philosophy have been reached, it is confined to something like 20 per cent of the population.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that it is a crude and a cynical ploy on the part of government to be prepared to subsidize this kind of inadequate scheme with public moneys to the extent which it does, simply to allow the private insurance companies to operate at such an inordinate profit and simply to allow the group plans to operate in the low risk areas and to include in the government plan all those areas which would normally be considered isolated and high risk.

Mr. Chairman, it is truly unbelievable that a Conservative government—even a Conservative government—would spend so many extra millions of public money, this year $10 million, simply to demonstrate that they are prepared to confine a scheme to 25 per cent of the population and leave all the rest to the private insurance carriers. Even their negotiations at Ottawa, as we understand, continue to enshrine the private carriers in a privileged position.

In other words, the government will do whatever it can to undermine the activities of a public operation simply to prove (a) that it is not workable, and (b) that the private carriers should be given a privileged position.

Even at the risk of offending its own status in the community, Mr. Chairman, the government is prepared to accede to this particular policy and it is a major policy decision made on the part of Cabinet. They have said to themselves: "We will continue to service 27 per cent of the population; the other 73 per cent can forever be covered by private carriers. If we have to drain off $10 million to $20 million of the public money in extra payments, which should not be justified, in order to subsidize our inadequate scheme, we will even do that so that it facilitates the private carriers." That is truly, Mr. Chairman, a cynical move. It can be described in no other terms.

I do not know when the government is going to come to its senses. I fear that when it comes to its senses, it will join a universal plan, but it will meet the 90 per cent universality demand by including all the private carriers and giving them, or maintaining their privileged position, and extracting federal moneys to provide for the private carriers' administrative costs.

Now, if ever there were an entente between government and private insurance, OMSIP is the open manifestation. It is the open sore in this kind of a relationship. It is a running sore in this kind of a relationship, and it cannot be tolerated much longer in this House.

We say to the Minister, if he wants to spend extra moneys on public medicare, then spend them on a universal plan where there is no inordinate underwriting of a scheme confined to a very small percentage of the population, and do not be so cynical and abusive with the public funds to underwrite this portion so that the private companies can get away with exorbitant profits.

That is really what has happened and that has become the rationale of OMSIP. I am much more concerned about that aspect of it than about the operations branch and the general procedures in the department because that can be overcome by the application of some intelligent human resources. But the other can only be overcome by a change in Tory philosophy and of that, we have no evidence whatsoever. It is another reason why this government is losing so much of the public confidence.

Mr. Trotter: I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could tell the House how much was spent in advertising and urging people to join OMSIP. I understand that it was about $700,000.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The amount was, I believe, $489,000.

Mr. Trotter: Oh, no, it was higher than that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We will get the correct figure for you. It was $500,000.

Mr. Trotter: As of what date?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That was in the first year of operation.

Mr. Trotter: That does not include what was done this year?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: From the passage of the bill on February 18, 1966, until the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if students from the ages of 19 to 21 are eligible for OMSIP?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes. It is the same as the income tax law as long as one is dependent; whether they are students or not, so long as they are dependent.

Mr. Newman: May the students file an application form for free OMSIP where the parents are not involved?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. Newman: I brought this up last year. I had the application form from a student who filed it and was refused twice by your department.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Was the student self-supporting?

Mr. Newman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Apparently he did not advise the division that he was on his own, and this being the case, of course, he would have been covered.

Mr. Newman: I will talk privately to the Minister later; this was refused twice by his department.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, could the Minister let me know what is taking place with regard to this latest financial statement that has been sent out? Are we getting a prompt return so that everyone will be covered? Some of the older people are becoming confused again with this latest card that was sent out in regard to their financial status.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is a card and the contract for those who are partially or totally subsidized, their contract is good for one year because it is based on taxable incomes. Now the card that has been devised was devised in consultation with the systems people and they believed that it was the most simple that could have been devised. Everyone who had a subsidized contract, either partially or totally, must sign this. It only means stating once again that they did not have a taxable income and signing their name.

This is being sent to every person who was subsidized. Those who have a change in financial status may be eligible for subsidization this year, whereas they were not last year and will submit a statement to that effect too.

Mr. Worton: I appreciate this, Mr. Chairman, but could we have some idea as to whether the returns are coming in? They were to be in by May 1.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am advised that they are coming in well.

Mr. Worton: As simple as they are, there are a number of people confused with the number of cards they have to fill out between the federal government and this scheme. It is becoming—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This, of course, is inherent in trying to clean this up in our new legislation.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, at this hour of the night I am not going to attempt to document the kind of confusion and the difficulties that the computer has had because this has been rather solidly presented to the House, but I do want to take one moment to present another aspect because it touches on the basic policy

which this government has insisted be followed.

This is the experience of a constituent of mine by the name of Richard S. Thorne. Mr. Thorne is one of those people who believes that since he has a contract with OMSIP to pay his doctor's bills, that those bills should be paid directly to his doctor, and that he should not be used as a sort of a post office to handle the money. With that rather firm belief, here is what happened.

On January 9 of 1967, his wife visited an eye surgeon. Her second and last consultation took place three days later on January 12. Three days after that visit, a bill was received from the specialist and Mr. Thorne returned the bill, requesting that it be sent to OMSIP by the doctor. Now, Mr. Thorne is a teacher and for the next two weeks he was deluged with phone calls, both to his home and to his school, where he was called out of class to answer. One or two more bills were sent by the doctor's office, which Mr. Thorne promptly returned, reiterating his principles that since he had a contract with OMSIP he wanted the doctor to be paid directly. He added, however, that he would be happy to pay the difference if the OMSIP payment was not enough. He also requested the doctor and his secretary to stop bothering him at the school.

At this point a conversation ensued between Mr. Thorne and the specialist. The doctor explained to Mr. Thorne that his principles were such that he would not contact OMSIP. The conversation ended with both parties protesting their principles and the doctor slamming the receiver down so hard that Mr. Thorne's ear rang.

However, the doctor accepted payment for the first visit, so apparently he managed to overcome his principles and, in fact, in the second instance he billed OMSIP directly apparently, for from that second visit a cheque was received by Mr. Thorne. However a little humour, Mr. Chairman, entered this rather sad story, because the cheque became the plaything for a while by the kitten in the home of the Thorne family and became rather chewed up so Mr. Thorne had to return it to OMSIP to get a negotiable cheque. He did that and Mr. Thorne asked for a replacement and requested at the same time that it should be sent directly to the doctor.

February 24, which I remind you, Mr. Chairman, is some seven weeks only after the visit to the specialist, the doctor sent a bill for $11.50 to Mrs. Thorne with the following notation and I quote:

> We have contacted OMSIP at your request and they have paid part of your account as indicated above. They claim that you have returned only one cheque to them. The balance therefore is your responsibility. Since you have not been helping us with this we have been forced to turn the account over to our collection agency.

This was seven weeks after the visit to the specialist.

On March 9, a letter was sent to Mr. Thorne addressed to his school, a letter from the collection agency, stating that he owed $11.50 and that legal action must be instituted against him with all the court costs taxable against him and urging him to contact the office within five days, adding that this was the final notice before proceeding.

On March 15 OMSIP sent a letter to Mr. Thorne enclosing another cheque and advising him that as his doctor had submitted a "pay" patient card they must pay the subscriber. Mr. Thorne returned the cheque once again stating in no uncertain terms that his contract with OMSIP meant that he wanted his bills paid directly.

Meanwhile the collection agency proceeded and a writ was issued in the eighth division court for the payment of $11.50. However on April 13, OMSIP mailed the cheque for $9 to the doctor and on April 14 Mr. Thorne mailed the doctor the difference of $2.50.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister a question or so arising out of this. Quite apart from the fact that this was a rather precipitate action in placing it with a collection agency within seven weeks, at a time when the doctors and everybody knew that there were some considerable delays because of the difficulties that the branch was having in processing cheques, I am wondering how frequent is this kind of complication in the administration that OMSIP has because of doctors insisting that they are going to have nothing to do with OMSIP and, understandably in some instances, patients insisting that they are not going to be used as a way station for the payment of their bills.

Indeed, I have learned that in some instances, doctors have actually torn up cheques that have come directly from OMSIP and sent them back in little pieces to OMSIP. Would the Minister comment to what extent this is a problem that the branch is having to cope with and to what extent this practice of doctors reacting in this fashion has been in their experience.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is very seldom and I know this must be a very distressing experience for a person and it is a most annoying thing to us. Doctors are human and sometimes I think you tend to forget that. We are subject to all the peculiarities and foibles that even politicians fall prey to and we have the small hard core in our profession, as you have in every trade, profession or avocation, who are determined that their principles shall not be violated no matter what.

We have got two people in this particular case, meeting head on, each with deeply entrenched principles, each determined that he was not going to yield an inch.

In trying to make this programme work smoothly, we established three methods of payment—or three possibilities for payment, as you all know. The one, where the doctor bills the plan directly and 75 per cent of the doctors are sending their bills on our cards into the division and are being paid, the cheque being sent back to them.

Then the next way was that we asked all of the doctors to complete their bill on our card, for ease of operation. Thirteen per cent of them do this and stamp it "paid patient". They send it in to us, or give it to the patient who in turn sends it to us and we send the cheque back to the patient. The patient in turn gives it to the doctor.

Once in a great while—at least those we hear about are very rare—some act in the rather stubborn manner that these two apparently acted in, and each one has a right to defend his own principles.

The other method is that the doctor sends a bill on his usual letterhead form and 12 per cent follow this procedure. They are the smaller number—I do not think this has changed—this has not come down any, this seems to be a constant figure now.

We are hopeful that this 12 per cent will come down and it has been the experience in some of the other provinces that this comes down to about eight to 10 per cent, but they always seem to remain with the final 10 per cent of the hard core, who will not even render the bill on the card that feeds into the machine, so that it has to be manually transposed from the doctor's letterhead to our card.

I do not know how to deal with this matter. I suppose they will have to work it out by themselves. I cannot understand the doctor turning in the bill, even if he knew nothing about difficulty, after seven weeks. That is pretty ridiculous.

Mr. MacDonald: And into a collection agency.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is what I mean, into a collection agency at the end of seven weeks. Doctors like all people—have often to wait for their bills, but again we are human and some of my colleagues do things in a very human way, and I cannot explain it. I cannot defend it. I am not going to try to. I am not going to try to apologize for it. We just hope that one or other of them will learn to give in, or I would strongly urge that the patient should choose a doctor with whom he can relate a little bit better, I think that would be the easiest way in the end. I think quite a number of this 12 per cent will be reduced simply by a process of patients going to a doctor who will deal in a more realistic and reasonable manner with them. This is really the only explanation I could possibly offer.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I must say I find it rather encouraging to hear the Minister say that 75 per cent of the doctors are now establishing the direct relationship. I think the same kind of experience emerged, whether as quickly or over what period I am not certain now, in Saskatchewan, where the doctors contended they would not have the direct relationship. I understand that 90 per cent now do. So if we have gotten up to 75 per cent in Ontario, that is better than I thought, quite frankly, was the case.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Plus the 13.

Mr. MacDonald: Plus the 13, yes!

May I ask the Minister this? In the early stages of OMSIP, press stories indicated that the OMA was playing a pretty active propaganda role, if I may describe it as such, in trying to encourage doctors not to have the direct relationship with OMSIP. Is it the case, as far as the Minister knows now, that the OMA is discouraging them from having a direct relationship, or is it becoming neutral in the whole picture?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh I do not believe that the OMA has changed its attitude. Your information is quite correct, there was a very definite direction from the OMA to its members that they should have a direct relationship with their patients and not with any insurance carrier. Indeed, I think by inference at least, as I read the information, we were not even supposed to have a direct relationship with our own doctor-sponsored plan. However, that—

Mr. MacDonald: Is the OMA actively promoting this?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not believe so now, I think they are a little disillusioned that 75 per cent or 88 per cent of the doctors did not follow their leadership.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I could never understand the OMA's views and how some of the hard cores still cling to the view that they should not deal directly with the scheme. I can understand why 75 per cent of the doctors plus this 13 per cent will deal directly with OMSIP simply because their fees are guaranteed, they have guaranteed payment.

I have brought this question up with many doctors. It is something to bear in mind in future when this scheme is being expanded—and I am sure this event will take place—if you are dealing with the federal government for an overall compulsory scheme, you should keep this in mind; it can be broken down simply on a basis of dollars and cents, that it is to the financial advantage of the doctors to get direct payment.

He is sure of his money and I know from the costs of collection, either through a collection agency or through a lawyer, that it is simply not worthwhile for a doctor to go to the time and trouble to try and collect some of these bills. It is not only bad public relations for him as the hon. member for York South has pointed out in one case, but even strictly on a basis of economics a doctor can lose money pursuing bills that are difficult to collect.

I think financial consultants that have prepared an analysis of a doctor's office to show that it is far more economical for a doctor to deal directly with such a scheme even as you have it here, even this half-baked scheme, that it is still more profitable for him. In the long run when they have an expanded scheme, it is even more profitable for him.

I would like to know in order to get around the Ontario medical association, which I feel has done a very poor job in representing the medical profession. The average doctor, in many cases, does not object to a public medical scheme. In a great number of cases they might not like it, but they will shrug and say it is here, they do not fight it and they find it is working.

But the Ontario medical association is being so adamant and so obtuse and narrow-minded, in everything that is done, that I think it has harmed the average practitioner of medicine in the province of Ontario. Why is it that the government—and I will have a couple of other questions after this—could not deal more with the college of physicians and surgeons and not with the Ontario medical association?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, as I said on previous occasions, the college of physicians and surgeons has a statutory responsibility and they do not want to involve themselves in these matters at all. They believe that the responsibility given to them by this Legislature is such that they should not be involved in these other things. We have tried to establish, and are now trying to re-establish, an ongoing relationship with representative groups of both bodies in the hope that we can get a common meeting ground, a representative group of the college and of the association. In this way, I repeat, I am hopeful that we can get an ongoing relationship.

Mr. Trotter: Well, I think this is extremely important because this is going to cost us millions of dollars extra a year unless we get some connection or some basis of dealing with the medical association.

The college of physicians and surgeons is created by statute, they could easily be in a position, if they so desired, and if the medical profession so desired, to represent the medical profession.

I have been thinking that almost a very obvious parallel is the law society of Upper Canada and the legal aid. I used to think that the benchers and probably the Toronto lawyers were about the most conservative people you could meet, and yet they were the ones who literally wrote the legal aid plan. Instead of fighting it they did a great deal to assist it. You are dealing with the law society of Upper Canada and there seems to be no difficulty in there, in fact they have been, I think, of great assistance. What is wrong with their opposite number in the medical profession, the college of physicians and surgeons?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): No insurance companies making big profits, that is the difference.

Mr. Trotter: Would the Minister have any comment on the parallel between those two?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No. First of all I do not understand the parallel. I do not know whether the law society is comparable to our college. I think it is the benchers who are comparable to our college.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): That is the law society.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The benchers are the law society? You do not have a split, you have not a dichotomy in your organization then? We have. We have two. This does not obtain in every province, but in Ontario we have, we have the college of physicians and surgeons, which is responsible—

Mr. S. Lewis: There is a split the—Canadian bar association.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Your Canadian bar association is akin to our Canadian medical association. The Ontario medical association is a division of this, and therefore—

Mr. Trotter: No, but among the legal profession the governing body is the law society of Upper Canada and they pretty well call the shot. You would think that the college of physicians and surgeons, which was created by statute by this government just like the law society of Upper Canada was, you would think there would be a parallel there.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, the college of physicians and surgeons was created by this government to look after certain things, principally the regulation of professional standards, education, training, registration and discipline. This is all they want to deal with. The college does not want to take on this matter of fees. Traditionally, in Ontario—and this goes back to the early days, indeed it goes back to the birth of our province—the association has looked after the socio-economic matters affecting the profession. The profession itself will not have any part of this, I am quite certain, because I have discussed this with the college.

Mr. Trotter: Well, in British Columbia, Mr. Chairman, the British Columbia government has got an agreement with the doctors in that province. It is in force, I believe, until 1970. Now, I do not know if this government has looked into the type of agreement they have. I am not sure if it is such a good idea, but at least they have some idea of where the cost begins and ends. I think that in British Columbia the medical association has an agreement with the provincial government to adjust its fee schedules so that changes in total payments to doctors by both the government plan and the doctor-sponsored plan will match changes in the cost of living index, and the index of average salaries and wages. I do not know if that is a good idea, but at least there would be some limitation upon what the raise would be. I was wondering if the Minister through his officials had looked into the scheme they have in British Columbia and if it could possibly work here.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think we have looked at it and I am not sure that the same scheme would work. The principle underlying the BC programme, I think, is a sound one. I personally urged the Ontario medical association to enter into an agreement of that sort and we thought we were meeting with some success until they told the Prime Minister and myself that they were not empowered to negotiate. But we did, from the start, urge them to enter into or to help us or together with us to develop a formula. I am not so naïve, and I am quite certain that no hon. member is so naïve, as to believe that fee schedules are going to stay where they are. They will go up and down in keeping, I hope, with the economy.

Mr. Trotter: Mostly up!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, as long as our economy is going up, of course they will go up. But I was about to say that I presume they will go in tune with our economy, whether it goes up or down, and we all hope, of course, that it will continue to go up. But so far they have not seen fit to do this, although I am a little more hopeful now since this amendment to the legislation than I was prior to that. Having invited both the college and the association to sit down with us and commune together or enter into continuing dialogue I am hopeful that between us we will now be able to devise some kind of formula that will be workable and will let each of us know what we can look forward to in the days that lie ahead.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, under this vote, as we cover the various services that should be given under this scheme, we hear today the problems the doctors are having, because of the so-called shortage of doctors and the number of services they have to provide. Of course, the introduction of OMSIP has probably increased the availability of services to the average person. Why then can we not give the doctors some assistance by permitting some of the other services into the scheme, such as the optometrists and chiropractors?

I know the Minister has some committee looking into the usefulness of these various groups, but the fact they have been in existence for so long, they have been regulated by this government, given certain powers under this government, they are recognized

services that would certainly assist the doctors. The doctors are supposed to be worked so hard, and yet it means today in order to get coverage for a prescription for glasses you must go to a medical doctor. This only increases this heavy burden of the medical doctors. It makes it more difficult for the people who want to deal with a particular optometrist. It means they must pay out of their own pocket, even though they have been paying premiums under the scheme. What is even far more widespread is the situation with the chiropractors here in the province of Ontario.

I know over the course of the years the workmen's compensation board spends millions of dollars in paying chiropractors to work on the men who are injured here in the province of Ontario.

So obviously one branch of this government recognizes them and uses their services to some great extent. In fact, where it is necessary and where in the particular work they do, chiropractic services do a good work and they are not as expensive as medical services. Actually, on the rates I have seen the cost is less and I think the workmen's compensation board has learned this.

Yet we persist at cost to our people who want chiropractic services, and we persist in carrying out the terms and clinging to terms of the scheme that just need not be. The Minister may give me the excuse that he has a committee doing this or a committee doing that, there are a number of things that would not do the Minister any harm to provide some good fresh air to make a firm decision on some of these important matters.

This is one that I again bring to this committee, through you, Mr. Chairman, particularly to the Minister. I know it is difficult for the Minister to like optometrists and like chiropractors because he is a medical doctor, but I think some of these experts in the field of health get off into their own compartments and do not know what the other half of the world is doing. This is probably a weakness of every doctor who is practising medicine in this country.

There have been provincial schemes—I believe in Saskatchewan, I believe now in British Columbia—where chiropractors are recognized. I believe also in Alberta. Now I understand the federal government, in the scheme that they are bringing forward, will recognize the services of the chiropractor. I do not see why we have to persist in the manner in which we do, it just seems to be sheer stubborness that only affects the welfare of the people of the province of Ontario to their detriment.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, it is surely worse than stubborness, because what OMSIP is now doing is pursuing a policy of dual discrimination, first against all the optometrists and chiropractors in the province of Ontario and second against all the people whom they regularly service. Such people amount to several millions in this province.

Mr. Chairman, it is a policy, I suggest to the Minister, that is entirely indefensible. If you have a large urban community served by an eye specialist, a medical practitioner, an ophthalmologist, he is compensated for certain procedures. A community in the hinterland of this province, a rural area or a small urban area away from the Metro complex does not have the good fortune to have an ophthalmologist. It has one or two optometrists in the community who perform exactly the identical procedures but they cannot be compensated under OMSIP, so they do not receive payment and their patients are discriminated against because they cannot submit their bills.

Mr. Chairman, in other words, the OMSIP scheme is practising a careful method of discrimination as between disciplines and that was surely never the object of the OMSIP scheme. Precisely what is true of optometrists is also true of chiropractors.

It is even worse than that, Mr. Chairman, because frequently in the case of chiropractors they rescue patients from general practitioners who do not know how to handle certain procedures and there are all kinds of chiropractors—I was speaking to one in my office yesterday—who have referrals from general practitioners requesting them as chiropractors to perform certain procedures. And they cannot be compensated under OMSIP.

It is a very peculiar kind of discrimination, Mr. Chairman, a very perverse discrimination both against those two disciplines, perfectly reputable disciplines in their standards of training and quality of service, and it is also this peculiar discrimination perforce against the citizenry who avail themselves of those services.

I do not know to what one attributes it, Mr. Chairman, whether the government is worried about the increased cost of the scheme, if chiropractic and optometric services were included. I do not know whether the government has the medical lobby which has never looked with particular favour on these related disciplines—let us face it, they

look with considerable condescension on the optometrists and the chiropractors — or whether in fact it is some peculiar kind of logic which feels it should be applicable to one plan or one government department and not to another.

But you cannot get away from the fact, Mr. Chairman, there is no avoiding the fact that OMSIP, in perpetuating this division, is denying service to several millions of people, is forcing people who do not have ophthalmologists to turn to optometrists for precisely the same procedures with no compensation and in the case of chiropractors is refusing to recognize what most people observe as an indispensable service in various procedures that are performed.

I appeal to the government, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of those disciplines, to become more flexible. It is not simply a matter of including them gradually in OMSIP. I think that you are taking a little too long in this, Mr. Chairman, if I may say, I think that it is something which should be done right away. Indeed, I would point out to the Minister that under the proposals put by the federal Minister of Health and Welfare, chiropractic and optometric services, even psychological services will be compensated up to 50 per cent by the federal government if included in a provincial scheme.

I admit that first requires the implementation of a universal scheme and a federal-provincial agreement but I would—

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister without Portfolio): That is not quite right, that is not what the federal government says.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is exactly what the bill says and the optometrists have made submissions to this government on the basis of that bill.

Mr. Bryden: What brought the Minister to life? We have not heard from him all session.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I would be glad to be corrected because I truly understand it this way, and the news stories understood it this way. What the federal government's bill says is that if the provincial government wishes to incorporate optometric services, chiropractic services, psychological services, then they will also receive the 50 per cent of federal compensation. They leave the onus on the provincial governments to include them and they are willing to give that compensation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is not the situation.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, what is the situation then, Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell us?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I think we have to get this on the right track. Let us repeat for I do not know how many times that this is neither a case of discrimination nor a case of my disliking. I like these fellows, some of them are my friends. First of all, the only common service to ophthalmology and the optometrists is the refraction and the medical services insurance bill specifically excludes refraction as a benefit.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I continue, please? We are told and we have never been able to prove this, but we are told that certain ophthalmologists are doing refractions and charging OMSIP for them. I have the assurance of the section of ophthalmology, I also have the assurance of the college of physicians and surgeons that if these people are performing a service and charging fraudulently for it, they will be disciplined.

Now I cannot do any more than that. It is simply a matter of this not being included in the programme and my friends talk about the other provinces where it is included. Mr. Chairman, it is included as an additional insured service and to the best of my knowledge refraction services or optometrical services and chiropractic services can be insured in Ontario by other carriers. Now one might argue if we are discriminating against these people, why are we not discriminating against the dentist, the druggist, psychiatrist, psychologist, and a host of other—

Mr. S. Lewis: You are.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We are not.

Mr. S. Lewis: You are.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We stated when this bill was introduced, we never pretended that this was a total health care plan yet, it was the second large step in a total health care plan. And it comes by evolution, not by revolution. No sound, sane thinking government believes in revolution. My socialist friends do but that is quite all right. This is a puny little group, sir, and will never be anywhere else.

Mr. MacDonald: Where do you think there is a revolution? Why do you not get off your podium and deal with the point—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not on a podium, I am dealing with you, my friend, and it hurts.

Mr. S. Lewis. Get off your podium!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I know that is all the comeback you have because you do not have a sound argument to refute it. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the interpretation which my hon. friend, the member for Scarborough West, has put upon the bill is completely wrong. Indeed I have just come back from a conference in Ottawa and I was very much surprised to find that the great majority of provinces are very much concerned about this, because once again the federal government is pushing provinces into programmes which they do not believe have top priority place in their provincial programmes, and this is worrying all of the provinces, with the exception of one.

Mr. Bryden: Health is of low priority, is it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Section 43 is the amendment to the Act which was put in in response to a tremendous lobby, but not from the medical profession. So far as I know there is no medical lobby. I might be blind to it—

Mr. Bryden: Oh, no, they just take over behind the scenes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: For the member for Woodbine, everything is a lobby to him. This amendment was brought in in response to a very extensive lobby. But the Minister of National Health and Welfare pointed out to us that this permits the Governor in Council to extend the services when there is a demand for them, but not when any province determines it is going to provide them. There has to be prior consultation, there has to be agreement between the two levels of government, and we have asked that a definite formula be laid down, sir, and that all of the provinces be consulted before the Minister of National Health and Welfare or the Governor in Council will enter into any individual arrangement or arrangement with an individual province to extend the scope of services.

We know that the newspaper reports stated that this would let in optometry, and the chiropractors have advised all of us that it was meant to let them in. In talking to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, I do not get that impression at all, but we have asked for a clear-cut definition of the meaning of this.

When the time comes that the costs can be absorbed or added into the insurance programme, then there is no question in my mind but that health care services will gradually be added until Ontario has achieved a total health care programme.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us start for a moment on the cost proposition. There is no organization that is more exacting in its examination of costs than the insurance companies. One of the reasons why the insurance companies have included, for example, chiropractic along with medical, is that they have discovered that it did not increase their costs; that having gone to a doctor once or twice the patient then came to the conclusion that perhaps he could get better service from a chiropractor and he went to the chiropractor instead of the doctor for the third time.

The significant fact is that the insurance companies did not increase their premiums when they extended the coverage. So I suggest that the Minister is setting up a straw man.

The Minister engaged in his interpretation of what the situation is in Ottawa. In fact, I do not think it is any different to what we were presenting from this side of the House, except that he says that they are not going to move until there is pressure, until there is a demand for it. Does that mean they are not going to move until he, for example, on behalf of the province of Ontario, says: "I think I should cease my discrimination against these disciplines and include them. In other words I have reached the point now where I think we should go one small step forward towards having full health services and I want to include them in Ontario?"

Will you, at that stage, then have to go and lobby all the other nine provinces to get the unanimity that you talked of before the federal government would move? I would suggest this is a perfect setup for you to stall forever and a day by not including them, and that is precisely what you want.

Last year, the Minister told us, and he repeated it once again just a moment ago, that while he was a little puzzled as to what chiropractic was—and these are almost his words—he recognized there was a growing number of people who felt that it was a health service that they wanted. That some day you would take another step to include them.

Now, until you take that step, you are discriminating against them in the fashion that my colleague, the member for Scarborough West, has spelled out. If you go out in the little villages and the little towns where they cannot get the alternative service, or if a person feels that he wants to go to a chiropractor rather than a doctor, or alternatively, as in the instance of a chiropractor in my riding who had a patient sent to him referred by a doctor, still that patient cannot get coverage under OMSIP.

The Minister can talk as long as he wants, but what he is doing is discriminating against these people, and more particularly the burden of the discrimination, the financial burden of the discrimination, is falling on the patient.

The question is, when is the Minister going to take the next step so he will include them? I was going to ask the question which I almost hesitate to ask because I think he has answered it.

If the federal government has indicated that they are willing by an order-in-council to proclaim an extension to include these services, is the Minister in any position to indicate that when he moves to integration with a national plan on July 1, 1968, he will move to cease the discrimination and provide the coverage for these various paramedical services?

Have you made that policy decision? Is the hon. Minister in a position to inform the House and the patients across the province who are interested, and the people who are providing the services?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The answer, Mr. Chairman, is no. In the fullness of time we will produce government policy.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, first I want to say to the Minister that he is being misled by the college of physicians and surgeons and the medical practitioners over the question of eye refraction, just as he was misled by them in the negotiations leading up to the change in the fee schedule, and just as he has been misled by them in other particulars, like the number of places available in the medical schools in certain of the universities. I am no longer as a member of this House prepared to take the considered opinion of the Ontario medical association.

At this point, having watched their behaviour, I would say that if they guaranteed a proposition you could be almost certain that the reverse was true. The fact of the matter is that there is something in your fee schedule akin to the phrase "primary ocular examination", I forget the precise wording, but I have it up in my files, under which refractions are done by ophthalmologists and claims made to OMSIP and compensation provided.

Every optometrist in the province knows that, and they know they are discriminated against. And let not the Ontario medical association or any other group foist upon you the pretence that such is not the case. I am sure that if you went to the optometric society in Ontario you would find that is true because they have made their case clear to Opposition members, as I am sure they have made their case clear to government. That is the first point, Mr. Chairman.

The second point is that surely one does not require a survey to justify psychological need in this province. The Minister has said in this House countless times how desperate are the needs in the area of psychological testing and diagnosis. One would not have to demonstrate need in areas of optometric qualification or in the area of chiropractic services when one knows that fully two to three million people in this province presently utilize those services in a joint fashion.

I forget the figures precisely, but the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) has used the figures in this House. He would know them, he probably has them at his fingertips, but I am sure the figure of two to three million is not low for combined chiropractic and optometric services.

Now if that does not demonstrate a need, a demand, then what possibly can? As far as I am concerned, what the Minister read from the amendment to the bill was precisely what we on this side said, the federal government is prepared to make the money available if the provincial government will enlarge the scheme. It is as simple as that. It does not matter what—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I was there, and I know what the Minister of National Health and Welfare said.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, my friend, if you know so much about it, what is the sense of the government going down to these conferences at all? I suppose you get it from remote control. I suppose you get some radionic impulses to tell you about it.

This is absolute nonsense, Mr. Chairman. I am simply repeating to this House, or paraphrasing what the Minister of National Health and Welfare said to us, and he did not say

that the federal government was ready by Governor in Council order to make this money available when the provinces determined when it was to be.

It has not yet been decided on what formula they will determine whether the national Minister will recommend the Governor in Council order. And until that determination is made, we do not know when additional services will be paid for or subsidized or supported under the proposed federal fiscal arrangements.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as we in this group are concerned, that is simply a ruse on the part of the Tory government in Ontario to deflect the central issue. When the matter was debated in Ottawa, it became patently clear that the federal government was prepared to provide these moneys. If the provincial government, because of its discriminatory attitude in respect to all allied disciplines in the helping professions, then says that it wants some complicated formula, hoping thereby to exclude such participation, if that is what it is coming up with as the answer, then again let it not put it before this House because we will not accept it. This puisne group, Mr. Chairman, this puisne group in the House is going to continue to fight—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Your spelling is worse than your speech. I did not mean that kind of puisne, I meant the real "puny".

Mr. S. Lewis: This group, Mr. Chairman, is going to continue to fight this central proposition because the demand is there. It has been well represented to this government and the government is being misled both by the medical society and by its own financial interests, and as far as we are concerned, Mr. Chairman, no viable case has been made here tonight.

If the Minister has any concrete proof, he reads from an amendment of an Act which states the thing as explicitly as it can be put, and then talks about private conversations. Well, one or the other has to be right and one assumes, Mr. Chairman, that an Act passed in the federal House of Commons is the governing determination in this instance.

Mr. MacDonald: No, do not rush; this is a very important matter.

Mr. Chairman: We are getting very wide of the mark.

Mr. MacDonald: Are we?

Mr. Chairman: We are discussing the whole field of medical care, are we not?

Mr. MacDonald: We are discussing the coverage within OMSIP, and this is a pretty important factor, particularly with all the pushing that is needed to get this government moving. But the Minister let the cat out of the bag a few moments ago and he is indulging in straight doubletalk. He said this government at Ottawa once again is trying to push the provinces into expenditures that they do not want. Now what the Minister in effect is saying is that he is not willing to have a plan contemplate the extension to include these paramedical services. And that is another phraseology of the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this hon. member as usual is expert in putting words into people's mouths. First of all, I did not say that the federal government was pushing provinces into a scheme they do not want. I said that the federal government—

Mr. MacDonald: Into expenses they did not want.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did not say expense they do not want and *Hansard* will bear testimony to this. I said the federal government by this action was again seeking to involve the provincial governments in expenditures which they themselves do not believe should hold top priority in their provincial programme. They were pushing the provinces into programmes which are constitutionally provincial responsibility with no prior consultation whatsoever.

Then on the other hand, some of their people want to take taxing rights away from us, expecting us to provide services which they dictate on their terms, according to their ground rules, and take the wherewithal that we should use to finance them away from the provinces.

Mr. Trotter: That is nonsense we are getting from the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is the sort of thing I was trying to tell the hon. member. And I want to point out, sir, that there were no private talks, this was an open conference. It was not open to the public but there were no secret or private talks between the Ministers whatsoever, it was a full and frank discussion of this bill and of the federal government's proposal as to how it should operate, or how the provinces—

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister has said, that these services, the next stage, are not of a high priority? They are not of a high enough priority that you are willing to include them, even though the federal government has indicated that if you include them, then they will cover half the cost.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They did not indicate any such thing, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: The bill, Mr. Chairman, indicates that they will cover it. Now the Minister, a bit earlier, said that he insisted that the federal government should not be left with the privilege of making an agreement with any one province, that there has to be an agreement with all of the provinces. It almost sounds as though you were going to leave any one province the right to veto an extension of the services, you would have to have agreement among them all before the federal government would pass the order-in-council.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, to quote the member for Scarborough West the other day, we are not communicating. The hon. member is simply interpreting as he wishes to interpret.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a fault we all have.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would like to tell you, sir, and through you the House, that the provincial Ministers, with one exception, insisted with the federal Minister that before any extension of benefits were brought about, there should be full and frank prior discussion with the provinces and that a predetermined plan should be developed so that provinces would not be faced with the necessity of expanding their plans without any prior knowledge of what was in the mind of the federal government.

Read the amendment as you will, there is nothing in it which says that the federal government will automatically provide 50 per cent, or whatever percentage, federal fiscal support to any extension of programmes the province might undertake.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one comment. Reference was made tonight by the Minister to the demand for these services. I presume that the demand would reflect itself in the degree of priority which the Minister would feel these various groups would have in the normal course of inclusion in a medical services scheme.

For the information of the House, it has been drawn to my attention that one out of every six people in the province of Ontario use the services of a chiropractor. That means in effect that well over a million people in this province depend on a regular basis on the services of chiropractors and it seems to me that that being so, the chiropractors perform a very vital service in this province.

As a matter of fact, they rank third in the health service field. It seems to me that the Minister should at the very earliest date give high priority to the inclusion of chiropractors in OMSIP, so that when the federal scheme comes into effect on July 1, 1968, the chiropractors will be in a position to have their services covered by our medical scheme in this province and indeed, in the whole of Canada.

So I urge the Minister once again to reconsider his position and to assure the people of the province that this service will be provided for them under our scheme.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if he is giving consideration to the inclusion of dental services to youths up to the age of 12, let us say, under the medical services insurance scheme?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am giving consideration to all health care services, Mr. Chairman, and not to any specific group of people; we are simply looking at the whole broad area constantly and keeping it under constant study.

Mr. Newman: Well, can we then assume, Mr. Chairman, that before the year is over we will have included in the medical insurance services scheme dental attention to youths under the age of 12?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would recommend the hon. member not assume anything from what I have said.

Mr. Newman: Well, then the Minister is not seriously considering the problem of dental services?

Vote 809 agreed to.

On vote 810:

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I believe there will be some discussion on this last vote.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with these estimates.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): And then?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I listed them last night. These will be followed by Reform Institutions, to be followed by Municipal Affairs. I may have to make an exchange there because I believe the Minister has to be away the latter part of the week, but in any event we will go on with Reform Institutions, Municipal Affairs and Public Works, in one order or another.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.55 o'clock, p.m.

No. 85

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, May 3, 1967

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 3, 1967

Ontario Municipal Board Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 2971

Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 2971

Municipal and school tax credits for the assistance of elderly persons, bill to provide for, Mr. Spooner, first reading 2971

Agricultural Development Finance Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 2972

Public Service Superannuation Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 2972

Question to Mr. Robarts re the Confederation for tomorrow conference, Mr. Nixon 2973

Question to Mr. Robarts re Mr. J. F. Cauley, Mr. Nixon 2973

Questions to Mr. Robarts re divorce, Mr. Worton 2973

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued 2975

Coroners Act, bill to amend, on second reading, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Sopha 2994

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3003

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, St. John's separate school, Weston and St. Stephen's separate school, Etobicoke; and in the west gallery, eastern high school of commerce, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, the bill is the usual type of bill to improve the operation of the Act and the board, and will provide particularly that councils that are elected for more than one year will be able to undertake a debt repayable during the life of that council without approval of the board.

THE PLANNING ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of amendments to The Planning Act and I think that a quick glance would indicate that the important ones are those dealing with the use of land, the establishment of housing standard bylaws and matters of that kind, and also another section that will deal with the matter of sham conveyances that are sometimes passed or entered into that seem to be designed to frustrate the housing standards bylaws.

TAX ASSISTANCE TO ELDERLY PERSONS

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for municipal and school tax credits for the assistance of elderly persons.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, the matter of municipal taxation is under continual review by this government. We are mindful also, because many of our elderly people are living on limited incomes, that such taxation together with other demands on their resources, in some circumstances may create financial difficulties.

We have therefore drafted this bill which, if enacted, will provide immediate assistance to elderly people on limited incomes that meet both municipal and school tax demands respecting their homes.

The bill will permit municipalities and school boards in unorganized territories to pass bylaws authorizing a tax credit without interest, and financed by the province. This credit will be equivalent to one-half of the real property taxes, excluding special rates, to a maximum of $150 in each year to any resident owner 65 years of age or over.

The municipality or the school board in unorganized territory would then be reimbursed by the province for these credits. The taxes for which the credits have been allowed would be deferred until there is a change of ownership in the property. It should be noted that since this is a deferment only, other municipal ratepayers will not be subsidizing these eligible people in respect of the principal amounts of the tax credits.

There are several private bills before the House which propose to provide various means of tax relief. The majority of these private bills provide for such relief at the expense of other ratepayers in the municipality which ultimately would result in the subsidy to the heirs of the present owners.

This government is not prepared to place such a burden on other ratepayers. The bill which I have just introduced embodies the essence of the recommendation of the select committee on aging dealing with this subject, which the government feels should be implemented at this time.

The report of the Ontario committee on taxation is expected in the near future. We feel the report likely will contain many recommendations for the reorganization and possibly the restructure of municipal taxation.

Further consideration will be given to the matter of relief for elderly people prior to the introduction of any new legislation arising out of the recommendations of the committee. In the meantime, we are prepared to pass this bill which should be treated as a temporary expedient.

Mr. Speaker, as mentioned, we recognize that many of our senior citizens are living on limited incomes, which may be burdensome during a period of economic expansion when the prices of such basic commodities as food, clothing and medicine have risen. This bill, when enacted and adopted by the municipalities, will assist many of our elderly people to remain in and maintain their own homes without being subsidized by or a burden to other taxpayers.

THE AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE ACT

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Agricultural Development Finance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, section 2 of the bill now provides that interest on deposits in the province of Ontario savings bank may not be fixed at a higher rate than four per cent. This limitation has been removed. I think I should say further that it is being removed to enable us to establish, from time to time, a rate that is competitive with the rates offered on savings deposits by the chartered banks.

I think, possibly, I should say at the same time that it is not regarded as a means of entering into direct competition with the chartered banks, but it is the feeling of government that those people who see fit to entrust the province of Ontario savings bank with their deposits are entitled at least to a competitive rate of interest. This in essence, Mr. Speaker, is the purpose of the amending bill which I have just introduced.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the explanation of this bill is somewhat lengthier than usual, but I would like to explain to the House that under section 1, the public service superannuation board is authorized to determine in special circumstances the amount that an employee is to contribute in respect of the part of his continuous service for which he did not contribute in the first instance.

Under section 2, the new subsection 1 of section 7: A contributor who is on leave of absence for a period of over one month due to illness or pregnancy must pay into the fund the same amount that would have been paid if the leave had not been granted.

Under the new subsection 2 of section 7: Any educational leave of absence without salary granted to an employee who did not obtain a bursary would be treated as an educational leave of absence without pay for superannuation purposes. In such cases, and in the case of special leave without pay, the employee will be given an option to contribute for the period of such leave. If the option is exercised the employee must pay both employee and employer contributions. If the employee declines the option, the period of such leave of absence will constitute a hiatus in his superannuation credit.

Under the new subsection 3 of section 7: Any educational leave of absence without pay granted to an employee who obtains a bursary will be treated as an educational leave of absence with pay for the purpose of this Act. In such cases the employee will be given an option to contribute, and if the option is exercised the employee will pay into the fund the same amount he would have paid if he had not been granted the leave. If the employee declines the option, the period of such leave of absence will constitute a hiatus in his superannuation credit.

Section 3 for the purposes of subsection 10: A person who received an immediate annuity before he was 60 years of age and who had credit in the fund before January 1,

1966, will have his annuity reduced by five per cent for each year by which his age is less than 60.

Section 4: The amendment specifies the date on which the contributor must have credit in the fund, thus clarifying the meaning.

Section 5: This new substantive provision will allow a person who was employed on probationary staff on April 1, 1965, and who has credit in the teachers' superannuation fund, to choose either to keep contributing to the teachers' superannuation fund or to transfer the credit to the public service superannuation fund.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Would the Prime Minister inform the House how many heads of governments have indicated that they will attend the proposed Confederation for tomorrow conference?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not issued any invitations, nor will I do so until the resolution which is on the order paper has been debated.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Prime Minister on Monday that perhaps he could comment on at this time?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, my answer to the question which is on the record, is simply that I do not personally have any opinion on this matter. The sub judice rule is the rule of this House and of course is applicable only to the House. I assume that if the commissioner himself feels that there has been a contempt of the proceedings with which he is charged, then he will deal with it as he sees fit.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the Prime Minister would feel that since the statement was made by a public servant of one of the commissions of the province, that he would have some responsibility through his Ministry to advise him that perhaps by the understanding of the government in this matter, that at least he was very much out of order in a general sense?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This matter, of course, has come to the attention of the Minister responsible, but as I say, it is a matter of opinion as to whether what he says is in contempt of the proceedings or not. I have no opinion. I think perhaps he would exercise a little more discretion if he did not speak of it, but on the actual point as to whether he is in contempt or not, I do not know that.

Mr. Nixon: My own feeling is that he was not in contempt, and it is a good thing to discuss these matters publicly, since they do not concern individuals, but matters of fact. I had a question for the Minister of Economics and Development as well on Monday, and I wonder if he is prepared to give us an answer?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): I answered all the questions yesterday. I do not know if the hon. member was in the House or not. His question was answered.

Mr. Speaker: A series of questions was answered yesterday.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

In view of the remarks in the Speech from the Throne relating to divorce matters, would the hon. Prime Minister advise the House when the public inquiry will commence and who will conduct it?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is my intent, Mr. Speaker, that this would in all probability be done by a select committee of this Legislature, which will be appointed prior to the conclusion of this session.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Speaker, I have a second question.

Has the government made submission to the federal parliamentary committee probing divorce reform? If so, by whom was the representation prepared and what did it recommend?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, this government has not made any submission to that committee.

Mr. Worton: If I might ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I recall reading in the newspaper a week or ten days ago, that the Senate committee had asked for a submission, or at least a report, from The Attorney General's Department, and Manitoba and Ontario had not replied to that report. Does this go along with the Prime Minister's statement on this?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I am just simply saying that this government has not made a submission to that committee.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on a point of order. I want to draw your attention to the fact that on the huge flagpole outside the buildings today, there is no ensign flying whatsoever, and I think that is an event of major significance. I hope it portends that that colonial symbol has disappeared forever. If the Prime Minister wants to borrow Canada's flag from the flagpole in front of ours, we shall be glad to lend it to him.

Mr. Speaker: I shall be pleased to draw it to the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell).

Mr. Sopha: Its disappearance is not my Centennial project.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise you, sir, and through you the members of the House, that this morning just before the noon hour an event of rather significant provincial interest took place when the Prime Minister broke ground for the construction of a new building which will house the alcoholism and addiction research foundation operations.

This body, as you know, has been an agency of this government since 1947, I believe. It has done a very great deal of research and educational work in this area, so much so that its fame has spread abroad far beyond the bounds of Ontario and Canada.

This new and permanent home will be established on the campus of the University of Toronto. This, I think, is significant and indicates the government's interest in having this organization participate in the academic life of our province, as well as having the university, in turn, participate in the research projects sponsored by it.

The headquarters will house the educational activities, the research activities and will also house a 100-bed hospital for the care and treatment of those who have become dependent upon alcohol and other chemical substances.

The cost is estimated to be somewhere in the region of $9.5 million. As I stated, it will be the outstanding facility of its kind in our nation and it is once more, sir, evidence of the fact that Ontario stands well in the van of progress in all of these matters for our people.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to express on behalf of the members of this House our congratulations to the Toronto Maple Leaf hockey club—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Eagleson: —who last night won the Stanley Cup for the fourth time in the past six years and the Toronto players are truly representative of all Canadian people. They are mostly ethnic in their origin and it was most fitting, as the member for Sudbury said on the way into the House, that the clinching goal was scored by George Armstrong, the captain of the team, and one of the descendants of our original Canadians.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Eagleson: It is also significant that the two teams in the finals this year, Toronto and Montreal, were the only Canadian representatives in the league and the chance that this will happen again is significantly reduced since next year, of the 12 teams, there will still only be two in Canada. I know that the mayor of Toronto and his council are making plans to honour the team and I trust that this House will take such steps as are necessary to do the same. Thank you.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Prime Minister with regard to the future business of the House if on occasions when state dinners —if that is the correct terminology—are being given by the province to visiting heads of state, specifically the first one next Tuesday night, is it the intention to adjourn the House, or will the House proceed while some go to the dinner?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I had planned on having a little conference with you and with the leader of the official Opposition so that we might formulate a satisfactory way of dealing with these things, and perhaps as the afternoon proceeds, we will have a chance to get together.

Mr. I. W. Thrasher (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to advise this House of a Windsor Centennial project which already has worldwide news coverage. At 10 a.m. this morning, three Exponauts, after countdown, blasted off their pad and are now in orbit. Sixty-four pupils from Southwood public school are involved in this project: Flight Captain Rainer Kunau, 1st Lieutenant Chris Campbell and 2nd Lieutenant Brien Walton entered their 16-foot capsule, Apollo Centurion, after

being examined by Dr. Dixon, a Windsor physician. He advised that they were physically fit for the 30-hour-long flight into orbit.

Several crews, dietitians, construction, military, communications, electrical, purchasing and activity groups are manning the capsule around the clock. All Windsor television and radio stations, as well as the Detroit *Free Press*, covered this Centennial project. The space craft lands at 4 p.m. tomorrow and will be on display at Cleary auditorium. Good luck to these boys!

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 18th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

(Continued)

On vote 810:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, it was estimated in the *Ontario Medical Association Review* in a quotation from Mr. Stanley W. Martin, chairman and general manager of the Ontario hospital services commission, that the commission would be handling approximately $466 million in 1967. This estimate was made in February of this year, so that an operation that originally began, I think, about 1959 at a cost of $157 million now totals approximately $466 million. I admit this is an estimate, but coming from Mr. Martin, I assume that it would be pretty accurate. Bear in mind that this amount of $466 million—an amount of money that the hospital commission will be handling this year—amounts to nearly 20 per cent of the entire budget for all of the province of Ontario.

It is an increase of $116 million over the amount of money handled by OHSC in 1965, just two years ago. That is an increase of more than $1 million a week, each and every week over the past two years, and there is no indication of any kind that this rate is going to decrease. In fact, a forecast expenditure for OHSC for 1968 is $556 million, or $90 million more than it is this year.

When we bear in mind the cost of OMSIP and the cost of mental health and the cost of OHSC, by 1969 this is going to come to a total of almost $1 billion. It has usually an annual increase of 10 per cent, which means that starting from 1969 these three items alone will increase by approximately $100 million. Therefore, I think on this particular vote it is vitally important that we take a look at OHSC critically, but I hope in a constructive manner, and in so doing we will really look at our whole health establishment, to determine whether or not we as taxpayers are getting the maximum amount of service for our tax dollar.

We must also critically evaluate past experience as a guide to present policies and future planning, because after all, the health services are essential to our people. Our people are our greatest resource and we need health services and hospitals in good times and in bad times and for all ages of people. Whether there is a depression or not, we are still going to have to keep up our established hospitals and see to it that we have proper services for our people because we know that appendicitis or cancer or any other disease is no respecter of people, and no respecter of people whether they have money or not.

But it is really tremendous, Mr. Chairman, when we bear in mind the cost of the Ontario hospital services commission. We are going to have to ask ourselves, shall we change our method of services; should we have more clinics; what is the necessary bed rate for general hospitals for the population; do we have enough chronic beds; literally what is our whole system, our whole approach in our handling of our hospital services to the public of Ontario.

For example, in 1959, OHSC handled—and this was not counting administrative costs, but just the cost of hospitals—$157,664,000, and at that time we had a total of over 5,300,000 people subscribing to OHSC. That is about 91 per cent of our population. In 1960, it went up 19.6 per cent, the amount of money we handled. In the years following we have almost been consistently going up each year 13 per cent, in some cases 12. In one year, a good year, 1964, the cost of hospital services only increased 11 per cent. But 1966 increased 15 per cent over 1965 and again in 1967 we are increasing 15 per cent over 1966. So that for 1967—and this again is an estimate—for 7,100,000 people we are going to have to spend $456 million, in fact $456,552,000 for 99.2 per cent of our population.

If we compare the costs that have increased, just to give you some idea, the cost for a patient in our hospitals in 1959 was $28.38, that is what it cost OHSC. Today, to keep that same person in our hospitals in 1967, it costs $64.30. This is an increase of

127 per cent. And we might ask ourselves, Mr. Chairman, what else has gone up, in that period of time, to such an extent. Because if we use 1949 as a base for the cost of living index of 100, the cost of living index in 1959 was 126.5 and last year, in 1966, the cost of living index was 143.9.

In other words, the cost of living rose 17.4 base points or 13.7 per cent since 1959. But hospital costs have gone up 127 per cent. So we have to take a hard look at these figures and these facts and reflect carefully if we are getting competent management, if we are managing our hospitalization system in an economical and prudent way. Is such a rise justified?

I believe it is not justified but we have to ask ourselves what are the alternatives, what can we do to improve on this system? If costs of hospitalization were vigorously scrutinized and alternative ways of providing services diligently sought out, I believe that hospital costs could at least be stopped from rising at such a rapid and shocking rate. If I could just cite figures again, in 1966, if the same rate in the cost of living had been applied to the cost of the rise in hospitals, instead of spending over $397 million, we would have spent something in excess of $222 million, a saving of close to $170 million —approximately, I believe, $174 million in operating costs.

In 1967, with the cost of living index estimated at 147.5 at year end, an increase of 16.6 per cent over 1959, the cost of hospitalization, had it been increasing at the same rate as the cost of living index generally, would be $234 million. The actual cost of $456 million is $221 million greater. Why, Mr. Chairman, are hospital costs so far out of line with the other costs of our economy?

In 1959, let us be frank and admit it, salaries paid to hospital personnel in Ontario were undoubtedly low and admittedly they are still pretty low. The improvement in basic salaries of hospital personnel to levels more in line with the economy generally is one reason why hospital costs have gone up faster since 1959 than the other segments of the cost of living index.

But let us bear in mind too, Mr. Chairman, that the hospital staffs were paid extremely low rates. This is a problem that we have to face honestly, that unless we get good personnel—whether it be in the so-called brain trusters who run it, or people in the rank and file of the organization—you will not, in the long run, have an economic and efficient operation.

Even when we make allowances for the increase in pay, it is my conviction that with proper management by a government that is concerned with getting value for its money, the cost of hospitalization in Ontario could be reduced over a period of five years by one-third. Based on the 1967 costs this would mean a reduction in the operating costs of hospitals in one year of $150 million. A saving of $150 million would go a long way in financing a progressive housing programme, with providing relief for property owners, for school costs.

Why are the hospitalization costs out of line and what should we do about it? I have a few suggestions. I know there is no one particular approach that will solve the problem, there are a number of approaches we can take and these approaches dovetailed together, I believe, will do a very great deal in cutting costs and stopping this tragic rise that is overwhelming the OHSC. It is most important that government run things efficiently. I get sick and tired of some people saying that because it is government, it is inefficient. Some people seem to assume that because a person is a civil servant, he is there because he could not get a job any place else, which is completely untrue. We have some able men in our civil service, we have many able men and women, and I believe by having a dynamic organization we can attract even more able people.

It is utterly important that we run government business on economic and financially sound lines. This will only get us the respect of the public and the support of the public and these great systems of social security that are absolutely necessary in a modern society, they are an absolute necessity, will not progress and be strong unless they are run efficiently and economically.

Here are several reasons, and I hope in part answered, why I think the OHSC is having its costs so completely out of line. The doctors whose workshops hospitals are, are not affected personally in their pocketbooks for the over-utilization and unnecessary utilization of hospital beds and services. The general attitude of both the doctor and the patient seems to be, why not order a battery of tests even if only one is really necessary? It does not cost the doctor or the patient anything, the patient is covered.

One weakness that is going to come up again and again is that people are covered for many of these tests if they go into the hospital and yet a lot of the tests could be carried out if they went to an out-patient clinic. Our present coverage should make

allowance for this and at the present time it does not.

The OHSC system offers no incentive to economy, that is if costs are pared this year, the hospital's per diem allowance for next year is cut. Why then should anybody try to economize? It is the old economic rule again, where is the carrot and whether it be in government business or in private business, there always has got to be that carrot out in front.

On the contrary, the very bad habit has become widespread of spending the full amount provided, whether it is needed or not, so that next year's budget will not be less than this year's. If this year's budget is exceeded, the government makes up the deficit and increases next year's per diem allowance. But "government cannot let the hospitals go broke" is an all-pervading philosophy that contributes to waste, extravagance and unnecessary duplication of the facilities of a hospital.

The hospitals' boards of governors are part-time directors, with no personal or financial stake in seeing that the hospitals operate in an economic manner. This is another important item, Mr. Chairman, because hospitals have become big business, in fact they are becoming one of the biggest businesses in the province and the country.

But this is important, the attitude of the board of directors. In fact, the attitude of boards of directors is widespread that a hospital deficit is a badge of honour and that the bigger the deficit, the greater the hospital's contribution to the community welfare. In this strange world of non-profit psychology, a profit-making hospital, that is one that is efficiently run, would be suspect and accused of cutting standards.

Why should not the hard-headed principles of efficiency, economy and balanced budgets that are applied to every other aspect of our economy be applied to hospitals as well?

Again, doctor services, particularly for diagnostic work and radiology and laboratory testing, can be rendered to office patients. For example, if a patient has a general series of tests done by private radiology, he owes them anywhere from $30 to $50 for X-rays, depending on what is done. If the family doctor admits the patient to hospital, however, the X-rays are paid by OHSC.

Now, I mentioned this briefly when I started, and we have said this many times in this Legislature and we are going to have to say it again and again, that the coverage under OHSC should provide for this. In other words, what we are doing is that the X-rays will still cost $30 to $50 if they are in the hospital, but in addition there is the patient's hospital costs of from $25 to $45 per day for one or two more days.

Well, with this escalation of costs, we should ask ourselves whether there is not unnecessary utilization of our hospital system. It has been estimated that 40 per cent of all patients in public general hospitals at any given time could be discharged without injury to their health. This includes old people, who have nowhere else to go; healthy people waiting for elective procedures; healthy people waiting for diagnostic tests like those that I just mentioned a few minutes ago.

I am quite certain there are many people in our hospitals who if they had a place to go, if there were standard home care services, if there were more proper facilities for our elderly, it would not be necessary to use the expensive bed space of a general care hospital because it is an extremely expensive hotel, from $25 to $45 a day.

When we examine the bed space in this province, we should also ask ourselves, what kind of bed space—chronic care, convalescent care? If we had more of this, would we not need less of the more expensive general hospital care? Some of the hospitals—and this is another reason, Mr. Chairman—may have bad design. There can be bad planning and bad practices. Why should hospitals provide room service with three meals a day to a sizeable portion of the patient population that could just as easily eat in a cafeteria? Why should hospitals be so large that it takes a messenger ten minutes to go from one end of it to another with a specimen or a prescription? And why should hospitals be so large that it becomes necessary for a bureaucracy to grow up in the administration to handle staff problems, rather than patient problems?

This whole problem of the size of a hospital and the number of beds needs to be re-examined. There have been experiments in other parts of North America and there is one experiment that has been carried on in Ontario that I would like to dwell on very briefly. There has been one carried on in California for 25 years by the Kaiser medical plans. They finance and operate their own hospital beds and meet all state requirements for quality for an insured group of more than 1.5 million people with 2.5 beds per thousand population. They have been doing this for more than 25 years.

Obviously under the present circumstances, we need double 2.5 beds in Ontario. It is estimated that for general hospital care we have approximately five beds per thousand population. But if you live in an area like Toronto, or Ottawa, where there has literally been a population explosion, we obviously realize that for general hospital care there must be a tremendous shortage.

But I would ask members to look briefly—I know others over the years have emphasized this—at the experiment that is carried on in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. That is a district health centre, and it provides medical care for 20,000 persons in the greater Soo area where they have approximately a population of 75,000. That health centre in Sault Ste. Marie, is like a clinic and doctors work on an agreed salary in the health centre a 40-hour week. They have vacations with pay and time off for refresher courses and a pension plan.

I know as soon as we start talking about services such as that, the Ontario medical association objects to it, claiming it destroys the so-called independence of the doctor. Yet despite what the Ontario medical association says, the doctors are doing this on their own. They are finding they have a better life and they are providing better services to their patients. They are cutting down the hospital bed space that is used in the Soo, and I will just give members an example of that.

The doctors work in a centre that has won a Massey award for architecture. I was complaining earlier about the inefficiency of hospitals, and yet this is an experiment that has won a Massey award for architecture. This building that they use cost nearly $1 million, so it is no cheap venture. It has been paid for by the subscribers who use the centre. Here is another venture that is really saving the government money. We talk about getting community effort and here is a marvelous example.

By educating their patients to making full use of the centre, and by providing a full service programme of general practitioners and specialist services with X-ray, laboratory and physiotherapy and all these other services —there is even a pharmacy on the premises, leased by a Sault Ste. Marie druggist and they have eye examinations, they seem to have the whole coverage—they have reduced the number of home visits for 20,000 persons for a whole year to 465.

This is what is so important and what the government should look at. They have cut the utilization of hospital beds from the provincial average of 1,800 patient days per 1,000 population per year to just over 800 patient days per 1,000 persons covered per year, or a reduction of more than 50 per cent.

Here is an experiment carried on in our own province by our own doctors for our own people and they have reduced the utilization of hospital bed space by 50 per cent. This is, I think, important that we, as a government look at this experiment, this pilot experiment, and certainly investigate it. From what I can see of it and from what others have informed me about it, this successful experiment should be seized upon to bring about a major change in the hospital services' policy in the province of Ontario.

When we are told that utilization of a hospital is reduced 50 per cent, with tremendous savings and the people getting the service, this means that we can save in the next few years hundreds of millions of dollars. It is unfortunate, I think, that the medical profession for some reason—that is their leaders judging by what they say in the press—seem to be against it, and the government has given no leadership in this matter. Instead, we have sat back and seen city after city and crisis after crisis about the lack of health facilities as given by a general hospital.

So again to return briefly: The average ward care costs of hospitalization in Sault Ste. Marie's two public general hospitals in 1966 were, St. Joseph's, $30.15, and the Plummer Memorial hospital, $36. This means that by doing diagnostic tests and minor surgery on subscribers in the clinic, rather than in the hospital, the health centres' doctors are saving $30,000 to $36,000 per 1,000 people for a year. A tremendous saving, and I would not want to see the health services of our people harmed in any way just for the sake of a dollar. Health comes first, not the dollar, believe me.

But when I see such an experiment provide good services, just as good as anywhere in Ontario—in fact they seem to have a whole gamut of services in one centre—and yet start to save thousands of dollars for the subscribers and for our taxpayers, it is time that we became mighty vigorous. When they have 20,000 subscribers it means that they are saving in hospital costs between $600,000 and $700,000 a year. What a fabulous saving it means to any community in any province.

If they can do it, why can we not do this throughout the province of Ontario? Why is OHSC not actively encouraging and promoting the establishment of health centres similar to the one in Sault Ste. Marie as one way of

bringing down the incredibly rapid increase in the cost of hospitalization? I do not say that it is the whole answer. No one way of doing something is the whole answer in such a far-going matter as Ontario hospital services, but it is a very major item, this particular experiment.

If the Sault Ste. Marie clinic can cut hospitalization to such an extent, why does the Ontario hospital services commission continue to finance without apparent control so many other more expensive hospital operations? Why could the programme not be launched to establish and finance medical health centres? If a $1 million investment such as that in Sault Ste. Marie could produce savings in hospital costs of between $600,000 and $700,000 a year, why could the same approach not produce similar savings elsewhere? What kind of savings might be achieved if this was done all over Ontario?

Are there other things that might be done to reduce costs? I mentioned before, and we have talked about, the pilot home care programme that took place in Toronto. That ended on March 31, 1964 after 2.5 years. We launched a full programme in the Toronto area I believe about April 1, 1964. It was found when the Toronto area experimented for 2.5 years, that the 309 patients who participated saved 7,418 institutional days of care at a net saving of $116,000 after home care service and overhead costs were taken into consideration. Now there are 309 patients and they saved $116,000.

What about further expansion of this programme? I would like to know from the Minister if we are going to have any more such pilot projects for home care and, of course, even for the sake of the patient we are told that it is far better to keep them in the home and getting home care than keeping them in a large impersonal building like a general hospital.

These are suggested solutions and yet the Ontario hospital services commission seems to be completely inadequate to the task it has to face. For example, in Sudbury, not too far from Sault Ste. Marie—and I believe the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) will dwell on this for some length—there is a waiting list for hospital care of more than 2,200 people. At the Ottawa general hospital, where there are about 692 beds, they have a waiting list of 987 patients. I am quoting these figures from an article by a former president of the Ontario medical association, Dr. Patrick Bruce Lockhart from the *Ontario Medical Association Review* of September, 1966. These figures were approximately taken in May 31, 1966, but the essential problem has not changed and these waiting lists are still with us.

The hospital for sick children, with an 810-bed capacity—and I admit it has been expanded—had a waiting list about a year ago of 700, and not even the expanded facilities are going to take care of that waiting list of 700. It is the same story in Peterborough; they have a waiting list at the Peterborough civic hospital of 314 people and they have 433 beds. It is the same story proportionately for the Toronto general hospital. The hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) went once more into detail about the waiting list in the Toronto area just a few days ago, as I did about a year ago.

In other words, this persists, and despite the expansion even in east end Toronto, the waiting lists are as bad as ever. The hon. member for Humber (Mr. W. B. Lewis) might bear in mind—and he is on the Ontario hospital services commission—that the tremendous expansion that is taking place in hospital bed space in the Toronto area is mainly in the east end. Now the west end of Toronto, if you talk to some of the hospital administrators, is finding it is going to be reaching a major crisis.

Whether the government is going to continue through its Ontario hospital services commission to more or less sit in the backwaters and let this roaring flood of a crisis continue, I do not know. I fear it is going to do that. It has let so many years go by with so much inaction that it is a tragedy that is amounting to a detriment of the health facilities and for the health of the people of this province.

I say one alternative is to use the system that is used in Sault Ste. Marie, but obviously our hospital building financing is completely outdated. To ask a local community to raise one-third of the capital cost of a hospital plus the cost of land is completely ridiculous. When we look at the local tax rates today across the province of Ontario, we know full well that the so-called "private benefactors" simply do not contribute to hospital construction like in the old days. If the hospital for sick children in Toronto cannot go over the top in its objective, what hospital can? Yet the sick children's hospital failed by millions of dollars.

This has become a problem of the hospital services commission and whether they like to think they just handle the finances for the hospitals and just more or less give a

general surveillance, this some may try to argue, but the truth is they have become responsible for finding the hospital bed space.

Even Dr. Bruce Lockhart, a man whom I do not often agree with on many subjects in regard to organizing public health, himself admits that this has come to pass. And the Ontario hospital services commission, and particularly the government and probably even more particularly the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), simply will not accept this obvious fact that faces us every day.

For example, in Ottawa there is a tremendous shortage of hospital bed space and I know when the OHSC prepared a report on the situation in Ottawa, they blamed the federal government. They said, well, because there was a federal government nearby they have particular problems; any large centre in Ontario has particular problems even if it is a great regional hospital like the sick children's hospital here in Toronto, literally a country-wide hospital which serves all of Canada. No matter where the hospital is situated in a large centre, it has its particular problems.

But the OHSC estimated the needs of Ottawa and its cost for hospitals over the next number of years and they came out with figures as to what the Ottawa district would have to raise privately and they are utterly ridiculous figures. For example, privately the Ottawa civic was supposed to raise over $2.5 million and the Ottawa general $2.5 million, this is to go out and do it privately.

They were to build a children's hospital which is badly needed in the Ottawa area and on which there has been a committee trying to get one going. But now making a conservative estimate, to read one of the reports—if a Liberal may use that term "conservative"—there is not going to be a children's hospital in the Ottawa area until 1975. And yet even if there is, they are going to have to raise approximately $3,500,000 on top of all the other funds they have to raise. Of course, there is the Riverside hospital. They are going to need about $750,000. The Salvation Army needs $1 million for their hospital and in part this amount of money for the Salvation Army has been raised. But it is ridiculous, just to use Ottawa as an example, to ask a local community to raise these sums.

Years ago to raise one-third of the cost of a hospital may not have been too difficult, but today with the rising costs of the other things that a municipality must pay for and with the tremendously rising construction costs of a hospital, these figures are completely out of line. It defies common sense to ask a municipality to have to raise them through charity or from putting so much on the mill rate. The average taxpaying householder is now being taxed beyond endurance. To come along and to recommend that they boost the mill rate at this state of our economy in this province is ridiculous. And yet this is what they are being advised to do by this government. They are simply not facing facts as they are today.

I know in certain parts of Ontario, particularly maybe in the rural areas, the pressure of hospitalization is not quite so bad as in the cities. But remember people have been leaving the smaller towns. In fact, this government in its economic policies is leaving some of these towns to die on the vine and people are leaving the small towns and villages and are coming into the cities, as well as the immigrants from other parts of the world. And this is going to give any large city a tremendous crisis in the financing of the hospital bed space.

These, Mr. Chairman, are just a few general observations. It is, to sum up, a sad story of long neglect by a government that is still living in the days of Queen Victoria. And we on this particular subject have not even been able to drag the Tory government screaming into the twentieth century. Its thinking is back in the good old days when you could go from village to village in a day in a horse and cart, and this is not the type of thinking that we need in the times that we now live in. When I look over this situation —literally from border to border, from east to west, from north to south—of the hospital problems of our major centres throughout Ontario it is one story, a story of neglect. I have come regretfully to the viewpoint that this government just does not care.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I will not repeat the points that the hon. member for Parkdale has just made in his excellent summary of submissions that have been made from this side of the House to the government, not only this year but over the years, with only very limited effect.

I would only like to add a footnote to his reference to the health centre in Sault Ste. Marie. I think it should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that this health centre was conceived and developed and is sponsored by the Canadian section and the local unions involved of the united steel workers of America, an organization which does not seem to please

the Liberal Party very much, most of the time. I only say in relation to the health centre that it is an excellent expression in practice of the underlying philosophy of the Canadian section of the united steel workers of America—I might say a highly autonomous section notwithstanding some comments that are made about it from time to time. This health centre is an excellent practical expression and demonstration of the philosophy under which that union operates. Of course it is that philosophy which has led it to express its support for the New Democratic Party ever since the New Democratic Party was founded.

However, Mr. Chairman, my major purpose is rising at this moment was not to refer to the health centre in Sault Ste. Marie. Rather it was to raise for the attention of the Minister and perhaps for elucidation from him, another aspect of the cost problem in public hospitals in the province.

Earlier in these estimates, I asked for information from the Minister as to the savings that had been effected within his department since the department introduced a system of centralized purchasing, with assaying through the Attorney General's lab, of drugs used in mental hospitals. The Minister was not able to give a precise answer to my question but I do not think there is any doubt from the information he was able to give that those savings have been substantial. I think he said $500,000 in the first six or seven months, and $1,250,000 or something like that in the next year. Although he did not have the figures with him, he thought there were increasing savings in subsequent years. I do not really have to press him for any more detailed information to make the point I now wish to make.

I wish to suggest to the Minister of Health that savings of a similar magnitude could very well be effected in the public hospitals of this province if the government and the OHSC would adopt a recommendation which was made by a select committee of this Legislature four years ago. I refer to the select committee on the cost of drugs. Its report was published on April 26, 1963, just about exactly four years ago.

On page 51 of that report, we find at the bottom of the page a recommendation, number 11 as follows:

> That a system of central drug purchasing for all Ontario institutions be established.

Perhaps I am behind the times. If I am, the Minister can bring me up to date. But it is my impression that nothing at all has been done in regard to even investigating that recommendation, much less implementing it.

I may say I was on the committee and the matter came to our attention as a result of the procedure that had at that time been fairly recently established within the health department itself with regard to the Ontario hospitals. The committee was very much impressed with the system that had been established and it was anxious to know if this system could not be established to general hospitals as well as other institutions.

We found at the time, I speak for myself, but I would say that the evidence adduced before us indicated a most undesirable situation with regard to drug purchasing in general hospitals. Some quite large hospitals did not even have formularies. They had no system at all for drug purchasing that we could discover and the committee—or at any rate some members of it, and again I should probably speak for myself only—felt that it was at least worth considering, if we could not set up a centralized system of purchasing with assaying through the Attorney General's lab, a service already provided for The Department of Health for the mental hospitals and an overall formulary system which would provide a basis for ordering.

We were told that the Ontario hospital association was looking into this matter, but I must say we had real difficulty pinning anybody down as to whether or not they would give serious consideration to the proposition, or indeed if they would even look into it.

I am not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that there are no difficulties in the type of system that was envisaged in the committee's deliberations. On the other hand, we all know that the cost of drugs in this country is completely exorbitant. This has been established by one investigation after another.

There is a highly monopolistic situation existing in the drug industry which I will not go into now, but which results in grossly excessive promotional costs and these inflate the price of drugs quite unreasonably.

Also, there are probably grossly exorbitant profits, but that is very hard to put one's finger on because nearly all the leading drug houses in this country are direct subsidiaries of foreign companies and of course they can easily conceal their profits by paying excessive prices for the raw materials which, as a captive group, they necessarily must buy from their head offices.

However there is no question that the price of drugs is exorbitant in this country.

It is not a matter that this government can solve in its totality. It is, however, one that we can solve with regard to matters under our own jurisdiction. The general hospitals are under our jurisdiction. In fact through the OHSC the people of Ontario pay the operating costs of general hospitals, including the cost of purchasing the large number and variety of drugs that those hospitals require.

The system that was proposed by the committee and which I bring before the House again was merely a system designed to introduce competition into the supplying of drugs to general hospitals in this province. In other words, if one had a standard formulary listing all the major drugs that are to be purchased by their generic names, then the centralized purchasing system could simply call for tenders for those drugs.

The Department of Health itself, in its experience in relation to the mental hospitals, found the calling of tenders had a most remarkable effect. Drug houses of leading brand names which claimed they could not possibly sell below the price they charged, found themselves undercut by as much as 50 per cent or even more by generic houses. In the next round of bids, the brand name houses discovered that they could undercut the generic houses. It was impossible for them to cut their prices before they faced the competition of the generic houses, but once they faced that competition they had no trouble at all slashing their prices, quite drastically in many instances.

We should try to make that same sort of competitive system operate with regard to the general hospitals, or at any rate to the major general hospitals. It is probably not feasible to develop a system that would cover all of the smaller hospitals, but it could cover a great many major hospitals.

Take for example, all the hospitals in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, whose purchases must be enormous. If these purchases were centralized in a central agency, I am certain that the calling for tenders and the supply of drugs on a competitive bid basis would greatly reduce the cost.

Perhaps, as I said, I am out of date, and the Minister can report more progress than I am aware of as having taken place in this area. But I would certainly like to hear what progress has taken place, if any. If it is little or none I would strongly urge that this matter should be actively considered, with a view to definite action in the very near future.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I can report at the outset, covering some of the remarks that are common to both and are related in the comments of both hon. speakers, that some research projects are actively underway, sir, covering the points which the hon. members touched upon. There is a research project going on in Metropolitan Toronto sponsored by the Metro planning council, which is a group set up by the government, into the utilization of beds in Metro Toronto.

My hon. friend from Parkdale spoke about this at length and spoke very fluently and obviously quite knowledgeable about it. He mentioned one of the things that has plagued us very greatly ever since the inception of the plan, the practice of utilizing beds for patients who actually only need diagnostic services. That gap we expect and plan will be fully closed this year, at long last.

With the advent of OMSIP, this took care of a great deal of it. That added to certain diagnostic services upon which we had established agreement as being part of the hospital programme, left very little actually in this area. But that little now is under process of being covered by regulations and during this year we anticipate that the entire gap in the provision of diagnostic services will be closed. This, we believe, will still further reduce the utilization, although there has been a marked reduction in this, with the advent of the programmes already mentioned.

The next very important matter and one that has caused us a very great deal of interest, the effect of group practice on hospital utilization, is also a research project. Sponsored by the commission, it is going on at the present time, the school of hygiene at Toronto University is actually doing the work, sponsored, as I say by the commission.

One is bound to understand the feeling of hon. members who might say, well why do you need to do more research, is not the story well enough documented already? In part it is and the figures that are given are most interesting and most suggestive. But we still cannot be certain that this represents a complete cross section of the population.

My hon. friend spoke about the Kaiser project, which I think was one of the first. It certainly is the largest. It may not exactly be one of the first, but one of the first to be formally established, and it is one of the largest and we consistently and persistently get confusing or conflicting reports. First of all, it is geared to serve a highly selected group, then against that, we get the opposite

view that it is not right and that it takes a cross section of the population. We are not quite certain as to where we stand because we cannot be certain that the reports given to us are wholly objective.

The Sault Ste. Marie group has not been in operation long enough, according to their own statement. They have given preliminary figures, but they point out very honestly and very factually that they do not believe that they have been in operation long enough to draw definite conclusions. Yet the figures they can produce are so suggestive of worthwhile impact that we are looking at them too, and therefore this research project has been set up and is in active process now.

Out of that, we hope we will be able to come to some conclusions based on objective observations.

I am pleased to advise the hon. member for Woodbine that a research project is currently in progress on the value or the advantages to be gained from central drug purchasing. We believe they are substantial, yet again here, we have conflicting reports because, only recently, a quite detailed report was published in one of the journals—I cannot recall which one—that pointed out, contrary to popular belief, the price of drugs to hospitals was not nearly as great as it might be if they were purchased—certainly not as great as they would be—were they purchased through the retail outlets, because certain extra discounts were apparently enjoyed by hospitals that were not available to the retail trade.

Indeed, I think there has been quite a bit of discontent and dissatisfaction with this policy. However, here again, we believe the only way to get to the bottom of it is to set up an objective study and this is on-going.

Mr. Bryden: Before we leave that point, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask how long this study has been under way. The reason I ask is that the recommendation of the drug committee was made four years ago and I think it was roughly about five years ago—about a year before the committee published its report – that the committee was advised that the matter was then under study by the Ontario hospital association and I think also by the OHSC.

How long do these studies go on before they produce results on which a decision can be made, either to act or not to act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The present study, to which I have just made reference, in fact, all of these studies to which I have made reference, have been instituted within the last year, since my own department reorganization took effect. This is all part of our total review of all health services in the province.

The OHA study was undertaken by an outside body—I recall reading about that, but I cannot recall what it was—but I believe, and again I might well be subject to correction in this, it was out of the OHA study came the report that the cost to hospitals was not as great as was popularly believed. However, my knowledge of this is rather hazy.

The hon. member did ask and I undertook to answer the question, "What have we saved?" Unfortunately, my comptroller is off quite ill and my office staff are still digging out the information which he usually had very readily at his finger tips. But we will have it, I assure you, before the end of this session because it is of great interest to myself as well.

The fourth research project, and one which I touched upon quite lightly in my opening remarks, is our consideration of this establishment of—for want of a better name—health centres, or medical centres. One has been approved already and approval has been given for the establishment of one of these centres in eastern Ontario. Out of it we hope to learn something of the value or the savings that can flow from this kind of operation. Here again is a new field for the province of Ontario and we can only learn from it as we go along. It would be unwise of me, and I would be most dishonest if I were to lead the House to believe that we are going to start building a rash of these places.

They are pilot projects and while there is not any question they have shown their value in certain places, one has to relate all of the circumstances to our situation here and it is not always reasonable or proper to say that because savings flowed from the operation of these organizations in certain places, they are bound to flow from the same kind of thing here.

I am deeply concerned about our own financial statement, because the costs, as the hon. member for Parkdale has pointed out, have risen from $157 million in 1959 the first year of the plan, to an estimated $477.8 million in this year. Yet I have just been given a clipping from an American paper datelined Washington and the headline is: "Daily Hospital Costs Near $60." The administrator of that hospital says his hospital likely will be $5 per diem below the national average.

I do not for one moment say that this is anything for us to boast about or to point to with pride or anything of the kind, but it does show the trend in hospital costs. Out of the things that we have undertaken, and I believe we are giving serious study and planning to begin certain of the things that the hon. members both have spoken about, we hope to be able, if we cannot reduce the costs, at least to hold the line in keeping with the changing trends in our total economy.

Mr. Trotter: The Minister's reply does not indicate that we are getting very much in the way of action. I admit that you have to have studies, but surely after eight years of unprecedented costs, and costs that are obviously out of hand, we could have more than just studies. We know that practical experiments have been carried out and you would think that the government would show at least some semblance of leadership in the matter.

The amount of money handled by the Ontario hospital services commission in one year amounts to approximately 20 per cent of our annual budget for the entire province and by 1969—only two years away—between mental health and OMSIP and OHSC, it is going to cost us nearly $1 billion. This is something for which we have to have more than just study groups after eight years, and again I say that this department moves at a snail's pace in trying to come to grips with these very major problems that are costing us a tremendous amount of money.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of brief comments I would like to make. One, I am sorry that I was just trying to tune back into the debate after having to go out of the House for consideration of other matters in connection with the Legislature's business.

With regard to the proposition of coping with and reducing, if possible, the costs of hospital usage—I am not going to go into detail as I assume the hon. member for Parkdale did cover many of the points which I attempted to analyze in considerable detail last year during consideration of the estimates, with specific reference to (a)—

Mr. Newman: But he did it much better.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I will leave others to judge on that. I will forego a comment I was going to make.

The two points that emerged from that were that the experience of many group plans now confirmed by the Sault Ste. Marie plan was that you could cut hospital usage by almost one half and I am a little suspicious of continued wonderings as to the validity of this—in other words, sir, whether or not some of these group plans are not genuinely representative of a cross-section, the excuse that the Minister is now fastening on.

A second point which I stressed last year, and I just mention it in passing, was that as we take a look at the average costs for a general hospital, for a convalescent hospital, for a nursing home, last year—and these figures are now out of date—it was within the range of 28-14-7 dollars per day. Now it is about 35-17 and some equivalent figure, I presume of 8 or 9.

In other words, if we had a range of hospitals that meant that nobody was going to be in a general hospital bed whose needs could not be met in a convalescent hospital, you would be saving considerable number of dollars per day by having them in a hospital with the facilities to meet their particular needs.

I think the quicker we move toward building the range of hospitals at the convalescent and the nursing home level, perhaps the pressure will come off in terms of building them at the general hospital level. I have had an uneasy feeling that we are today building general hospitals because we have not adequate numbers of other lower-cost hospitals and we have not developed group practice which would reduce the usage by one-half. We may discover that we are building these general hospitals unnecessarily.

However, Mr. Chairman, that apparently has been dealt with by the hon. member for Parkdale and the Minister has commented on it. I would only agree with the hon. member for Parkdale that I think we should have some definitive conclusions instead of continued studies for much longer.

There were a couple of comments, Mr. Chairman, on the overall figures that were given to the committee this year which I would like to make.

I agree completely with the general observation of everybody that there has to be a critical examination of the rising costs of the Ontario hospital services commission. In fact, my recollection is—and I am wondering if I am wrong and whether the Minister is in a position to correct me—that Dr. Neilson last year in his final appearance in his capacity as chairman of the Ontario hospital services commission, indicated that the total cost of the OHSC would continue to rise by some $35 or $40 or $50 million a year and would

tend to level off at approximately $475 million to $500 million.

I was a bit curious as to why he thought the levelling off process would come, but more pertinently we now discover that the increase he thought would come in the next two or three years before the levelling off process was achieved has been accomplished in a single year. In other words, there has been a jump in this past year, according to the figures given in the tabulation to the standing committee, from $397.2 million in 1966 to a projected $477.8 million in 1967, a jump of some $80 million.

My first question, and I would put it to the Minister and then proceed with another, is: What is the explanation for the apparent failure to reach a levelling off? Or why the apparent acceleration of the increase so that we reached the levelling off plateau much more quickly than Dr. Neilson anticipated?

My second point, Mr. Chairman, is that I think we have to be a bit cautious in indiscriminate criticism of these rising costs. I was rather interested in the fact that between 1966 and the projected figures for 1967, the total was a rise from $397 million to $477 million, an increase of $80 million; the overwhelming proportion of that increase in costs is to be found in salaries and wages in public hospitals where the increase is to go up from $303 million to $365 million, in other words an increase of $62 million out of the total increase of $80 million.

Mr. Chairman, if this is where the increase is going I must say I am less apprehensive than I might be under other circumstances. In the past we have paid shameful salaries to people working in hospitals—indeed so shameful that a previous Minister of Labour in this province permitted hospital workers to organize even though organization carried with it the danger of a strike at some time. He said that it was just so shameful that it was intolerable and he was going to strengthen the bargaining position of the hospital workers so that they might be able to help themselves.

Secondly, we still are faced with a situation, generally speaking, across this province where hospitals tend to be under-staffed, not only at the professional level, but they have considerable difficulty in maintaining non-professional staff. In other words, even if we do have the increases that have taken place in recent years and are projected for the year 1967, we face a difficult problem of maintaining adequate and competent staff in our hospitals. The reason for the difficulties stems directly from the fact that wages are going up elsewhere throughout the economy and people can get work elsewhere, therefore they are not going to bother going into a hospital.

So I just add this word of caution—that if the major increases in our hospital costs today are arising from an increase in wages and salaries to the people who are working in the hospitals, I for one am not as apprehensive as perhaps the hon. member for Parkdale left the impression he was. I do not know whether, in view of my point, he would be as apprehensive, because I feel as firmly convinced as anything that the salaries paid in hospitals, if anything, are still too low—they are not high enough to be able to compete with the rest of the economy and the result is that many hospitals are understaffed.

Implicit in all that is not necessarily a question, through the Minister may have a comment, but I come back to my earlier question as to what explanation, if any, there is for the unexpected quick increase to a level of $475 million where Dr. Neilson anticipated a levelling off. And now—at least the hon. member for Parkdale suggests this—next year it is going to jump away up to $550 million or so, away beyond the plateau that Dr. Neilson anticipated. What is the explanation for that?

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, as a member of the commission, may I make one humble answer to my hon. friend's question? We will have many new hospitals in operation next year which we never had before.

Mr. MacDonald: Does that really explain a jump of $50, $60 or $70 million or more?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The large part of this increase is in salaries. There was an average 15 per cent increase in salaries that last year and hospital staff salaries now are quite competitive, I believe. But this is a trend that again I think will keep pace with the economy as it ought to do, and so long as this happens there cannot be a plateau. I recall Dr. Neilson believing that we would reach a plateau but I think he was thinking more in terms of the time when we would reach a plateau in respect of needing any large increase in the number of beds—that when the bed state was up and simply had to keep pace with the growth in population, we could go along on an even keel. I think that that was in his mind, rather than the fact that the total costs would hit a plateau. I

cannot see how the total operating costs can ever do anything but peak and dip as the economy peaks and dips because they must keep pace.

The hon. member mentioned the understaffing. I do not believe that it can be said with any factual backing that hospitals are understaffed now. They do have difficulty attracting and holding certain categories of staff. There is a lot of housekeeping work in hospitals and it is not the most desirable work, as any hon. member is bound to realize, and it is not attractive to large numbers of people. Therefore, like most service industries, when general employment is at a high level then this kind of work in service situations is less attractive. However, the wages and salaries must keep pace with those paid in similar industry and this accounts, as the hon. member himself pointed out, for $62 million of the estimated increase.

The salary levels, while there is no question and none of has ever tried to hide this fact, that when the hospital programme came into operation, hospital workers as a rule were grossly underpaid.

But this has changed very greatly. In 1960 the salary increase was 13 per cent; 1961 10 per cent; 1962 9 per cent; 1963 7 per cent; 1964 7 per cent; 1965 8 per cent; 1966 —it was 12 per cent; and in 1967 it was 15 per cent. So that they have accounted in large measure for cost increases. Of course it is the greatest single cost of operating a hospital and it is only natural to expect that this would account for the largest increase.

The hon. member for Humber, the commissioner, pointed out too a constantly increasing number of beds, and in Metro Toronto alone this was something of the order of 854, I believe, and for the province about 1,600 I think. I cannot recall the exact number, but it is something in that region for the increase in the number of beds. This naturally puts an increased burden on the costs.

And there has been an increase in costs generally. Food is up; cleaning materials are up; repair materials are up; insurance and all of these things are again keeping pace with the bounding economy and are bound to be reflected in our figures.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize to ask the Minister this question, it may have been covered before but in the hospitals of Ontario it is up to the hospital boards to control the salaries at the local level; is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: Then the only control you have is insofar as the hospitals are under your jurisdiction; but the last time we discussed this in the House the Minister said the nurses were comparable, they were receiving $400 a month in salaries.

I have a case in point where a registered nurse left nursing in Toronto and went to the airlines at $525 a month.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am sorry, I did not get—

Mr. Sargent: The only point I want to get across is: What steps are you taking to protect the nursing profession? What are we going to do about the nurses in Ontario from here in?

You say you are satisfied their salaries are comparable to the rest of the economy. I do not agree with this. I think they should be on the same scale as teachers and I would like to know what steps you are taking, or your department is taking, to see that nurses get comparable wages to the rest of the economy?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has touched on the core of the problem.

The hospital board negotiates with their staff at the local level. They submit this in their budget to the commission and the only time the commission will interfere is if a hospital is over the maximum for the whole province.

This may very well have come about as a result of a negotiated agreement, in which case this is accepted. If the hospital board has entered into a negotiated agreement with any of its staff, and as a result of that the scale paid to that group of people is at odds or higher than that paid to comparable groups throughout, if it is the result of a negotiated agreement the commission accepts it because it will not interfere with these negotiations.

Now how does the commission arrive at these levels? The commission enters into discussion with various bodies, including their own pay research branch and the metropolitan hospital council. Each of these three groups draw up their view of the salary scale that should be paid in the current year out of those three findings—

Mr. Sargent: Will you pinpoint the nursing profession?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: Will you pinpoint the nursing profession?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is the nursing profession.

Mr. Sargent: All right!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is the nursing profession.

The three groups—the Ontario hospital association, the metropolitan hospital planning council and our own pay research branch of the OHSC—as a result of their own studies come to a consensus as to what the scale should be for the current year, and that is usually accepted by the commission as the scale it will look upon.

Here again, I would have to say that salaries agreed to by boards, or tentatively agreed to by boards across the province, would be at variance with this. Then the commission would be bound to review its figures and would very likely upgrade them, but we do not dictate what nurses' or any other salaries shall be, nor will we interfere in negotiations. If there should be difficulty in negotiations, we will offer our good offices, but we will not interfere. And I may say too that one of the most recent allowable costs by the commission is that a board can retain expert labour counsel to assist it in coming to agreements with its staff.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for this. The RNAO, the organized nursing groups, cannot go on strike. This is factual, is it; they cannot go on strike?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. Sargent: Then does not the Minister anticipate a shortage of nurses if he continues on this do-nothing policy insofar as the department is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is reasonable, or it certainly is not right, to say "the do-nothing policy". In 1966 the rate for the general duty nurse was $372 to $447 per month. In 1967, by consensus, the basic range was increased to $400 to $480 per month, and so right down the line: 7.5; 7.5; 7.6; 8.1; 13.2 and 10.1 per cent increases on various categories. These are all nurses—general duty, non-registered, assistant head supervisor and registered nursing assistants. So that there is an increase and we just do not arbitrarily say, "This is what we are going to pay for nurses and this is all you can pay."

Mr. Sargent: To be perfectly fair then about the nursing associations, you say by consensus, Mr. Chairman. What consideration was given to their demands insofar as this? You say by consensus? Their wishes were not granted. So you are putting them in the position that eventually they will have to threaten a strike to get their demands met.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If they have made any demands at all, they made them to the boards, and this is where we arrive at our consensus. As I say, we start with the three groups, the researches of the three groups, and then as we get budgets in we see the agreements, the tentative agreements that boards have reached with the nurses at the local level and all of the rest of their employees. But we will stick to the nurses alone—when we see those tentative agreements, then we alter our consensus accordingly.

As I say, if we see that many boards have had to come to an agreement to pay more than we believe should be the level for this for the current year, then the commission has to up its view. But we have not at any time pushed the schedule down. After the board has dealt with its nurses, then it comes to us with its budget, but we do not interfere or tell the board what it must pay or what it cannot pay.

Mr. Sargent: I will finalize my remarks by saying I think it is most unfair that the doctors can charge any amount of money they want, they can charge by the ability of the patient to pay, but you subject the nurses to the lowest scale in the economy, much lower than the junior teachers, much lower than the hostesses on airplanes get. The most needed profession, and you subject them to boards. They do not have any say in it at all. I think it is most unfair the way you are handling the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, first of all, may I say that if the doctor is on a salary, I cannot raise my pay or charge what the traffic will bear. The province of Ontario says to me, "We are only going to pay you so much, and that is it," and if I do not like it I have to quit.

Mr. Sargent: It must be competitive.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Now just a minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: It must be competitive.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The doctor who is on salary, if he does not want to take the pay

that his employer offers him, or that he can negotiate for, he does the same as the nurse, he quits. But I would also like to point out to the hon. member that he is a little bit off the beam, at least as far as our part of Ontario is concerned, when he compares the nurses' salaries to junior teachers' salaries. I think our junior teachers in our elementary schools are starting at something in the order of $3,500 to $3,700 a year. Well the registered nurses start at $4,800.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Read the paper, it is $4,800.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: For elementary school teachers?

Mr. Newman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no, not at all. High school teachers are what, $5,400?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, it is at $400 a month, that the elementary school teachers in the separate schools and public schools start in the city of Windsor.

An hon. member: That is right!

Mr. Newman: And the nurses in the city of Detroit start at $525, $589 and $632. We will always have a shortage if we are going to have to compete against salaries such as that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Let me tell the hon. member that the city of Detroit has a greater shortage of nurses than the province of Ontario has ever had. Again, I repeat that the Canadian nurses are attracted to United States by big salaries, simply because of the fact that none of the states of the union, with two exceptions, has begun to produce the number of nurses they need to take care of their regular patient rate. They simply attract our nurses with big salaries. If Ontario was graduating nurses on the same basis as the majority of the states to the south of us, we would be turning out fewer than 1,500 nurses a year as opposed to the more than 3,000 we are now turning out.

Mr. Newman: Should we not try to keep those we graduate here in Ontario, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Of course we should.

Mr. Newman: All right then, the way to keep them here is by doing exactly the same thing that they do to attract them to the United States.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister is forcing the nursing associations across Ontario to strike if he will not meet their demands.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, might I direct the Minister's attention again to a problem with which, in the multiplicity of his duties as Minister of Health, he is familiar? That is the problem adverted to by my hon. friend, the member for Parkdale, involving the critical shortage of hospital beds at Sudbury.

Sudbury is very fortunate in having in its service some very community minded persons who form the Sudbury and district hospital council. That council was formed in 1963 and was incorporated in 1966. It is described to be a voluntary non-profit organization made up of representatives of the four Sudbury hospitals, and its committees look into all hospital problems and study ways and means of giving better and more complete hospital services to the area residents without duplication of expensive services required.

Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, in relation to the history of the building of hospitals to serve the Sudbury area and Sudbury—as was the good fortune of other centres in northern Ontario—was the missionary zeal of various religious orders who migrated into that part of Ontario to not only carry on their religious duties, but to carry on good and charitable works among the inhabitants.

As a result of the arrival of an order known as the Grey Nuns of the Cross—to use its English name—whose mother house is in the city of Ottawa and is a French Canadian order, there was built St. Joseph's hospital in 1897. It has operated on the same site, in what I take to be more or less the same building, ever since that time.

Along in 1950 the Sudbury general hospital was founded by an order of nuns whose mother house is in North Bay.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: St. Joseph's!

Mr. Sopha: The order of St. Joseph's, thank you.

And that hospital is administered by that order. Then it will be seen that, at that time, there were two hospitals operated within a religious atmosphere. Accordingly, in the nature of things, it was not surprising that at some time the Protestant section of the community should feel it desirable to be served by a hospital which was entirely non-denominational. So in 1956, the Sudbury memorial hospital opened with 236 beds and it is the

newest of the hospitals; and I suppose was equipped at that time with all the paraphernalia, if I may use that word, that is to be found in the modern hospital.

Then a mention ought to be made, of course, of the erection of the Sudbury-Algoma sanatorium and the part that it played in the conquest of that disease which, as a layman, I take it that experience has shown that medical practice and procedures has won a victory over tuberculosis from the point of view of the incidence to be found among our people.

Consequently, the sanatorium was found to have a good deal of unusued capacity and the Minister of Health, in his discretion and with the interest of the province, arranged that part of that building at least should be used for the care of people suffering from psychiatric disorders. And Dr. Doherty, to whom the community owes a great debt in the exercise of the versatility that is inherent in him, transferred his talents from the assault upon tuberculosis to the containment of another dread affliction—that of mental disorders. The hospital is now used largely for the care of people who suffer from disturbances of that nature.

Well, having concluded that, it is useful to bear in mind the historical development and to point to the ecumenicity that is inherent in an atmosphere of cooperation in the Sudbury hospital council where, as I say, representatives of all these disparate groups meet together in the endeavour to iron out their common problems.

Well, as was to be expected, the hospital council conducted a survey of the problems, and the gravest problem which they encountered was a desperate shortage of hospital beds. As a layman, as a lawyer and as a person who, because of the practice of that profession is suspicious of language and treats language with a good deal of scrutiny and analysis, let me say at the outset that one of the terms in current use by the medical profession—and by others outside the medical profession who do not know what they are talking about—for which I have the greatest contempt is "elective surgery."

Not only do I think the term has no meaning, but I think those who use it do not know the meaning they seek to impart by the use of it. I would think looking at it analytically, that upon examination, there is no such thing as elective surgery. Either a person needs some surgical procedure exercised on him or he does not; and if he does not need it, sir, then he can be erased from the calendar. But if he does not need it, I would be highly suspicious that his need for the surgery can be postponed to some indefinite date.

The greatest illustration of elective surgery, of course, or an illustration that can be pointed to, is that mother can suffer from varicose veins—which give her tremendous discomfort—but, because of mother's obligation to her family and the necessity of her presence to get supper for father and the children when they come home from school, she will forbear the elimination of her discomfort. Because of the family's need for her, she will get the varicose veins attended to at some much later period than the doctors ought to have employed surgery. I suppose sometimes the sequelae will be all the more severe because of her forbearance and her sacrifice to the family. Years ago, of course, that sacrifice depended upon the economic factor, the availability of the money to pay for the hospital bed and the doctor to get the necessary repair done to the vascular structure of the legs.

So anyway, that term is thrown around now with great abandon, as I say, by a good many people who do not endeavour to use much analysis in their thinking. The impression is given by these people who need the surgery that just any old time will do whenever a hospital bed can be found for them and they can be brought in and the hernia can be repaired. I find it very distasteful that a man who goes to work daily should have to suffer the inconvenience and distress and pain and discomfort by reason of the fact that somebody thinks—someone in control of the situation—that some opportune time will present itself when all other things are equal for the repair of that hernia. It is not the way I like to think that a civilized society treats its members.

Well as a result of the inquiries of the hospital council it was discovered very quickly that St. Joseph's hospital had 479 patients waiting for beds. The Sudbury general had 1,270 patients and the Sudbury memorial hospital had 539 patients; and this study was made this year. That is a total of 2,288 people in Sudbury and district who were on a waiting list for beds. Then in order to ensure that there were not duplications, a special scrutiny was exercised to determine whether the names were repeated and it was found that less than five per cent of the people were duplications.

So, as my friend from Parkdale correctly pointed out, that means that this year there were 2,200 people in Sudbury and district

who were waiting for beds for medical treatment that necessitated being placed in a hospital.

Having determined that, the council took note of the fact that each of the hospitals, in the exercise of the responsibility in the sector where they employ themselves, had made very elaborate plans for the expansion of their facilities. Of course, it is the easiest thing in the world, as you know, Mr. Chairman, to make plans for expansion, but it is another thing to acquire the necessary coin of the realm to pay for their crystallization.

The hospitals were cognizant of the fact that before this expansion took place, help must come from some quarter—so a little arithmetic, or a good deal of arithmetic, I should say, was employed by the council to determine just how much money would be needed for the building of these new facilities. One of them involves, I might say at this point, in order that the picture can be accurately portrayed, one of them involves the complete rebuilding of the earliest hospital, St. Joseph's hospital, the one erected in 1897—the furnishing of a new institution.

The total, to make it a matter of record, that had to be raised; the total construction cost for the expansion of facilities in all hospitals, was the round figure of $26,729,300, which was quite a breathtaking amount of money.

It was determined, and the Minister will be able to correct the council if the facts are otherwise, it was determined under the present legislation and regulations, that the government would provide $18,510,723 leaving the amount which is euphemistically described in the brief as the amount to be raised locally—that is a nice way of putting it, is it not—the amount to be raised locally, $8,218,631.

It goes to show that in the provision of many necessary services—I think it is fair for the Opposition to make this point—for our people, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) can run around the province all he wants and I have no doubt he will not be hog-tied in any way in the coming months. He can talk about the great benefit that we have realized; that there is no increase in taxation in Centennial year. There is going to be no increase in taxation at the level of this government, but, as this demonstrates, the increase in taxation is going to occur at the municipal level and in the Sudbury area it is going to occur over the next few years to the tune of $8,218,631.

Then the other thing to be said rapidly, to get it out of the way, and it has been said here many times and does not need to be proved, is that the day is gone when large amounts of money can be raised locally for the capital costs of hospital expansion.

Perhaps in yesteryear, when hospitals were looked upon more or less as being totally charitable institutions, providing a necessary public service, a citizen at the local level would come forward and contribute, sometimes very graciously, to the cost of building hospitals.

As I say, and I do not suppose I have to argue that to convince anybody, that day is completely gone. As the Prime Minister of the province says, you cannot fool the public, no matter how you try. The public know that, to all intents and purposes, the Ontario hospital services commission runs the hospitals of this province, try as the Minister of Health may do in the skilful use of language that he employs, to convince us otherwise.

The person who holds the purse strings is the one who makes the final determination in every area of human life. So it is in the administration and the organization of hospitals and the man on the street. Indeed, the man who is in the hospital and is close to the situation, he knows that.

Accordingly, I would judge that there is, among our people, an ingrained belief that if hospital facilities are needed, if new construction is needed to provide this necessary service, then the man on the street is ready to look to government to provide the funds for their creation.

Therefore, with ease, I can go to the next step in the history of this thing. It was not, therefore, surprising that when the amount of money that was required locally, was determined as to its quantum, then it was almost the acting out of the dialectic, that the council of the city of Sudbury should be the first to step into the breach and indicate how much it would provide.

It has recently announced, by proper passage of the necessary resolutions and bylaws, that of this $8,200,000, the city of Sudbury itself will provide $4.5 million. Presumably—or not presumably at all—that is on a per capita basis, and that is the amount of money that descends so to speak, upon the heads of the ratepayers of Sudbury. Sudbury, with its 80,000 population will put up more than half the amount.

The other 15 municipalities, and I am not sure about the accuracy of that figure, let

us say the other score of municipalities, will have to, or we hope they will, come forward with their pro rata share.

So there is the increase in taxation for all to see to go along with the increase in education costs that will be borne. But there is an increase in taxation this year on the citizens of the city of Sudbury which will be reflected in their municipal tax bills when they are received.

That $4.5 million is, I believe, going to be paid over a period of five years—I am almost sure I am correct in saying that the citizens of Sudbury will put up that money.

I have no way of knowing the part in this that the Minister of Health has played. He will have to tell us. I know of one occasion, a couple of years ago, when the Minister of Health arrived in town and he sat down with the people and discussed these problems. Far be it for me—I was not at the meeting, I was not invited to the meeting, and it would be impertinent of me to try to express what part the Minister of Health played in it—but surely this afternoon we hope the Minister of Health will tell us the part that the government played.

When is this going to be built? The people responsible, the hospital council, they say that construction, the first phase, must start this year. And that construction will take place until the year 1972, over a period five years. They point out that notwithstanding the expenditure of $26 million, it is very germane to call attention to the fact that this will not provide hospital facilities for the Sudbury basin that are within the optimum limits that are recommended by the Ontario hospital association to the Ontario hospital services commission. And as I understand it, the optimum is something like six beds per thousand of population with the anticipated expansion of population in the Sudbury area, this added capacity in the three hospitals will bring the beds to either 4.6 or 4.7 beds per thousand, which is well below the optimum prescribed by the Ontario hospital association.

So it is well to bear in mind that the problem is by no means being solved. I am one of those who in this House has heard many times—the member for Parkdale addressed himself to this problem and to advance his views about the responsibility of government in this area—the idea of sharing the cost of capital construction of hospitals. But the Minister of Health as far as I am able to apprehend, and I do not feel that I judge him unfairly, lives in a world of yesteryear and prefers to dwell upon the archaic notion that these institutions can be financed at the local level. Certainly there is no indication that he has ever persuaded his colleagues in the Cabinet otherwise.

The same Minister of Health, whom I heard in this House get up and defend the impossible proposition that there are enough nurses in the province—I have heard him say this, my ears have reacted to the entelechy that this man believes it. Mr. Chairman, anybody who knows anything about the real world around him knows that hospitals throughout the length and breadth of the province are continually suffering from a chronic shortage of young ladies and, for that matter, young men in the nursing profession.

There is only one other thing that needs to be said, and that is to relate the disturbing intervention in these plans that I have described by the Minister of Health. I feel it necessary in carrying out my responsibilities. As the result of a letter addressed to me on April 6, 1967, I draw the attention, your attention and that of the House, Mr. Chairman, to the intervention that the Minister of Health and his department have made in these carefully laid plans.

Now, it was decreed as a result of the collective wisdom of the Sudbury hospital council, being addressed to this grave problem in our midst, that a system of priorities be set up. And the first priority in construction would be the erection of the new St. Joseph's hospital; that is to say, the relocation of that hospital from its present site to a site adjacent to the Laurentian University. You see the great advantage, Mr. Chairman; the location of the hospital close to the university might make one optimistic enough to believe that the day would not long be delayed when that hospital would become a teaching institution connected with the medical faculty at Laurentian University.

Then the second priority was to be the construction of the new capacity for beds at the Sudbury memorial hospital. The third one was to be the second phase of construction of St. Joseph's hospital. The fourth was to be construction of facilities for beds and services at the Sudbury-Algoma sanatorium, to which I have already adverted and drawn your attention to the fact, Mr. Chairman, that it is both a sanatorium for the treatment of tuberculosis and is used for the treatment of people with psychiatric disorders.

Notwithstanding those carefully laid plans, the Minister of Health, The Department of Health—maybe the Minister of Health does not know anything about this at all, but his

department got into the act—came in and notified these people that they were ready to proceed with item 4 of the priorities presently. That is to say, that they were going to take steps, intended to take steps, for the establishment of a diagnostic assessment centre at the Sudbury-Algoma sanatorium.

The representative of the sanatorium in the council reported to the council that they had been informed by Dr. Dymond and the Ontario hospital services commission that the province would be prepared to inaugurate this plan immediately and they would pay the two-thirds share but that—note this, Mr. Chairman—the remaining one-third must come out of the moneys collected from the municipalities. And, of course, with the one-third at the local level, which is the emphasis of this department, that part of the plan would go ahead.

Now, the minutes of the meeting of the Sudbury and district hospital council relate that this suggestion of The Department of Health was greeted with considerable dismay. There is no need for me to read it, but a letter of April 5 was sent to the Minister of Health—who incidentally is very good at answering letters. If you write to the Minister of Health, I must say you get a very quick reply—indicating attention has been paid to the matter raised. I have no doubt that the Minister of Health has replied to this privately. The council sent him along a resolution which sets out in the clearest of terms that the order of priorities of construction of hospital facilities in the Sudbury area ought to conform to those priorities set out by the Sudbury and district hospital council.

Well, of course one would not think one would need to convince the Minister of Health, who places such emphasis together with his colleagues on the Treasury benches on the participation at the local level—particularly in the world of finance—that not only is there emphasis on autonomy but the provincial government requires that there be autonomy in the realm of finance that they have to raise one third of the money at the local level for the construction of hospitals. So in view of that, one would not think one would need to convince the Minister of Health that the priorities determined by this hospital council ought to be the ones that govern.

Now I put this matter very quietly, I think, and I hope very responsibly, because I might get excited about some other things—my own ideas. I must bear in mind that I am the representative of Sudbury here and these people at the local level are very deeply involved. They are very responsible people; to read the names of the people on that council, one must be impressed at the calibre and one must be impressed at the sense of responsibility that is exhibited by these people. I can only, in the exercise of the stewardship conferred upon me, draw attention to these matters. I am not saying to the Minister of Health, or to anyone else, that this necessarily is the great election issue in the Sudbury area; it is anything but that. It must continue to be merely the recognition of a very grave problem that attends our people. The people of Sudbury want to feel that they have the same facilities available to them that people in other parts of the province have.

I might point out that you know very well, Mr. Chairman, from your own experience that living in the northland used to mean that if there was something esoteric wrong with a patient, if I may use that adjective, he suffered from something that was more complicated than a fractured femur.

Then off to Toronto with him right away, on the train and off to Toronto. The way the word flies by the crow, you could always tell if there was something complex wrong with people by the fact that he was shipped off to Toronto; and it meant with some gloom because it might mean that it was terminal.

But we have seen a great change in that. We now have established in Sudbury various units that practise specialties and are staffed by very highly trained and very competent people. I merely refer to the recent inauguration of a cardiovascular unit at the Sudbury memorial hospital, where some of these operations on the human heart are now done that formerly were only done at such places as the Toronto general hospital.

Well that makes one very sanguine; that makes one very gratified to see those developments and one could only hope that the Minister of Health will exercise his talents and his powers to make the road ahead for this Sudbury hospital council all the more easy. One would hope that the Prime Minister of the province (Mr. Robarts) and his chief lieutenant, the Provincial Treasurer—and as a result of a recent radio interview, we must assume that the Provincial Treasurer is Lin Kow to the Prime Minister—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That was CFRB; I remember that.

Mr. Sopha: On CFRB; the Prime Minister decreed that the Provincial Treasurer is Lin Kow.

Mr. Nixon: The Prime Minister is Mao Tse-tung!

Mr. Sopha: He is Mao.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, he is Mao.

Mr. Sopha: One would wish that they would recognize that a greater responsibility must be accepted by the province to provide the large funds necessary to pay for the capital cost of construction of hospitals.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would just say briefly that I do not believe that any really good purpose will be served by me discussing the details of the Sudbury situation on the floor of the House. I will be very pleased indeed to discuss it with the hon. member and his colleague.

First of all, there was nothing secret or sinister about me visiting Sudbury. I did what I am highly honoured and privileged to do wherever my services are sought. I went to Sudbury at the invitation of these public-spirited citizens. I had nothing to do with their choice of the guests who were there and was not consulted about it. I was there myself as a guest and was very pleased.

I say very frankly to you, sir, I was rather disappointed that the hon. member was not there; but again I have to repeat I had nothing to do with who should be invited to that meeting.

I want to say however, in general terms, that the hospital planning council in Sudbury, as hospital planning councils all through the province, and there are quite a number of them now—deserve a very great deal of credit for the realistic way in which they have tackled their problems. I might say with humility and with not a little pride that if my hon. friend would talk to some of the people on the council he might find I am not such a bad fellow as he thinks I am.

Mr. Sopha: They think you are wonderful.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: However it is all right; my hide is getting thick, it does not really matter. I just throw that in as an aside.

They are very wonderful people and they have done a tremendous job. Indeed this whole programme did not get off the ground until these people with a deep sense of public responsibility and duty got together and formed themselves into a council, in a formal incorporation, to which I gave my sanction on that visit.

It has been our policy not to countenance the incorporation of these bodies. We do not believe that this is a good thing. However, when the situation was explained to us in Sudbury, we found we were dealing with unique situations that are peculiar to the area they serve, and I was very much impressed with their arguments. I immediately gave my consent on behalf of government to the incorporation.

That this advice they gave me was sound has been more than proven, because in a very short time, it is less than a year since I was up there, they have gone out and according to the last information I have they are fairly well assured of their local share of the money, their one-third.

I would like to express here my great sadness at the very sudden death of the first chairman of that board, Mr. Maddock. He, I think, was one of the moving forces behind this. I know he will be missed, but he was also flanked by several excellent lieutenants any one of whom can take over and do the job as I know Mr. Maddock would have wanted it done.

Now again speaking in generalities, to say that the government has not been alive to the need is I think a gross understatement. On the statement of the council themselves, out of an outlay of $26-odd million we are paying $18-odd million. This is in keeping with the recommendation of the Ontario hospital association that the government's support of capital grants should not exceed two-thirds of the cost. We went a little further and included in our support two-thirds of the cost of furnishings and equipment, whereas heretofore hospital boards have had to find that total money. It is quite true that they reclaimed it by depreciation, but now they have it supported by grant in the amount of two-thirds.

Now in addition to providing assurance that finances would be forthcoming at the local level, the council has done a very great deal by way of planning and scheduling. It is quite true, as the hon. member said, the first phase of the programme is already approved in principle and I believe they are quite optimistic of beginning the building of Laurentian this year. Again I am not positive of my figures, but I believe that is the plan.

The first phase will provide a new hospital of 200 beds and I believe services for the ultimately larger hospital. There will be an extension to the general hospital. The psychiatric facility, and I am not going to discuss it other than to mention it in passing, is to be included in the first phase; the regional school of nursing and the central laundry are both to be built on the grounds of memorial; all of these are included in the first phase.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister is upsetting the priorities. Will the Minister address himself to that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No I do not think so. I think there is a little misunderstanding here. I was talking to Mr. Plaunt and Mr. Plaunt said less than two weeks ago: We have understanding. I am going back up to Sudbury and I hope the member is there in order that he hears what is going on, because I am quite sure he would be very deeply interested in the discussion. I think there is just a lack of understanding between us.

The regional school of nursing—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to interfere on a point of order, but if the Minister would yield for a moment. The private members' hour was to have been called at five o'clock and it is now ten after five.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I really felt this discussion concerning a particular incident might be completed and I think the House would be quite prepared to sit until a quarter after six in order to accommodate the private members' hour.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I had just another sentence or two, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to encroach on the private hour.

The regional school of nursing will of course be built at government expense. The central laundry is to be built by a non-profit corporation and therefore will be no drain either on government finances or on the local finances.

I am quite certain that the fruits of the work done by the council will be very evident in the near future and I feel equally certain that provision for hospital facilities in the Sudbury area will be on an orderly, well planned ongoing basis from this time forward.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister advise how far the central laundry plan has gone in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, if we are to embark on another subject, I would move that—

Mr. Sargent: I want the answer to this question first, it is very important.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when the private members' hour commences, I think it would be the wish of the House that the various speakers be permitted to finish. If this were to take them past the hour of six o'clock, as we have encroached upon the private members' hour with the discussion we were having on the estimates of The Department of Health, could I ask your indulgence for an extra ten or 15 minutes at six o'clock if it proves to be necessary?

THE CORONERS ACT

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): moves second reading of Bill 83, An Act to amend The Coroners Act.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I intend to curtail my remarks so that we are not inconvenienced by requiring the House to sit after the hour so far as my remarks will be concerned.

I had introduced this bill because of a difference in attitude and viewpoint to the office of coroner in the province of Ontario, which resulted from the interpretation, placed by the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), on the provisions of The Coroners Act relating to the power of the government and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, to dismiss a coroner from office without the coroner being given an opportunity to be heard, or without cause being given in the form of an inquiry prior to the dismissal taking place.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is quite a simple one and I do not intend to read the provisions. It provides simply for the protection, in office, of a coroner in the province of Ontario on the same basis on which a magistrate is protected in his office in the province of Ontario. The members will note in section 2 of the bill, of Bill 83, a provision that while a coroner will hold office during pleasure, he can be removed only if there are circumstances respecting misbehaviour or inability; and if they are first inquired into; and if the coroner is given reasonable notice of the time and place appointed for the inquiry; and is afforded an opportunity by himself or his

counsel of being heard and of cross-examining the witnesses and producing evidence on his own behalf.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall the argument which was placed by the Minister of Justice and Attorney General, which appears on page 1993, being the *Hansard* for the afternoon session of Tuesday, April 11, 1967. At that time, the Attorney General, and I quote, made his argument to justify the dismissal from office of the chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto. He generalized his remarks without any specific reference to that particular office and I assume, because of the context of the remarks, he was referring to any coroner in Ontario. The Attorney General said:

> The coroners, Mr. Speaker, are appointed under section 1 of The Coroners Act and prior to 1966, prior to the amendment, it read as follows:
>
> "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint one or more coroners for Ontario or any part thereof."

He then, Mr. Speaker, referred to section 21 of The Interpretation Act, which reads as follows:

> Authority to the Lieutenant-Governor to make an appointment to an office by commission or otherwise shall be deemed authority to appoint during pleasure—

He then referred to subsection 1 of section 27 of The Interpretation Act which reads:

> In every Act, unless the contrary intention appears, words authorizing the appointment of a public officer or functionary or a deputy, include the power of removing him, re-appointing him or appointing another in his stead, or to act in his stead from time to time, is in the discretion of the authority in whom the power of appointment is vested.

He then went on to say:

> So there was no need of the amendment of last year to dismiss a coroner.

Mr. Speaker, the only amendment made to section 1 of The Coroners Act in 1966 was to add to the operative part of the then section, the words and I quote:

"Who, subject to subsections 2 and 3—which are not material for the purposes that I wish to discuss this afternoon—

—shall hold office during pleasure."

He then stated that:

> That amendment did nothing more than reaffirm the law as it stood on that date, as interpreted and applied by the court of appeal for Ontario, I would refer to the case of Clark against the Attorney General for Ontario, Miller and Creba, 1964, No. 2 Ontario Reports, page 209, the judgment of Mr. Justice Campbell Grant; and it was affirmed on appeal.

The substance, therefore, of the Attorney General's interpretation of his power, was that it was not necessary to amend the Act last year to specifically provide that a coroner hold office only during pleasure; that The Interpretation Act and the decision in that case would have so held regardless of the amendment.

My position, Mr. Speaker, is simply that those provisions of The Interpretation Act would not have been so construed in the absence of the provision in the 1966 amendment, if the matter had come before a court for decision as to what the power of the executive was in relation to the removal from office of a coroner.

I would like briefly to deal with the office of the coroner, both from the point of view of its historic tradition, and also from the point of view of the nature of the office and the function which the holder of the office performs in our society.

It is quite clear, as clear as it can be on the basis of the legal scholarship which has been done about the office of coroner, that the office of the coroner is not of great antiquity. It certainly goes back to the period prior to the year, I believe, 1194, when there was a reference at that time to the office of the coroner.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Who is running this government?

Mr. Renwick: It is quite clear that at that time, and up to The Magna Carta Act of 1215, that the coroner, in fact, held what were known as pleas of the Crown. He proceeded in the holding of those pleas, in the holding of those trials, and proceeded to judgment and to sentence of the person who came before him. It is of historic interest to note the Magna Carta, which is also part of the law of this province, now specifically prohibits a coroner from holding pleas of the Crown in the sense of proceeding to judgment and sentence in any matter which comes before him. That is part of the folklore of the province of Ontario, but it is of interest for the purposes of this particular bill.

Some time after that, in the next century, a bill was passed dealing specifically with the office of the coroner, and I do not intend

to go into it at any great length, except to say that in the year 1276, a statute of the office of coroner was passed in the reign of Edward I, in the fourth year of his reign.

I think it would be adequate for all persons interested in authoritative statements about the history of English law, if I simply refer to the essay, "The King's Peace in the Middle Ages", by Sir Frederick Pollock, which appears in the *Select Essays in Anglo-American Legal History*, which was published in volume two in 1908. At page 410 he states:

> An important exercise of the King's increasing control over criminal business with the constitution or definition of the office of coroner in 1194. The most important function of the coroner was, from the first, the holding of inquests on the bodies of persons who had died by violence, or accident, or in circumstances giving rise to suspicion; and that function continues to this day as part of the machinery of our criminal law, side by side with the jurisdiction of justices of the peace and to some extent developed by it, but not superseded by it.

He then refers to the earliest incidence of any preliminary inquiry into criminal offences in England and the use of the coroner for the purpose of carrying on the inquest into those deaths.

The learned author of that essay then goes on to say that:

> The coroner's duties in respect of inquiries into the causes of suspicious deaths have hardly varied at all from the days of Edward I to our own, except as regards the method of summoning jurors and witnesses and other details.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is sufficient background explanation of the historic office of the coroner to indicate that, in fact, the office is more of a judicial office—although it has aspects of a ministerial nature. It is, in fact, a judicial office and a court in the province of Ontario held in the last century that, for practical purposes, the office of coroner was equivalent to that of a magistrate. That is a case which is recited in 1872 in the 32nd volume of the Upper Canada Queen's Bench Reports at page 569, where Mr. Justice Morrison states:

> Mr. Cameron who was counsel appearing in the case—very properly conceded on the argument that a coroner is a magistrate.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record the questions and answers which were given in 1909 in England under a Home Office inquiry and which is contained in the first report of the departmental committee appointed to inquire into the law relating to coroners and coroners' inquests and into the practice in coroners' courts. At page five of the minutes of evidence of that particular inquiry, we find the responses given by Mr. James Brooke Little, who was a barrister of some 30 years' standing, who appeared before that committee, and who was the original contributor of the article on coroners, which appears in Lord Halsbury's encyclopedia of the laws of England.

These questions and answers were submitted before this inquiry and I think are of significant interest as to the status of the coroner and the tenure of his office, as it existed both at common law and under the statute law which codifies it.

> Question 81: We now come to the question of the removal of coroners. There are two statutes I think relating to that. There is a common law liability and a statutory liability to removal. The old common law liability was for any inability or misbehaviour in the discharge of his duty he was then removable by the Lord Chancellor and that common law liability still remains.
>
> Question 82: Are not those exact terms embodied in the statute? That is so, but the Lord Chancellor may, if he thinks fit, remove any coroner from his office for inability or misbehaviour in the discharge of his duty. That has been included in The Coroners' Act but that has always been the common law jurisdiction of the Lord Chancellor.
>
> Question 83: It has been embodied in section eight of The Coroners' Act of 1887. Yes, that is an affirmation of the common law jurisdiction of the Lord Chancellor.
>
> Question 84: Is there any explanation of the fact that a coroner who is what one may call a common law criminal officer, an officer concerned with criminal law comes under the jurisdiction of the Lord Chancellor and not under that of the Lord Chief Justice. The Lord Chancellor having been an equity judge, how does he get seizen of the coroner? Perhaps as keeper of the King's conscience. I think it must be in that way, I cannot account for it at all. I can only record the fact that the Lord Chancellor has always had that jurisdiction. It was especially laid down by Lord Elgin that it was a common law jurisdiction, that you will find in ex parte Parnell in the year 1820, Jacob and Walker, page 451. Lord Eldon laid down there what the powers of

the Lord Chancellor are and what they always have been.

Question 85: And they are now embodied in the statute of 1887? Yes.

Question 86: So that the two grounds of removal are inability and misbehaviour? Yes. Then the common law inability and misbehaviour went really beyond that because if a man was too much occupied that was one of the grounds for removing him.

The questions and answers then go off on the question of whether or not the coroner is devoting sufficient time to the business as a coroner. And I skip then to question 95, which states:

Is there any definition of misbehaviour? No there is no definition; the Lord Chancellor has a great discretion in the matter. You will find that exemplified in a judgment of Lord Selborne when he was asked to remove a coroner and that was the case of re Hull 1882, 9 Queen's Bench Division at page 689 which gives a very ample account of the Lord Chancellor's powers in this matter.

Now Mr. Speaker, that to my mind establishes conclusively that the office of the coroner has at all times been considered to be a judicial office; that in England the removal of a coroner from office was a matter to be dealt with as a judicial matter before the highest judicial officer in the land, the Lord Chancellor. It is quite clear from the case to which I have referred in England that the Lord Chancellor would not, in the exercise of the judicial power to remove a coroner for inability or for misbehaviour, have dreamt of exercising that power without giving the coroner concerned the opportunity to have been heard and the opportunity to have placed any facts that he wished to before the Lord Chancellor and an opportunity to examine and cross-examine any persons who may be giving evidence against him as to the reasons why he should in fact be dismissed from office.

Now you will readily, Mr. Speaker, now recognize the problem which the Attorney General felt was inherent in our statute, where The Coroners Act was, until last year, silent on the point about how a coroner could be removed from office. There were two possible alternatives: One was that he would be held to have a judicial office and that therefore, regardless of the specific wording of The Interpretation Act, those sections which the Attorney General referred to would not have been held to apply to a person who held such a judicial office and that then a court would have asserted the common law jurisdiction of the court to decide the way in which a coroner should be removed from office if there are allegations made of misbehaviour or of misconduct.

The Attorney General chose, however, to amend the statute because of this ambiguity in the position of the coroner. There was a very real likelihood, in my firm opinion, that had the matter gone to court prior to 1966 without the amendment to that statute—in circumstances similar to the unwarranted dismissal of Dr. Shulman, as chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto; to question the authority of the government, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to dismiss him out of hand without a hearing, without any inquiry—that the court would have come to the conclusion that The Coroners Act was in fact an Act which created and continued in Ontario the position of coroner and that the coroner as such was entitled to the protection in his office of the same nature as was provided in the common law of England.

And I refer again to the questions and answers which I have mentioned previously and I go on to question 87 which says:

On that I ask you this, apart from inability or misbehaviour a coroner holds his office for life? Yes, a county coroner does certainly.

And question 88:

Just at present we are discussing only the county coroner. He holds his office for life? Yes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would be quite clear that a court here would of necessity be faced with the argument—and, as I say, in my opinion would have had to come to the conclusion—that a coroner was not removable from office; that he held office for life and that he could only be removed for inability or for misbehaviour; and that those matters would have been required to be decided in some way or other by way of a judicial inquiry.

I think that the court here would have simply said that the codification in The Magistrates Act of the province of Ontario as to the procedure to be followed would, by common law in this province, in the province of Ontario, have been applicable to the office of coroner without having been enacted as part of the statute.

It is for that reason that I disagree entirely with the proposition which the Attorney General has put forward—that in some way

or other the provisions of The Interpretation Act would have indicated that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council had power to dismiss him arbitrarily without the amendment which was enacted last year. The purpose of my bill is to simply point out to the House the unwisdom of having on our statute books a provision which now permits a coroner to be dismissed summarily and out of hand without any proper inquiry and without any recognition of the judicial nature of his office.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Well what construction does the member put on the words "during pleasure"?

Mr. Renwick: I think perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Sudbury had been listening, I was simply saying that what we have to do is to change the law as it was enacted by this Legislature last session. The provision of the amendment last year which said that the coroner holds office during pleasure should not be part of the law of the province of Ontario. The judicial nature of his office must be recognized and he must be provided with that protection under our law. This is the sum and substance of the reasons why I introduced this bill into the Legislature.

Now, the nature of the function which the coroner provides in our society is an inquest into cases of suspicious deaths. In cases of sudden death which are unexplained there is an obligation on a coroner to hold the inquest. I think the very nature of the inquest is such as will convince on rational grounds, let alone on historic grounds, that the office has that quality of a judicial office which, in our tradition of government and in our tradition of the exercise of judicial functions, must of necessity require that such a person as a coroner be protected in his office.

It is not sufficient to suggest that the power to remove at pleasure is one which is consistent with maintaining the independence and the ability of a coroner to conduct his office. To hold the inquests—which are so much a part of our tradition—without fear or favour from anyone, without being subject in any way whatsoever to any executive pressure.

This is the nub of the problem. The problem is that the Attorney General seemed to feel that the coroner was in some way an employee of his department, a servant of his—that if he disliked what he did, he, the Attorney General, could refer the matter to the government and the government could dismiss the coroner out of hand. I simply say that there is nothing in our tradition in Ontario—and to the extent that our tradition relies upon the tradition of law in the United Kingdom and in England, particularly—there is nothing whatsoever which exists in the law which would give any sense of solace to a person who took that view. Therefore, the Act was amended last year to make provision that he could be removed during pleasure.

I say that that Act is wrong. I say that the Act should be changed. I say that the simplest way, Mr. Speaker, is to provide for the removal of a coroner along the same lines and on the same precedent, confirming the common law of Ontario and of the United Kingdom as is now set out, for practical purposes, in The Magistrates Act. Instead of this summary dismissal of a person holding a judicial office, without any inquiry, and then subsequently an inquiry which is not dealing with the question of the status of a coroner—his tenure of office, the nature of his office—not dealing with that matter at all. It is left entirely in limbo.

Instead of that it would have been quite proper to have eliminated the ministerial function of the chief coroner. I think this was not a judicial function. But to have discharged him both as chief coroner and as coroner in the circumstances as they existed, points up very clearly the necessity for an amendment to this statute so that the judicial character of the office can be protected. We must have that protection for all persons who perform judicial functions. It is not sufficient any longer to leave in limbo the question of the division of authority between a coroner, a chief coroner, a supervising coroner and their relationship to The Attorney General's Department.

I think it is however, perfectly clear from this bill that dealing with the one part of the problem—that is, the office of coroner related to all coroners in the province of Ontario—that they are entitled to, and under our system of law should have, as a constitutional part of their protection, the same protection in the tenure of their office as they would have had in the absence of the amendment which was passed by this Legislature last year.

Therefore, in moving the second reading of the bill I am, in substance, asking for the repeal of the amendment which existed because of the change which took place last year. I am asking for a clarification by inserting in the bill the provision of what, in substance, is a modern statement of the common law, to so protect a person in the office of coroner.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment posed in Bill 83 would be, as the member for Riverdale has suggested, to make it impossible to dismiss a coroner who has held office for two years, unless he has misbehaved or is unable to perform his duties properly. Then he could be dismissed only if there is a public inquiry and notice of an inquiry, if counsel are present, and if there is cross-examination of witnesses and the production of evidence. A judge of the Supreme Court would be appointed. There would, in fact, be a Royal commission. This commission would be set up to decide whether what is, for the most part, a part-time employee of the government should continue to be employed—a Royal commission to decide whether or not the head of a department should recommend dismissal of an employee whose effectiveness as a coroner, able properly to carry out the functions of his office, is purported to no longer exist.

This bill further provides that all evidence and correspondence relating to his term of office should be laid before this assembly by the Attorney General.

What, Mr. Speaker, is the definition of "misbehaviour?" Well, behaviour involves deportment, manners, bearing, conduct, demeanour, action, life attitude, management, tactics, policy and strategy. Who else better knows those things of a man than those who deal with him and work with him day by day? How can a Royal commission effectively deal with these characteristics? Would it turn into the same type of witch hunt that developed in the federal Royal commission dealing with the Munsinger matter, where there are still strong objections by many learned men to the commission's findings, and to the question of misbehaviour?

It might be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to consider some of the history of the office of coroner. The hon. member for Riverdale gave a brief résumé of this history, but it is possible we were reading different books. Originally, in England, a coroner was appointed by the Lord Chief Justice. The coroner of the city of London was appointed by the common council. I would assume, therefore, that the appointment was during pleasure and could be revoked by the common council. County and borough coroners in England were also so appointed. A coroner had to be a barrister, solicitor or legally qualified medical practitioner of not less than five years standing in his profession.

Previously, by the statute of Merton in 1235, it was assumed apparently as a matter of definition that all coroners were knights on the basis of land ownership. The statute of Westminster provided that none but lawful, most wise and discreet knights should be chosen for the office. The practice of choosing knights fell into disuse and a statute in 1354 directed that the coroner should be chosen: "of the most mete and lawful people that shall be found in the said counties to execute the said office".

Apparently, the actual amount in fee deemed to be sufficient was never determined, Mr. Speaker; it is said that some persons bought grave plots in cemeteries. In England, the coroner's court is an inferior court of record. A court of record is one of which the acts and judicial proceedings are enrolled in its archives, and are conclusive evidence of what is required.

At one time, a justice of the peace took the place of coroners in becoming primarily responsible for maintaining law and order locally. At the present time in England, the Lord Chancellor has statutory powers, if he thinks fit, to remove any coroner from his office for inability or misbehaviour in the discharge of his duties. What amounts to inability or misbehaviour is a matter entirely within the discretion of the Lord Chancellor. Apparently bankruptcy does not necessarily constitute inability or misbehaviour.

The Lord Chancellor's power to remove a coroner is exercised judicially. He acts upon complaints substantiated by evidence which is normally given by affidavit. The coroner concerned is given an opportunity of being heard. If the Lord Chancellor considers that the case of removing the coroner is made out, he makes an order accordingly.

In Ontario, at the present time, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may dismiss a coroner. This is more than the decision of one man. However, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that there should be a provision, whereby a coroner, whose dismissal has been recommended, should have the right of an appeal and a hearing at least, before the Cabinet or Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

It is important to remember that an inquest or coroner's court is a court of inquiry only. It can make no findings as to a person's rights or person's property. In such a court, the accused does not have the right to call witnesses, submit argument or cross-examine. Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, this is sometimes allowed, but this is at the discretion of the coroner and the questioning is usually done by the Crown attorney. There is no right to address a jury, there is no right of appeal.

This bill would give a coroner the same immunity as the judge or magistrate. These provisions now only apply to such positions, they do not apply to a commissioner, a justice of the peace or a sheriff—all public servants.

However, those judicial officers, that is a magistrate or a judge, hold courts of accusation. Both our civil and criminal courts are such, and the accused has the right of appeal, and all the other procedures available in the administration of justice, in the protection of his right.

It is important therefore that the office and authority of the coroner is not confused, misinterpreted or misconceived. The coroner is not a judge. The whole premise of Bill 83, Mr. Speaker, is that a coroner, a part-time servant for the most part, should have the same procedures as to dismissal and the same security of tenure, as a member of the judiciary. The position of a judge or magistrate is quite different from that of a coroner. A coroner's functions are not the same, nor does he have the independent authority, or must exercise the independent authority to such a degree, as a magistrate or judge. Certainly, the whole controversy now surrounding a present justice of the Supreme Court, is proof of this.

The hon. member for Riverdale says that the office is a judicial office. The position of a coroner is a hybrid position, part legal, part medical and part judicial. A good coroner, therefore, must seek the advice of those learned in the law and cooperate with those who have the professional knowledge he lacks in carrying out his duties.

Mr. Speaker, every time the Lieutenant-Governor in Council decides to dismiss an employee, we would have to have a Royal commission. The government would be on trial as well as the person dismissed. In most cases, it is not because of one act that causes a person's dismissal, it is usually an accumulation of acts over a period of time.

Earlier, I mentioned such things as conduct, attitude, management and tactics. This bill, Mr. Speaker, would be just one more step in the ever-increasing bureaucratic hindrance facing government trying to govern. I believe that the people of this province, under our system, want the elected officials to set policy, make decisions and effectively govern and administer the affairs of this province.

Does a chief of staff of a large metropolitan hospital have the same protection from dismissal? What position in private life is so cloaked? Remember, Mr. Speaker, the government must be responsible for any mistakes of its employees, and that includes coroners. The same does not apply to a judge.

Certainly, by cloaking the position of coroner with such immunity, the servant may be the master. The delicate instrument could become a deadly weapon and in order to avoid public and political controversy, a government with such legislation, as in this bill, might keep the man—and the people may suffer the consequences of a public servant who is just not fit for the job and has lost the confidence of his superiors.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, it has always been a matter of great curiosity to me that when something occurs out of the ordinary, the occurrence adopts a popularity among others. I refer to the fact, by way of illustration, in reference to this bill, that when the Prime Minister got hiatus hernia, people all over the province got hiatus hernia.

When Shulman got dismissed, as a person who was appoinnted by order-in-council, the next voice we hear is Henry Bull, the Crown attorney of York, saying that he is appointed by order-in-council and to quote him; he says:

> I had no instructions from any government official except to watch the case with care. I am not a part of the government and under no one's dictates. I am appointed by order-in-council and exercise my own judgment.

That was Henry Bull, the Crown attorney of York, who apparently has set up an Alsatia downtown where the Queen's writ does not run.

So this becomes infectious. Turning to this statute, I say, on behalf of this party, that we agree that coroners, in the exercise of their administrative functions, must be unfettered and free in the independence of their actions in carrying out their duties. But having said that, I hastily go on to say, as a lawyer, that, in my opinion, the coroner is not a judicial officer in any way, shape or sense of the term.

And though the member for Riverdale, in whose knowledge I have the greatest respect, kept saying over and over again that the coroner is a judicial officer, it is to be noted that he did not produce any authority, not a shred of authority. He referred to some ancient English materials.

But I say to him in reply, that, as in the case of all of our institutions in this country, whereas they have English origin, they were adapted here and were changed to suit our

own requirements. And so it is with the coroner.

I was aware before this bill was introduced, that this office, I say to him, does not go back to, what did he say, the 13th century, or the 12th century—there are records of the office of coroner as far back as Alfred the Great.

By the time the 12th century rolled around, the coroner was a well recognized official in the area, sir, who not only had the duty of looking into the incidence of homicide and determining whether there was culpability connected with it, but if the finger of suspicion pointed to some person in connection with the homicide, the coroner had the duty of taking into custody, the person suspected and indeed, the witnesses.

He also took them into custody, and kept the accused and the witnesses in some safe and handy place until one of the itinerant justices came along and then the coroner would deliver them up for judicial inquisition and punishment.

The earliest records in Canada about the activity of the coroner, are to be found just after the conquest, if my friend, the member for Stormont (Mr. Guindon), will permit me to use that phrase, and there is a reference in the year 1780 to the adoption of the office in Canada. In the year 1836 there was a statute passed which imposed upon coroners very definite duties in relation to the criminal law.

From 1836 until 1892 and the adoption of the first criminal code, the coroner had not only the right but the duty to present people for indictment. If the coroner, as a result of his inquisition, was satisfied that a case was made out against an individual's culpability in a homicide, then the coroner could present him at the next assize and no other determination was necessary to prefer a bill of indictment apart from the coroner's presentment.

But in 1892 that was eliminated and any function the coroner had or any right he had in that regard was completely taken away. There is a memento in our present criminal code where a section says in the clearest of language that no person shall be presented for indictment upon a coroner's inquisition. So then, at that point, in 1892, any part played by the coroner in the criminal judicial process was completely eliminated.

The Attorney General would be the first to agree with me, and my friend the member for Russell (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), who attends me, that if we attempted in the province, here, to impose any duties upon the coroner in the way of determination of criminal matters, then someone in our federal government no doubt would take the necessary steps to have our legislation declared *ultra vires* as an unwarranted intrusion in the criminal law.

I say then to my friend, the member for Riverdale—and I appeal to my friend the member for Russell, to support me in this as one lawyer to another—how can an officer's function be described to be judicial if there is no case at bar, if no person's rights are being determined? In order for there to be the exercise of judicial functions then the deliberations of the tribunal must be such as to come to a determination that affects somebody's rights.

Now he did not present any authority to the contrary. In other words the proposition I make, and I am going to support it with authority, is that the activities of a coroner are administrative only. As Henry Bull put it—and I tell the Attorney General I was referring to Henry Bull a moment ago and he has got some ideas of independence too—as he put it: When, where, how? Three pregnant words. When, where, how? and Henry Bull said yesterday in the inquiry, to put in the words "by what means" would be reduntant.

Are not words art in the three that I have cited? It encompasses completely the activities of the coroner as administrative, or as my friend from Riverale prefers a ministerial official's function.

In doing that, in answering those questions, he simply does not affect, in anything he does, any person's rights.

Now my friend from Halton I think referred to the presence of the Crown attorney. Well certainly the Crown attorney is there. The only person other than the coroner that has the right to be there is the Crown attorney or his agent, under section 24 of the Act. Indeed it takes note, that section, of the presence of the Crown attorney, or rather it makes it mandatory that he be notified of the holding of the inquisition and confers upon the Crown attorney the right to attend and examine and cross-examine witnesses.

So having disclosed that, it then becomes apparent what the whole intent of the process is: The Crown attorney being the chief functionary in the area concerned with the administration and enforcement of the criminal law, then this affords the Crown attorney the opportunity to determine, in a public way, whether there is some culpability connected with the death.

In other words, as Mr. Justice Wells puts it in the case I am going to refer to, the inquisition is held for the benefit of the Crown attorney. Mr. Justice Wells, in the case of Wolfe and Robinson, 1961 OR, at page 259, has this to say:

> By section 24 of the present Act special rights of cross-examination of witnesses is given the Crown attorney or to counsel representing the Attorney General. It is interesting that to permit such a thing to occur, it was apparently thought necessary to specifically provide that counsel for the Attorney General should have such power. Fundamentally it is not a hearing for the benefit of the public—

Note the words.

> —although that is undoubtedly one of the by-products of the procedure. It is an inquiry which is made chiefly for the benefit of the Crown, or those enforcing the rights of the Crown in the maintenance of the criminal law.

Mr. Renwick: Do you agree?

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes, and historically that is so, because I am prepared, and this party is prepared, that so far as the apprehension of those who have culpability in death is concerned, then that is a matter for the police.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the member permit a question?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Mr. Renwick: Does the member not agree that there is a public interest in the inquiries which are made into the circumstances of suspicious death?

Mr. Sopha: Certainly there is a public interest.

Mr. Renwick: And a public benefit from the inquest?

Mr. Sopha: I am also satisfied that if there is any suggestion of culpability in connection with the death, that the Crown attorney, and the police forces in this province, are aware of that long before the inquest is held. Indeed, there is a rule that when a person is to be charged in connection with a death, no inquest at all is heard.

Which is the converse of the proposition I made that the inquest is for the benefit of the Crown, and for the benefit of those charged with the responsibility of the administration of justice in the province.

How insignificant it is, you see, to refer back to the fact of the historical development of this office, in the days when we had inadequate police forces, and detective devices were not as sophisticated as they are today, the coroner had the right to prefer an indictment.

When we have highly developed techniques of the detection of crime, society takes those rights away from him and leaves them to the police. So the inquisition then becomes this—the Cown attorney has the right to attend, and to examine and cross-examine witnesses. If information comes to him at the inquisition, of which he was unaware to that point, then he may immediately go away from there and prefer such indictments as in his discretion he deems necessary, in order to bring those responsible to the bar of justice.

So in what sense, I ask, in the light of Mr. Justice Wells' words, can this inquiry be deemed to be judicial? It is technological, this is a technique that is employed. And I am against, I say to the member for Riverdale, I am against surrounding people in this society with the majesty and the trappings that are afforded to other officials such as magistrates and judges, merely because they appear to hold some tribunal of looking into facts.

Now let me go on and cite another statement from this case, and I am afraid my friend has not read this case, which is authority for part of the law of Ontario. It went to the court of appeal in 1962 and it was affirmed. Mr. Justice Wells went on:

> One of the reasons why many of the principles which apply to other courts, do not apply to the coroners' court, is that it is in its essence an inquisition. There are no parties before the coroner and until there is a verdict, no one is in any way involved.
>
> There is no issue. It is simply an inquiry how a human being came to his death. And if as a result of a verdict someone does become involved in a criminal charge, as I have already pointed out, the law surrounds him with all the protection which in reason he can ask.

What is the difference really in the light of the description of the functons of Mr. Justice Wells? What is the difference between what the coroner does and some committee that the Prime Minister might appoint to look into some facet of public life? For example, one that comes to mind, is the inquiry into the healing arts. In what sense could it be called

a court, when no person's rights are affected and there is no issue before it?

The coroner's court, I contend, to my fellow lawyers, is nothing more than an inquisition directed to the obtaining of facts whereas a court, a judicial officer, his activity is directed beyond the acquisition of facts. And having got the facts, he takes that next step and he determines someone's rights and he decrees what, in his mind, the weight of the facts will mean viz-a-viz the parties before him; whether it be the Crown and the subject or whether it be subject against subject.

If such be the case and that be a credible discussion of the office of coroner, then why should we as a Legislature apply to these people the same protection as we afford to judicial officers? In what way does the coroner differ from the Deputy Minister of any one of the departments? Who, in turn, is appointed by Attorney General? Of course, in the ordinary exercise of human rationality we do not fire people who do their jobs well, who are trying. You do not walk into your office and fire the secretary because she is chewing gum. You employ the rational faculties of discretion and good judgment.

Deputy Ministers do not get fired, I say to the member for Riverdale, because the Minister does not like the colour of the tie. All these things are encompassed within the dictates of human reason. Coroners, so long as they employ their best judgment and behave themselves, then under the statutes of this province will continue to be coroners and need not fear that an arbitrary Attorney General, whoever he may be, is suddenly going to sack him and hand him a copy of The Unemployment Insurance Act.

Finally, I am one of those persons who just because something extraordinary occurs because we meet on the landscape an extraordinary individual—I hope that is a safe word to use without getting too involved—does not mean that we have to—as a result of the unexpected—rush around and revise our statutes.

This statute was revised in 1926, it was revised in 1948. There was a substantial revision of it last year. It never occurred to anyone in the province, certainly it never occurred to the great C. R. Magone, to record to coroners any of the incidence of protection during good behaviour that are applied to officers who are truly judicial. Therefore, in my view, and in the view of this party, there is no need to revise this Act in order to attend the office, a purely administrative office, the way my friend from Riverdale wants to do. I recommend to him the reading of Wolfe and Robinson, 61 OR and in the court of appeal, 1962 OR, where Mr. Justice Schroeder, I might say to the Attorney General, has some doubts whether the office is constitutional or not.

Mr. Speaker: This concludes the debate on Bill 83.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will complete, I hope, the estimates of The Department of Health and then deal with the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 86



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 4, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 4, 1967

Questions to Mr. Robarts re election returning officers, Mr. Nixon 3007

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Dr. John Porter, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald 3007

Questions to Mr. Robarts re Confederation for tomorrow debate, Mr. MacDonald 3008

Question to Mr. Brunelle re James C. Heaney, Mr. MacDonald 3008

Questions to Mr. Rowntree re automobile insurance, Mr. Sargent 3010

Question to Mr. Dymond re after-burners, Mr. Sargent 3011

Questions to Mr. Dymond re hospital laundries, Mr. Sargent 3011

Statement by Mr. Haskett re highway and street signs 3011

Statement by Mr. Rowntree re appointment of Mr. John A. Ross 3012

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, concluded 3012

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman 3036

Recess, 6 o'clock 3044

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, Immaculate Heart separate school, Scarborough; St. Joachim's separate school, Scarborough; in the west gallery, eastern high school of commerce, Toronto and in the Speaker's gallery, the ladies of St. Paul's P.C. association.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question of the Prime Minister.

Have any recently appointed returning officers undertaken expenditures such as the renting of offices, or the hiring of staff in carrying out their duties, and if so, what is the total amount of such expenditure and under whose instructions were they made?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am told by the chief election officer that there are some returning officers who have acquired premises in order to carry out their duties insofar as the redistribution is concerned.

There have been no accounts submitted to date, so I am not able to give you definite information as to the amounts. This is done under the jurisdiction of the chief electoral officer.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if I might ask the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, if it is intended that the premises be kept open until such time as an election might be called?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It has absolutely nothing to do with the election. There was much pressure in this House for the appointment of returning officers some months ago, as a result of the redistribution. It was felt that it was necessary for these people to be appointed in order that they could establish the growing subdivisions, and so on, and this is what is being done.

The expenses that have been incurred, have, I am told by the chief electoral officer, been incurred only by those returning officers who are not able to do this work out of their own homes. This work is being done in every riding across the province. A great many of the electoral officers are able to do it from their own homes, therefore this question of expense does not arise.

I think it is a very responsible move by this government, and when the election comes, we will be all ready to go.

Mr. Nixon: The Prime Minister is, as usual, as plausible as anyone could be under difficult circumstances.

I would like to ask the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, if I may, would the Minister advise the House which inquests were originally assigned to Dr. John Porter and are now re-assigned to other coroners and what specific improper procedures were permitted at inquests conducted by Dr. Porter in the past?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I believe there were four questions asked by hon. members today. I have just received them. I have not had time to get the answers. I shall take them as notice and have the answers tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member for York South care to put his question?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mine is a six part question.

1. For what period has coroner Dr. John Porter been relieved of his duties?

2. Where and for how long will the retraining take place?

3. If the supervising coroner's objections were regarding Dr. Porter's unorthodox procedures, could these not have been corrected either by advising or instructing him to return to normal procedures in future inquests, instead of being relieved of his duties?

4. When was Dr. Porter dismissed from his role as coordinator of the research project into traffic fatalities?

5. How does the Attorney General reconcile this with his assurance to the Legislature on April 24 that the research project was proceeding with more coroners involved in the inquest, but with Dr. Porter as the coordinator?

6. Has the research project now been abandoned? If so, why, and if not under whose direction is it being carried on?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, sitting listening to that question, items four, five and six I can answer immediately.

Dr. Porter has not been relieved of his duty as coordinator of the research project, therefore five and six do not follow really. He is still carrying on the research and all material will be made available to him.

I do know that certain traffic fatality inquests which it was intended he should take, he will not be taking. Other coroners will be assigned, because of his lack of experience and because he permitted certain procedures which were not proper in some inquests which he recently took. He is receiving training and assistance from the acting chief coroner of Toronto, Dr. Cruikshank, and from the Crown attorney. He has not been relieved of his duties in that he is carrying on the research project, and he will be given every facility and every assistance. Nor has he been relieved of his duties as a coroner except with respect to certain inquests. He was asked to take all traffic fatalities, and that we do not think is wise.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Attorney General, does this mean that all of the research work that Dr. Porter will now be conducting will be on the basis of written reports, in other words, second-hand material? None of it will be from his own inquests?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He is quite at liberty to attend all the inquests and hear all the evidence. It will all be presented to him, fully and completely.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) that might be taken as notice if the House leader will agree.

Is the Minister aware that certain welfare recipients are unable to send their children on school-sponsored tours to Expo because they are forced to pay the cost in advance? If so, would he consider making arrangements to have the money paid and deducted from welfare allowances in small monthly instalments?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): You could put it as a lien on their estates.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have two further questions. The first is to the Prime Minister: Will the government consider granting approval of broadcasting the forthcoming Confederation debate, in order that the people of Ontario may be given an opportunity to be more intimately involved?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Is the member referring to the debate that will take place in this House? No consideration has been given to setting up television cameras in this chamber. My answer would be no.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the Prime Minister give it any consideration?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I am inclined to doubt that I will give it any consideration.

An hon. member: A kind of a love-in.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, at this stage you need a love-in with the people of Ontario to recover your image.

Mr. Speaker, my final question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests: In view of the judgment handed down recently by the magistrates court in Welland, in the petty trespass charge against James C. Heaney, which was heard on January 9, 1967, is it the intention of the government to review the 1951 amendment to The Beds of Navigable Waters Act in order that beaches can be restored to the public domain?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, according to the information which I have, the prosecution under The Petty Trespass Act involved the question of ownership of a beach in the township of Bertie, and although the prosecution was not successful, it was not dismissed. This legal situation merely reflects the absence of jurisdiction of a magistrate to determine questions of ownership of land, and cannot be regarded, and is irrelevant, as far as the question of ownership of this particular beach is concerned.

It is the policy of the government to insure that public beaches are available for the public, and likewise, it is the policy of the government to recognize the right of private owners where such exist. Accordingly, where beaches are private, and it is in the public interest that such beaches be made public, such land may be acquired.

The department has a programme for the acquisition of public land which has been

discussed in this House on many occasions. The question of the possibility of reverting to the 1940 legislation has always been before the department, but by reason of its confiscatory nature, such legislation has not been re-introduced.

However, as the hon. member has raised the question, I have asked my departmental officials to review it, and we hope to be able to have some information for the member in due course.

Mr. Singer: What happens to an unsuccessful prosecution that is not dismissed?

Mr. MacDonald: It was dismissed, as a matter of fact, I think.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, April 27, when my estimates were before the House, the hon. member for Grey North made baseless charges, as reported on pages 2741 and 2770—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): That word "baseless"!

Hon. Mr. Haskett: —of the debates respecting the handling of a particular file by the motor vehicle claims fund of my department.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order!

Some hon. members: No, no, sit down!

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, the Minister came across to me before the House and asked if he could read a statement to the House. He did not use the word "baseless" at all, and I agreed to it. What is he trying to pull off here? He can read the charge without the word "baseless", I will go along with that.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Minister proceed with his statement?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I will erase the word "baseless".

Mr. Sargent: That is good.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: But they happen to be.

Several hon. members: Shame, shame!

Hon. Mr. Haskett: As promised, I handed him the file in my office the following morning.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: There is a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is a different point of order. I cannot explain it to you unless you let me talk, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I shall hear it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder on what basis the hon. Minister is allowed to continue a debate which ended the other night, before the orders of the day?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister is within his rights to make a statement regarding a correction of any particular information that came out in his estimates.

Mr. Singer: This is just continuing the debate, Mr. Speaker. The debate is over.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion it is in order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I desire to report to this House, and I believe the hon. member for Grey North will agree, that the entire case has been handled in accordance with the provisions of The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act, and the laws of the province, in an expeditious and efficient manner. The matter is before the courts and the full protection of the courts has been afforded all concerned.

Mr. Singer: It is a political debate, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have a question—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: —a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), he is not here, so it is for the record.

Will the Minister consider changing the present unconditional grants system to provide that all municipalities will receive the same amount per capita?

And the supplementary question I was going to ask him—

An hon. member: No supplementaries until the question is answered.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: A question for the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Will the Minister advise why we cannot have an insurance commissioner in the province of Ontario to establish fairer rates for automobile insurance for Ontario car owners?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would say that is quite a question.

First, there is a superintendent of insurance in the province of Ontario, and that office has been occupied for some several years and is presently occupied by Mr. Cecil Richards.

Mr. Sargent: What did you say it is?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Superintendent of insurance.

Mr. Sargent: What does he do?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well I will just refer you to The Insurance Act, which is available to you, and which I am sure you have read with diligence.

The inference in this question has to do with the suggestion that automobile insurance rates in Ontario compare unfavourably with those in Quebec or the majority of some other jurisdictions.

I might tell you that there was an increase in rates. Rates must be filed with the superintendent's office. There were questions raised of me by correspondence with various people in the past few months about that increase and the matter has been looked at, and is still being looked at. I can report this to you, and I take it that this is the spirit of your question.

The headlines in the newspapers came out and said "Insurance Rates in Ontario"—meaning automobile insurance—"Are Increased; Rates in Quebec Decreased". That was the general substance of the news media's headlines.

The facts of the matter were that rates in Ontario, if I could pick an index of $150 or $160, went up say $6 per policy; and I pick this to illustrate the point. Accordingly there was an increase in rates.

The reduction of rates in the province of Quebec had to do with a premium which, compared with our $150 to $160, was some $250 and $260; and they were reduced approximately $4 to $5 per policy. In other jurisdictions, take Missouri, New York State, Illinois and other areas, the corresponding rates are substantially larger than exist in Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister accept a question supplementary to that?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: Being a fair man, the Minister will agree that other jurisdictions in the United States have their insurance commissioners to check their rates against excessive and discriminatory charges. Why can we not have it in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We do have.

Mr. Sargent: Do you check for excessive rates?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, they do not set the rates; they review them before they go—

Mr. Sargent: Then what powers do they have?

An hon. member: Read the Act.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The power to receive them and approval.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: No power to lower the rates, though?

Mr. Singer: None.

Mr. Sargent: Just a filing clerk, that is all.

Mr. Singer: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Do not get so excited; the hon. member will be having a heart attack over there.

Mr. Singer: No, no, we are very healthy over here.

Mr. Sargent: I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health. I thought it should go to the Minister of Transport, but he has passed the buck to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid I will have to ask the member to direct his question properly.

Mr. Sargent: Well, your office was the one that told me—

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker's office redirected it to the Minister of Health.

Mr. MacDonld: It is easy to pass the buck—

Mr. Sargent: I will let the House be the judge of this.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Give up, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: In view of the findings that a car emits into the air over 5.19 pounds of carbon monoxide fumes each per day, when is the government going to make afterburners compulsory on every car in Ontario?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the answer is to be found in *Hansard*, page 1760.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Minister not know the date?

An hon. member: May 4!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What about the time of day?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: To the same Minister, will the Minister advise why the government is setting up government commission businesses in competition with existing small laundries and drycleaners across the province? I asked this last night in the estimates. How far has this expanded in Ontario, and how far is it planned to be expanded?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, there is no commission associated with my department setting up business in competition with laundries, drycleaners or anybody else throughout the province.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept a question on this? The institute of drycleaners and launderers charge the Minister is setting up central laundries to service hospitals. Is this true or not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, we are not setting up central laundries. Certain central laundries are being set up. The use of those by hospitals is approved by the commission, just as they would approve the use of any laundry which hospital boards would determine to use.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the drycleaners say this, and they claim they can do it at less cost to the taxpayer, why is this allowed to go on?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has answered the question.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce a significant—

Mr. Speaker: One moment, please. I have one more question from the member. I would like to have it completed first.

Mr. Sargent: This is to the Attorney General. He would not accept the other one, but this one he will take.

The question is, in the interest of better law enforcement, will the Ontario police commission consider three levels of entry into the police departments in Ontario:

1. By men joining as police agents as part of an elite crime investigating force?

2. By men joining as police officers to do routine duties?

3. As cadets between 17 and 21 years of age to work primarily with juveniles?

Has the Ontario police commission considered hiring a public relations firm to improve police relations across the province?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce a significant decision in regard to highway and street signs in Ontario. The principle of symbol signs, wherever practical, has been approved, and these signs will conform to the standards adopted by the council on uniform traffic control devices for Canada. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) and I regard this decision as a logical extension of past sign policies, and one that will have substantial benefits to the people of this province.

The greatest possible uniformity of traffic signs is clearly desirable, for the sake of safety as well as the convenience of motorists. It is equally desirable that such signs be clearly recognizable at a glance, and that they be clear to all drivers, whether they are from this province or elsewhere, and whether their native tongue is English or French or some other language. To meet these aims, the best signs are those that convey their message by symbols rather than words.

Ontario has made substantial progress toward uniformity and symbolization in recent years, and this matter has been under continuous study in both The Department of Transport and The Department of Highways.

The effectiveness of the symbol signs adopted to date—curve and turn signs, for example—has proved their worth. This experience gives us a basis for extending this type of device to all the cases for which it is practical.

Symbols have been devised to warn of steep hills, pavement that is slippery when wet, and so on. These signs will be introduced throughout the province, gradually, on a maintenance basis—that is, when new signs

are needed they will be symbol signs in an increasing number of cases. In the introductory stage, the symbol signs will be accompanied by a plate bearing the appropriate wording.

The standards for these signs were worked out by a consortium of technical personnel from across Canada, supported by the Canadian good roads association and the institute of traffic engineers. The present Deputy Minister of Transport has been closely associated with this programme and was chairman of the committee responsible for its development. The symbols are essentially the same as those used in many countries of Europe and in parts of the United States. These standards have been endorsed in principle by the conference of Ministers responsible for road transport in all provinces, and they have been approved specifically in most provinces. Over a period of time I expect that these signs will be uniform across Canada, and uniform internationally.

Mr. Singer: What will the Minister think of next?

Mr. Speaker: I regret that in welcoming the various people to the Legislature today, I omitted a group of students from Windsor with a member of their staff present, under the Speaker's gallery west. We also welcome them to the Legislature this afternoon.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are entered upon, I would like to raise a matter of personal privilege.

It will be recalled that last Monday evening, a heated exchange took place while the House was in committee. Since recollections of such occurrences can sometimes be imperfect, I have refrained from further comment until the official record became available.

I have now had an opportunity to peruse it and, on the basis of that perusal, there is one statement on which I would like to comment.

I am recorded as saying of Mr. M. Solski of Sudbury, and I quote: "He is a commie actually". I believe that statement went too far and I therefore withdraw it.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House of the appointment of Mr. John A. Ross, F.C.A., as financial and accounting adviser to my department on a full time basis.

Mr. Ross has resigned as vice-president and director of Shell Canada Limited, after 20 years with that company, in order to assume his new duties. He brings to the department a long and valued service both in the business world and in the public sector of our community.

He is a commerce graduate of McGill University and worked as a chartered accountant with the federal income tax department in Montreal prior to the second world war. He served in Ottawa as assistant chief of the prices division of the wartime prices and trade board and was assistant chief of the merchandising section of the foreign exchange control board.

He is currently president of the institute of chartered accountants of Ontario, a member of the executive council of the Canadian chamber of commerce, and a past president of the Toronto chapter of the financial executives institute.

Mr. Ross was born in Morrisburg, Ontario, and resides in Toronto and he has already taken up his new position with the department.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 23rd order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

(Concluded)

On vote 810:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the Minister a chance to refute this letter from the dry-cleaners and launderers institute. I think he evaded my question. I do not want to take the time of the House to read it, it is a lengthy letter, but it says in effect that:

> You may or may not have heard about the hassle we have had with the Ontario hospital services commission, and the Ontario Conservative Party, in regard to the establishment of central laundries to service hospitals.
>
> We have an active laundry branch of this institution and we have much useful information, including the setting up of government commission-owned businesses in competition with existing commercial enterprises.
>
> We are sure we can prove rather conclusively that the existing commercial enterprises could handle the laundry problems

of the majority of hospitals in Ontario, at a much lower cost to the voters who pay for the Ontario hospital services commission with regular assessment for hospital care.

This goes on further, but I do not think that this very substantial group of people in the province of Ontario should be given the back of the hand by the Minister who disregards it as being unimportant. Are these people telling an untruth, or what is the story? I would like to know the story from the Minister in this regard.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to add to the story, as my hon. friend calls it, to what was said last year. This matter was the subject of lengthy debate last year. In was gone into very, very thoroughly.

Mr. Sargent: I did not hear the debate last time, I am asking you now.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The debate is in *Hansard* and—

Mr. Sargent: I will not take that for an answer. I want to—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not really interested in what the hon. member will take for an answer. It seems to me, a futile waste of the time of this House, going over something that was very thoroughly discussed and is on the public record, at some expense to the public.

There is nothing further to add. There have been no further developments. I want to put the member's mind clear on one or two points, and I will make them one or two, so they will be firmly implanted upon his mind.

First of all, the business is not being established or operated by any government department or commission. These are non-profit organizations. We do nothing to finance them in any way, shape, or form, other than approve the hospitals using them, if this is the will of the hospital boards. Most hospitals in Ontario have their own laundry.

When a hospital establishes its own laundry, then by law, the government of Ontario must provide certain capital construction grants toward the establishment of the laundry, and, of course, pay for the ongoing costs of operation.

I repeat, sir, that no department—at least not my department—nor the Ontario hospital services commission, either establishes or operates these businesses.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, there is a great concern amongst the industry that you have your finger in the pie someplace. I understand you approve the rates and the charges. Is this correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, this is not correct. When the hospital includes the cost of laundry in its budget, of course it is part of the operating cost of a hospital.

Mr. Sargent: Then may I ask you sir, does the hospital services commission approve of this?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They approve of the budget.

Mr. Sargent: Of setting up this opposition to private industry?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, they do not.

Mr. Sargent: You do not approve of it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member—would he mind sitting down while I try to answer?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member is trying to read something into my words that is not there. The hospital commission has nothing to do with the approval or rejection of the setting up of the business. This is determined by a non-profit organization. If they can establish a laundry, sell their services to hospitals at a competitive price, or at a price more advantageous than the hospitals can either do it themselves or have it done commercially, then they are in business. If it is the desire, or the intention of the board to use the services of such a laundry, they submit the cost of doing the laundry in their budget to the hospital services commission, and the commission then either approves of the budget, or rejects it.

Mr. Sargent: If the Minister tells me that the setting up of a government commission's own business, as quoted here, is not correct, I will inform these people of his remarks.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is not correct.

Mr. Sargent: I cannot understand why a responsible organization like this could write such a letter and I do take the Minister's word for it.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should talk about the bedpan rebellion insofar as nursing is

concerned in Ontario. Recent development in Napanee in the new hospital there, which is about one year old, where they have had five of the top nursing staff fired and the president resigned, because of the fact that the hospital board, and the nurses, could not negotiate an agreement.

This was because the government here announced—putting into effect the legislation brought forth in 1965—the nurses collective bargaining act of 1965—and, to date, the government is sitting upon this matter. It is going to create increasingly more margins of nurses going on strike in the province.

We must, in this field of health and under the estimates we have before us, have a programme to provide more nurses, to pay them a decent compensation and set up this Act of collective bargaining. This is the most serious thing facing Ontario health today, the nursing and doctor shortage.

Many of you may have read in the past months, the exposé in *Maclean's* magazine on the situation in hospitals. It goes on to say:

> At a time when medical science can do more for what ails us than ever before, we, the patients, are asking with disturbing frequency, can I trust the doctor?

We ask the same question about nurses, hospitals and other medical people.

It has not yet reached the proportions of a crisis of confidence, but it is a symptom of a largely unrecognized revolution that is quietly agitating the world of doctors, nurses and hospitals—the people in whose hands we place our lives. Doctors, who sometimes seem unable to agree whether a toenail is ingrown or not, currently display an alarming unanimous belief not only that Canada is perilously short of doctors, but many of those now treating patients, GP's particularly, are badly or inadequately trained and not necessarily good at the job.

Nurses, the case in point here today, whose principal off-duty concern has long been the alleged poverty level of their pay, are beginning to show even more concern at Canada's dependence on immigrant nurses, and the way nurses are trained and then misused in our hospitals across Ontario. The nation's hospitals, faced with a waiting list of thousands, are probably plagued with the question, "Are hospitals a safe place to be sick?"

The medical profession, Mr. Chairman, is split with bitter wrangling over whether Canada should stake its future health on the general practitioner or the specialist. Nurses are muttering rebelliously about slave labour, they call it, which has them doing menial jobs in hospitals and which may be the real reason for the so-called nurse shortage.

Getting on to the shortage in doctors, one survey in this story suggests that around a quarter of the nation's 10,500 GP's—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is dealing with a matter that has already been dealt with under the first vote of my estimates, the shortage of doctors.

Mr. Sargent: All right, I will leave the doctors then. We will talk about the nurses and the way you are handling them.

In 1965, six per cent of the nurses graduating from high school went into the nursing profession. Today, only five per cent of the girls graduating from high school go into the nursing profession. We know, the Minister knows, everyone knows, that the image of the nurse is changing. The image of Florence Nightingale—of the angel of mercy —this image has changed. I think one of the main reasons, Mr. Chairman, has been the apathy of this Minister, of this government and of hospital boards across the province and they will have to do something about it. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that two-thirds of the nurses in this province are working in hospitals. Here is a matter of control that you could do something about.

We much have first of all a recruiting campaign. We do not have a recruiting campaign under this Minister's jurisdiction. How can you make this profession attractive to nurses, when you pay them $80 a week? That is your pay for nurses here. In the United States, the record shows that salaries are 30 per cent higher, with better working conditions.

In the field of education, we have girl students with no more education, less training, and certainly doing a lot less work, making many hundreds of dollars more a year than the nurses are. But these are a favoured group because they have legislation that allows them to do collective bargaining to force the government to give them decent wages. Now we have an Act before the House since 1965 to enable the nurses to get enabling legislation to let them negotiate to get a fair, decent wage—but the nursing profession gets the back of the hand. And the shocking situation results from the Minister of Health who should be going to bat for the nurses. The doctors are doing all right, I will tell you.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He goes to bat for the doctors.

Mr. Sargent: He sure does, but he is doing nothing because he will not pass this legislation.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is it in order to discuss legislation during the estimates?

Mr. Sargent: I think it should be a matter of record that the member for London South is against nurses getting decent salaries.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would suggest to the member—

Mr. White: On a point of order, I have been working for nurses in this Legislature for eight years, so do not be so silly.

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not sit down then?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. White: Let us keep this debate in order, please.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member for Grey North if he will please try to restrict his remarks to the Ontario hospital services vote before us.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will make my remarks as brief as I can, to make a case for nurses.

This article goes on to talk about the nursing shortage, about the slave labour we have in our hospitals here. It goes on to say that, "Now the nurses are in the midst of what one would call a bedpan rebellion in the hospitals. The first target is the traditional training system"—which the Minister might have something to do with. "Historically nurses have always been trained in hospitals during a three-year unpaid course."

I think they pay them now maybe $20 a month to go through this training. I quote:

> A year which they spend working in wards which some have described as slave labour, some better hospitals have begun to abandon this system, but there is an increasing tendency to have nurses' education taken out of the hospital hands and placed in independent schools such as the Nightingale school of nursing in Toronto.

This, I know, the Minister has had something to do with.

> There the girls become registered nurses in two years, spending around half the time in various hospitals doing jobs designed to keep them and not to do odd jobs that they call slave labour.

Now I think what we need in this training programme is to have a programme set up—in the end result—producing nursing teams such as nursing aides, practical nurses and finally registered nurses to make this whole big ball of wax we call health in this province tick. We have literally billions of dollars tied up in physical assets in hospitals.

Mr. S. Lewis: Is that metaphor permissible, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Sargent: Well, you would probably say it better. I am not very good at this talking business, but I want to get across my point that this government is giving a real snow job to the nursing profession. On this nurses collective bargaining act, 1965—I am shocked to see that some men, who have the lucky break to be called Ministers of the Crown, can sit there and see maybe 12,000 to 15,000 wonderful people get short shrift because of apathy and lack of intestinal fortitude on behalf of the already known lackadaisical government.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think the member should go into any specific Act. I think we should now stay with the vote.

Mr. Sargent: I want to show the House, Mr. Chairman, how through the Ontario hospital services commission—which we are discussing in this vote now—the government, in not having put this Act into effect, precludes this body of people from collectively and effectively bargaining.

Mr. Chairman: Discussion on a bill or on an Act or anything else of that nature would be properly part of the Budget debate, and I would ask the member if he will—

Mr. Sargent: The whole problem seems to be who is going to be part of the bargaining unit—the general staff, the head nurses—where is the cut-off line? That is the key in this negotiation problem here.

Now we have a lot of people who should be included in this, but there is no provision in this for the director of nursing. They cannot be included in the bargaining unit.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well Mr. Chairman, this has absolutely nothing to do with my estimates, whatsoever.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the head of the nursing profession, the president elected last week, said that the way your government is handling it is a real shambles. This group have been waiting for two years for action.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This has nothing to do with my estimates at all.

Mr. Sargent: Well it certainly has, and unless you get this nursing business straight, you are going to be in real trouble.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! We have to stay with the vote before us.

Mr. Sargent: This case in point in Napanee; a new hospital built last year called the Lennox and Addington hospital. There are 30 to 40 nurses in this—I am talking about nurses, Mr. Chairman—and they have been suffering growing pains. They have got a beautiful small hospital there, but in the last two weeks the two head nurses, two supervisors and one other nurse were fired by the administrator.

Now on top of that, the chairman of the hospital board, Mr. Fred Creighton, resigned because he was very unhappy at the way the nurses were treated. Now they have approached Mr. Lloyd Sharp of the RNAO of Ontario, who represents 12,000 nurses, to go down and patch things up. Now I would ask the Minister what weapons does he have to go down and do a patching job here? Because there is no bargaining machinery for him to work with, and if all the nurses were allowed to be part of a certificated unit they could bargain collectively and they could settle the whole matter.

I think it is time that we had this Act into effect. I understand that the Minister of Labour has told of a meeting the Minister had with them shortly, that it was under study and this is the old ploy. When they get into a jam they say it is under—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. This is labour, this has nothing to do with The Department of Health.

Mr. Sargent: Well all right. I will finalize it by saying—thank you for cutting me off—they are going to name this a grey hospital unless they reappoint those nurses. Now you are going to be in trouble, real bad trouble, Mr. Minister, if this happens across the province through neglect of these nurses. Yet you sit there smugly, and flirt back and forth with your clowns in the back row there—

Mr. Chairman: Order, now, order please!

Mr. Sargent: I do not care, this is not a small matter. This is a very important matter.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, that remark should be withdrawn. The members of this House—

Mr. Sargent: Well I say they look like clowns, the way they are grinning back and forth.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Any clowns sir, are on the other side.

Mr. Sargent: We have the hospitals of Ontario listed as grey-listed hospitals because he will not do anything. It is a serious matter. So I think it is time we got up and did something positive for the nurses of this province.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to get involved in this nurse problem, but I think maybe we ought to put the record straight. Some of us have had a lot of experience with hospitals and with nurses in training, and I think maybe if I stay with nurses and hospitals I am on the vote. I do not want the Chairman to rule me out of order.

Mr. Chairman: No, except I say to the member for Niagara Falls that negotiations on labour contracts, wages, and so on, would properly come under The Department of Labour, not under this particular Minister.

Mr. Bukator: My experience takes me back quite some time, Mr. Chairman. I sat on a hospital board for some nine or ten years. We have dealt with problems of the nurses—the graduate nurses naturally—and with the student nurses in hospitals. I must make the point that my colleague from Grey North was touching on. These young ladies work—or did work at that time—for some $15 to $18 a month, and they did the routine work.

Now I believe, when I tell you this, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the members, that the member for Grey North and I both have daughters who have graduated as nurses. We know the problem. They came home weekly with the little difficulties they had to contend with in the work that they do, and I might say on behalf of all these nurses—most of them that I have met—have worked hard to serve their fellow man and to assist humanity when they are badly in need, that they never complained. At least my folks never complained about the money they were getting for the training that they did receive.

They were not there to fight for their rights to be paid well. They were there to serve their fellow man and they did a good job.

Now I would think under those circumstances, since they are that type of people—

and there are many of them in the province here—that someone should take up the battle for them and give them an opportunity to make a decent wage, a living wage, such as my friend was speaking about.

I cannot apparently touch on the bill, but if all it requires is Royal assent, then I cannot see why the government is preventing this from happening. There is not a man in this House, I do not believe, who would not want to see this happen.

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh sure there is.

Mr. Bukator: Well, I wonder whether the back benchers go along with the Cabinet? It would appear to me that this is good business to give these youngsters an opportunity to live as well as the rest of the people in our society. They do not speak for themselves, a very few do. You did have a march here on Queen's Park a year or so ago, when some 2,000 nurses came to tell you that they do have a problem. Someone must speak for them.

I commend my friend from Grey North for bringing this before the Minister. I am sure that the Minister is in a position, Mr. Chairman, to influence the proper authorities to bring about satisfactory legislation; to give the youngsters who have served humanity and served them well at least a wage as good as the teachers, because I think they render a service as well if not a little better. The hours are long, and I can assure you that the work that they have to do for the first year or two is something that makes one wonder why they would contend with this kind of treatment. One wonders why they would take this kind of abuse from the professional men they have to work under.

Sometimes you believe—or at least the doctors would have you believe—that this kind of training is good for them to keep them humble and in their place. They have followed through, they have served you, the province of Ontario and they have served you well. The least that this government can do is to give them an opportunity to make a living wage. This is not asking for too much.

On the problem of this non-profit organization that has gone into the laundry business, is there someone in the Minister's department who can tell me the name of this particular group? Is there someone in the department who could tell me what particular group of people they are in the non-profit laundry business? Why would a group of people go into a non-profit business? I thought people got into business to make a living.

Now I say this to you, that we have had similar representation, at least I have had, of the laundry people and of the drycleaning establishments, who have told me in no uncertain terms that this has cut into their business. And I can say this, that if there ever was a group of people in Ontario that are interested in free enterprise, it is the government. They do not interefere with private enterprise, at least that is what I was led to believe since I have been here, and yet here is where they are cutting into private enterprise whereby it is costing them millions of dollars annually.

Now, the member for Grey North talked about his area, and I speak of the Niagara peninsula. The association there has come to me and said that its business is being hurt; claiming they are paying taxes, paying drivers and maintaining trucks, and this action could be the difference between staying in business and having to quit.

Under those circumstances, Mr. Chairman, someone should look into this particular problem, at least give them an opportunity to bid on that business, to give them a chance to re-establish themselves in the society of ours again, to work in a competitive field rather than have some particular group of people undermine them by doing the business on a non-profit basis. I am sure, sir, that if someone were to look into the thing, they would find someone would have to be paid; no one works for nothing, except maybe the nurses. But I would like very much to get a little information on this; how much of the business have they taken from our establishments; and why does the government allow it?

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I was rather surprised at the Minister's attitude to the statements made by the hon. member for Grey North, because I never have heard such a clear, concise and unequivocal statement of policy.

He made it short and concise and, I thought, to the point. All the hon. member for Grey North said was this: one, this province has had a very critical nurse shortage and still has a nurse shortage; two, that this nurse shortage was a result of their being underpaid—and the hon. Minister agreed that the nurses had been underpaid, because he stressed yesterday, I believe it was, that nurses, in the last few years, have received what he considered to be inordinately high rises in salary, he mentioned percentages.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am nowhere recorded as having said that the nurses, or anybody else in the hospital field, had had inordinately large increases in salary.

Mr. Ben: I stand to be corrected in that the Minister did not use those words, but I stand by my position that the Minister's implication, in reciting the percentages of these increases, was an implication that they had received high increases and that it was due to their salaries being low in the first instance.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I want it recorded that I did not imply any such statement.

Mr. Ben: Fine, I will accept the hon. Minister's statement.

The present rate that is approved by the Ontario hospital services commission is in the range of $480 a month. If we take the maximum rate of $480 a month, that is a total of $5,760 a year. This amounts to less than one dollar per day more than the salaries paid to the common, unskilled labourer, in the city of Toronto and in the Metropolitan Toronto area, who does not have to have any educational qualifications for his job. It is less than one dollar a day difference. Now that is if the nurses are receiving a maximum of $480 a month.

Mr. Sargent: They get $400 a month.

Mr. Ben: The range is $400 to $480 a month. That is the salary scale.

What the hon. member for Grey North was saying, was that this is inadequate under today's circumstances. He also stated, again very concisely to the Minister, that the nurses, after being trained here, go to other jurisdictions—and the Minister mentioned these jurisdictions as not having adequate nursing training facilities. They go to these other jurisdiction because they are attracted by the higher salaries.

The hon. member went on to point out that because of the fifth point, that is, the nurses going into other jurisdictions, because of higher salaries, the Minister's department had to put into operation, a crash programme to train nurses to replace not only the ones who are leaving the jurisdiction, but to try to bring the number up to par.

Seven, when these nurses leave, we have to train their replacements, so we not only lose the services of these nurses, but we lose the capital cost we have invested in their training.

The point that the hon. member for Grey North made very clearly and concisely, was that if we paid the nurses enough in the first instance, they would not be going to other jurisdictions, we would not have to set up a crash training programme and we would not have had a nursing shortage.

What was wrong with the submissions made by the hon. member in that regard? I can see no scope for argument.

While we are on this $400 to $480 range, the commissioner is sitting in front of the Minister and advising him; we had a strong debate here—a very loud debate about commissions which appear before the standing committee on government commissions.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this hon. Minister advise the commissioner, his advisor, that certain members, at least in the Opposition ranks, are getting sick and tired of having a report put on their desks by the commissioner, a good report I will admit, which contains all the facts and figures and then have to go to a standing committee and sit there and listen to the same thing being read to them as if they were incapable of reading English.

I want it to go on record now—this is the Minister's department, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this has nothing to do with my estimates whatsoever.

Mr. Ben: This is the Ontario hospital services commission and the Minister's responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: May I finish my point of order? I submit to you, sir, that if the hon. member has anything to say about the procedures in the committee for commissions, it should be done there, not in the course of my estimates.

Mr. Ben: On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, this Minister is responsible for these estimates.

Mr. Chairman: All the members of the House realize that the Minister is responsible for the estimates of the House. He speaks well on his point of order. I remind the member for Bracondale that it is not the procedure of the committee which is before us at the present time, it is the estimates. I would ask him if he would stay with the estimates.

Mr. Ben: I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for your impartiality. However, the item that is before us is Ontario hospital services commission. And this is the Minister who is responsible for the adminis-

tration of the Ontario hospital services commission. They sit there as his advisors and—although, albeit, we are not supposed to recognize their presence there—I would suggest that it is high time that he also did some advising of his advisors.

The fact is that the hon. members, at least in the Opposition ranks, do know how to read; we are not shortsighted that we have to have great big placards—

Mr. Chairman: I was listening to the member. I must once again remind him that even if what he said is true, that they are responsible from the standpoint of the Ontario hospital commission, it has nothing to do with the committee procedure.

Mr. Ben: Oh, I am not talking about the committee procedure, I am talking about this department wasting the taxpayers' money. They waste the taxpayers' money by printing reports which obviously they expect will not be read, for if they did expect them to be read, they would not get up and recite the same thing like children do poetry in school. If they expected it to be read, they would not waste the taxpayers' money on making huge four-by-two enlargements of the figures contained in the report—because the hon. members here are not blind nor are they shortsighted. If there is any criticism of their sight, it is that they are farsighted.

The Minister's department and this particular commission is wasting the taxpayers' money in preparing those reports, preparing those great big signs and calling all the people to sit in that committee, when they know they will never be reached for questioning because they are going to spend all the time reading that report, which is already on the members' desks.

Mr. Chairman: Being a member of that committee, I do not think it comes under this particular vote. And as a member of that committee, of course, if you do not want to hear the report, you can ask it be stopped, you do not have to listen to reports in committee, if the majority of members present concur.

I would like to stay with the vote before us.

Mr. Ben: I have made my point, Mr. Chairman, I will sit down.

Mr. Sargent: Speaking to the administration of hospitals: in view of the fact that two-thirds of the nurses of Ontario are working in hospitals, would the Minister advise the House when this collective bargaining Act of 1965 will come into effect?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, first of all, this belongs rightly in The Department of Labour, but I would put the hon. member's mind straight on this. There is no collective bargaining Act passed by this House in respect of nurses.

The hon. member for Niagara Falls spoke about having Royal assent and proclamation. There is no such Act on the statute books.

Mr. Sargent: If there is not any such Act before The Department of Labour, then the RNAO are way up the creek without a paddle, because this is the only—

Mr. Chairman: I must remind the member, once again, that this discussion of the Act—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want to get this point across to you that you cannot staff hospitals without nurses. I am talking about nurses and they cannot operate effectively unless they have a proper flow of nurses.

Mr. Chairman: Your statement is fully in order but when you discuss the Act you are out of order.

Mr. Bukator: Apparently there is no Act.

Mr. Sargent: There is no Act and I want to—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is no Act.

Mr. Chairman: Then it is definitely out of order. No question about it. It is out of order.

Mr. Bukator: The Cabinet should come through with something worthwhile.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is not the time or the place.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I will leave that for a moment. I think there is a great master job of evasion going on. Will the Minister tell the House then, how he thinks that he can help the RNAO get collective bargaining, so that they can have an instrument to work with? Would you just tell the House please how they should go about it, and, by golly, if you cannot, we are in trouble.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): The Labour Relations Act.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well then, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid he is in trouble because—

Mr. Sargent: No, you are the one that is in trouble.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I ask again that we stick to our estimates. The collective bargaining with the RNAO has got nothing to do with the hospital services commission estimates.

Mr. Sargent: That is par for the course. I say indirectly this is the key—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not—

Mr. Sargent: —to the administration of hospitals. We are talking about the administration of Ontario hospital services commission. You cannot work without nurses. How are they going to continually effectively operate the hospitals without nurses? Now how are the nurses going to get an instrument—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I will say to the member, once again, that if he wants to discuss labour matters he can bring it before the labour Minister but that it not properly before us at this time.

Mr. Sargent: I will talk about, then, the flow of nurses and the pay of nurses. How will the Minister go about continuity of these matters?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I stated yesterday how nurses' salaries are arrived at. There is little point in repeating what is already on the public record.

The negotiations for salaries take place between hospital boards—who are the employers of the nurses—and the nurses themselves, or all the other employees or their representatives. When this is agreed upon, the budget is submitted to the commission and is either rejected or approved, and that is how these matters are arrived at.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Minister agree that the nursing profession should have the same rights and privileges as teachers—that they should have legislation that would allow them to have collective bargaining? We have collective bargaining in Quebec and in British Columbia, but they cannot have it in the province of Ontario, and I ask you, why?

Mr. Chairman: Once again I must remind the member that I ask him to stay with the vote before us.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I must apologize, but I think the Minister should tell this House that under the present set-up the nurses of Ontario cannot bargain collectively, or continue to stay in business with hospital boards, because he will not give them the machinery.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows perfectly well that under The Labour Relations Act the nurses can now—and have already demonstrated—their ability to bargain. They have established bargaining procedures in some hospitals. I cannot name them here, but this has been established and they have the right. And it is not the most desirable method, according to them. Now I myself am out of order, sir, but I would like to bring some kind of finality to this discussion, because it does not rightly belong here.

The fact remains, the nurses can bargain under The Labour Relations Act as it now stands.

Mr. Chairman: The Labour Relations Act—

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, two questions to the Minister. If the board sits down and negotiates the wages of the nurses in that individual hospital—has this happened? How many applications have come before the hospital services commission to approve an increase in wages for the nurses? How many applications have come before them and how many have been rejected?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No agreement which has been the result of negotiations has ever been rejected by the hospital services commission.

Mr. Bukator: You cannot recall in an instant how many have applied?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I am sorry, I could not tell you. I could find it for the hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister, can the nurses of Ontario go on strike?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: What will happen, Mr. Chairman, if the RNAO blacklists the Napanee hospital?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have no idea.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if I could enter at this point, I think the member for Grey North is making a very salient observation. The nursing profession is in a state of open rebellion and in a state of very severe oppression. One need not corroborate it by any other mechanism than by reading the

RNAO publication each month wherein the rebellion is stated hospital by hospital, demand by demand, request for bargaining after request for bargaining. And there is no question—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, once again I have to rise on a point of order. Bargaining does not come into my estimates in any way, shape or form. This is a labour matter, I submit to you, sir.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I simply am not going to be sucked into this very confined limitation of the estimate.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is for you to rule, sir.

Mr. S. Lewis: You are not asking the Chairman to rule. I will offer an observation and then maybe the—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Will the member resume his seat please? The Minister has stood in his place on a point of order. He has indicated that this does not properly come before us and is a matter for The Labour Relations Act. I would ask the members to deal with this specific vote before us under the OHSC of vote 810 and not under The Labour Relations Act.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about The Labour Relations Act. We are merely saying, sir, I put to you—

Mr. Chairman: Bargaining comes under The Labour Relations Act and not under this vote.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, there will inevitably be a certain overlap in the way in which the Opposition presents its case. If, in fact, there is a breakdown in the hospital functioning in the province of Ontario because nurses feel aggrieved at the nature of the work and the level of their salaries, this becomes the responsibility of the Minister of Health.

I am not suggesting one alternative solution or another. I am saying to the Minister now, that he is faced with this background. That is what has animated this discussion for the last three quarters of an hour—this breakdown. What is he prepared to do about it?

Mr. Chairman: I am suggesting to the member for Scarborough West, as well as the member for Grey North that I rule it out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in 1965 the nurses, through their association, to get higher salaries, better training facilities, and better treatment, came to the Minister of Health and presented to him an agreement that they wanted separate legislation whereby they could get the things they wanted out of life. That was in 1965, to make the big hospital services commission work. Now they gave them that agreement. I would like to ask the Minister what happened to the agreement the nurses submitted to him? What happened to it? And if you have—okay, go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well I will wait until you finish your question.

Mr. Sargent: Answer that one first, please.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the nurses in 1965 did not come to me with any agreement. They came to government and presented a typed bill which they asked to have considered by government and—

Mr. Sargent: What was it called?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —it was the decision of government that this matter should rest in the hands of The Department of Labour, which department has responsibility for all other labour matters.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this Minister can stand here and will refuse—he says it was not called the nurses' collective bargaining Act. They submit it was that. He will not tell us the name of the Act. Does he know what the name of the Act was?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North, once again I must remind you that the negotiations for labour do not come under—

Mr. Sargent: May I ask the Chairman how we would find out about nurses' salaries? How do we find out about them?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have already told them what they are.

Mr. Chairman: The negotiations for nurses' salaries, as I understand it, would come under The Department of Labour and under the labour standards branch, or the labour standards code. They would not come under this Minister.

Now the argument that was advanced formerly from the standpoint of shortage of nurses I permitted because it came within the ambit of this vote. But when we come into labour relations matters, it is not before us.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. Chairman: I must remind the member that the ruling of the chair is not debatable.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am not debating the ruling of the chair, Mr. Chairman. I am just a little baffled. For three years, we have been discussing the position of the nurses in these estimates each year and I can remember an extensive discussion of shift differential and the amount of money that would accrue, with the Minister of Health. I can remember an intensive discussion on the levels of pay for—

Mr. Chairman: You say you are not debating my ruling and you continue to debate it.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am reminding you, Mr. Chairman, that your ruling is inhibiting any intelligent discussion of the nursing shortage.

Mr. Chairman: I am suggesting to the member whether it was for three years or 30 years, it is out of order now.

Mr. S. Lewis: All right, let me take it from an entirely different angle. I will accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, although I will indulge myself in the observation that it baffles me.

Could the Minister tell the House whether he is at all concerned about a purported shortage of nurses in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, we continue to be concerned about it, Mr. Chairman, and we are steadily pushing our programme forward to correct this shortage. With the expansion of existing schools, the continual moving forward of the opening of regional schools, we have in view the correction of this shortage and the keeping apace with the demands for nursing services.

Mr. S. Lewis: What does the Minister think causes the shortage? What factors contribute to the shortage of nurses in the province of Ontario at this time?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There are many factors. I think the most important one is the fact that our province is growing rapidly, we are steadily increasing the number of beds, putting forward greater demands for nurses and the sophistication of medical practice in large measure is causing an increased demand for nurses. The 40-hour week, of course, was the biggest single factor in the last 15 years, increasing the demand for nurses. There is no doubt, of course, that the outflow of nurses, the so-called brain drain, is one of the factors; but this is not all a one-way street. Indeed, I am just told that we registered approximately 1,100 nurses from other jurisdictions to practise in Ontario last year, so it is not all a one-way street, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: It is not becoming for a backbencher of the Opposition to flog an hon. Minister who has done so much for health in this province, and I say that sincerely, but I cannot understand him, Mr. Chairman, being so reticent to tell us the facts to help a great profession that he should be concerned with. I know there must be some reason. He tells us that the nurses in Ontario cannot go on strike but they can in other jurisdictions, in Quebec, Alberta and B.C. they can. But he says they cannot in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: We are getting back into the labour—

Mr. Sargent: How can these people then fight for better wages, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: You are getting back into—

Mr. Sargent: I am back on the vote of nurses getting better wages. But it is a shocking thing that intelligent people can sit here, and you sit there and tell me my verbiage must be along with some cockeyed rules you set up to help the government. Let us get on and talk—

Mr. Chairman: Now, now, I know the member does not mean this.

Mr. Sargent: I certainly do mean it.

Mr. Chairman: Well then I will have to ask him to sit down, resume his seat, and stay within the vote, that is all.

Mr. Sargent: I will sit down and stand up again. I would like the Minister to tell me, to tell this House—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would like to tell you too, but I would not dare.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sargent: I could tell you a few things too.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the Minister—I think we could stand here and ask him the same question all day and I would be within my rights, Mr. Chairman. But I expect this House to find out how he plans to help

the nurses get an instrument whereby they can better their lot insofar as wages, working conditions, and so on. How does he plan to do that?

Mr. Kerr: That is under The Labour Relations Act.

Mr. Sargent: That is not under The Labour Relations Act.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have no answer for this question. I have gone over and over and over it, and no answer I have been able to give has satisfied the hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I still do not know the Minister's position. Is he going to do something for the nurses or not? I want an answer to that question, please.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have no comment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will make some brief observations then within this vote because obviously we are going to get absolutely nowhere at all in eliciting responses.

No. 1, the nursing profession is in a crisis of confidence, it is losing its numbers in an absolute way every year and hospital services and related services are seriously affected. That is No. 1.

No. 2, Mr. Chairman. It is a seriously oppressed profession with lines of authoritarianism operating in one hospital after another from the administrative class of nurses imposing their will on the subordinate groups.

No. 3, it has no adequate salary range or no adequate working conditions and there is, Mr. Chairman, no question whatsoever that the Minister of Health has to ally himself with the nursing profession in the seeking of their demands if he is to rescue that profession from open rebellion.

And No. 4, Mr. Chairman, it is incumbent on government and the Minister of Health to step in when there is a serious crisis in health services. It is not sufficient to talk about maintaining the pace of providing nursing schools, because indeed one of the aspects of the nurses' rebellion is in the nature of these schools, some of which reduce them to serfdom during the training period.

Now, there is just no question, Mr. Chairman, that the hierarchical structure of the nursing profession and the internal dissension which was evident in the formation of TAPPIN in 1964, and the move within the RNAO in 1965, and the tremendous acceleration of militancy over the last two years—comparable only in the teaching profession—renders this profession at an explosive point in its evolution. It is up to the Minister to respond, and it is simply not sufficient to dismiss with such a cavalier authority the observation of the member for Grey North or any other member of the Opposition in this House.

Our concerns about the nursing profession are pretty serious concerns and they are felt within the profession itself. That is why they have advanced so many briefs; that is why they have pressed government with such vigour over the last two years, akin to nothing, but nothing, comparable in the decade before. The whole character of that profession is changing, and they have far outpaced government and this Minister will face an impossible situation six months from now if he is not prepared to respond to that revolution within the nursing profession.

Now that is all we are asking on this side of the House; some kind of explanation of how the Minister will respond, and he can stay quite apart from The Department of Labour if he wishes to do so in his reply. But we feel this earnestly and feel it strongly, and there is no getting away from it, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The member in his usual own inimitable way with wild, extravagant and unfounded statements has brought a blight upon a profession that has for years done a tremendous job.

Mr. Sargent: What are you doing about it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This nonsense about serfdom is so out-dated that it just has no place in the modern scheme of things at all. Why, we would not attract 100 girls into nursing—

Mr. Sargent: I do not see doctors carrying any bedpans around.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would just sincerely say, Mr. Chairman—without any rancour whatsoever—that if the bedpan revolution starts, I hope the hon. member is caught in full stream.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would—

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has listened to members of the House and I would ask them to give him the same courtesy when he replies.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: And I hope the bedpans are full.

I would say again, sir, that this claptrap about serfdom in the schools for the education of nurses is ridiculous in the extreme. We would not attract 100 girls—we would not attract a dozen girls—if that sort of condition obtained these days. The schools of nursing today are on a par at least with any of the post-secondary school educational institutions.

It was my privilege, and something of which I am very proud, to stimulate the establishment of the college of nurses so that the profession would direct its own destinies in the matter of education. We established what we accepted as government policy in the matter of education, that the schools for nursing would follow an educational experience for two years, that to be augmented by a final third year of internship, just as all those almost in the health profession observe now. There is no honorarium paid during the first two years, because this is purely a post-secondary educational experience; there is no charge levied against the student with the exception of a very, very few schools; they are provided with free room and board; they are not reduced to the level of serfdom or slavery, as my hon. friend put it; and I am quite certain—

Mr. Sargent: What about what they say in the magazine?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am quite certain that no student in nursing, who is really a good student in nursing, would ever say—and I am quite certain that neither of the daughters of the two hon. members, both of whom are good nurses, has ever told their dad—that they were treated as slaves, or subjected to serfdom; nor were they badly treated by the hierarchial strain that my hon. friend, the member for Scarborough West—

Mr. S. Lewis: The ward nurses have been in rebellion against the hierarcy of the nursing profession in the hospitals for ten years now —that is why the change in the RNAO, and that is well known.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health has nothing to do with the way the girls treat each other. I am not going to run around after them and hang on to their apron strings and say, "No, you must not talk in that way to this little girl". Believe me, Mr. Chairman, these nurses are a pretty keen bunch of youngsters and they can handle all of their own battles, and they do not need any of my hon. friends, nor me, to fight their battles for them.

Rest assured of that, sir, they are doing a very good job in every sense.

Mr. Sargent: That is a ridiculous statement —12,000 nurses want a change and the Minister will do nothing about it.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Oh, the member is not really mad, he knows that.

Mr. Sargent: Twelve thousand want a change and there is nothing done about it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the fears that the member for Scarborough West has. I can see no great crisis arising in six months, nor do any of those who are close to the hospital situation. I think the nurses are handling their own situation, so far as working conditions are concerned, in a very logical and reasonable fashion. I am quite certain they will be able to handle it well, and to their own satisfaction.

This discussion, sir, started with some questions about a central laundry. First of all, may I assure my hon. friend, the member for Niagara Falls, that I cannot understand how any of the laundries in his area are concerned, because there is not a central laundry there. The hospitals are doing the laundry the way they have always done it, either through commercial laundries or through their own laundry. Hospitals themselves can now build a laundry and many of them have done so.

Mr. Bukator: The concern is that it started in other areas in the province and they can see it spreading out. The association there said, "Please can you do anything, as a member representing us; we do not want this to happen here because we are taxpayers and we do not want this kind of an institution by government to put us out of business."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, even if a central laundry does start in the area, they will only be doing the hospital laundry. This is a cooperative. I called it non-profit—it is a non-profit, a cooperative venture. It is not in the business of making money.

Usually, the board that establishes the central laundry is composed of members from the boards of the hospitals who will utilize the services. They establish the service, they borrow the money to build—and that, of

course, is amortized over a number of years and built into the cost of doing the laundry.

When this venture was undertaken in Toronto here, I am sure hon. members will recall, sir, that there were two alternatives given us by the hospitals involved—either they were to do it this way, or each hospital was to build its own laundry. If each hospital had built its own laundry, as is the traditional pattern, it would have cost this government many hundreds of thousands of dollars in capital grants alone.

It seemed only reasonable, sensible and economical to us, because we retained a firm of laundry consultants to study this whole matter, and it was their view that this was the cheaper and more efficient way to do the job. I would also point out that this is not a new concept at all.

In one part of the province, I think the central laundry has been going since 1949, and I can also say, sir, that if I were to look back to *Hansard* where my estimates were considered over the last eight years, I am quite positive that I could pick out statements of hon. members opposite who advocated the establishment of centralization of laundries, just as is now being advocated for centralization of drug purchases.

Rest assured, Mr. Chairman, that if we get into this, five, ten years after it, hon. members will be coming back and criticizing this move for putting private industry out of business. We believe that this is a good thing, the hospitals themselves have told us they believe it is a good thing and that this is the only way they will have it. Either that or build their own laundries, which would cost the taxpayers of the province a great deal more money.

Mr. S. Lewis: Just to follow on this for a moment. If the quality of my statements are extravagant, I shall not bother to comment on the Minister's bedpan allusions.

But I do want to comment on this business of holding the apron strings of the nurses in the hospital, because that is on a par with his remark of last year about public health doctors keeping their hands off his baby, so to speak.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that when there is a crisis in a given medical profession, or medical discipline, it is incumbent on the Minister to intervene. When that crisis involves working conditions in hospitals, and the nurses' feeling of discrimination in their job and in their work, then it is important that he intervene.

When their association collectively comes to him for whatever reason, it is important that he view them with sympathy and respond to their requests. There can be no argument, Mr. Chairman, no argument at all, that the nursing shortage is severe. If one looks at the figures—and, again, I wish I had them here because I must admit I should have had the little table with me which was printed in the last issue of the RNAO journal, where the entry into the teaching profession, and the entry into the nursing profession, was compared from 1954 to 1966.

One showed a regular increase in the percentage of those who moved into the teaching profession, and a regular decrease in the percentage of those who moved into the nursing profession over the last decade—because of the intolerable conditions in the nursing profession to which young trainees are subjected. Surely there can be no dispute over that.

It is historically true that the nursing profession has been an authoritarian profession in its organization, and that that is part of the rebellion at the moment. But beyond that, Mr. Chairman, it is a more sophisticated rebellion and I am perfectly willing to concede that it is more sophisticated, in the sense that the nurses have learned the importance of collective pressure and a collective statement of their case.

I think that is what is so unsettling to the government, that whereas one had a fairly timid, reticent and retiring group, one now has an entirely militant body insisting that the government respond; insisting that the elements of the service, particularly in the hospitals, that are akin to authoritarian organization or to serfdom, however extravagant the term, that the Minister wipe it out; and that the Minister step in and take some control and direct his resources, his energy, his capacities, in that area.

There is absolutely nothing wrong with that—that is the job of the Minister of Health. It is not every man or every woman for himself in the medical field and the allied disciplines. Mr. Chairman, it is important that the Minister exercise some authority if there is a crisis in the profession.

Now whether it stems from articles in the newspapers of two years ago, or the changes in the RNAO, or the article in *Maclean's* magazine which the member for Grey North quoted from at some length, it is all there, it is all set out. However passive the Ontario hospital services commission may be, and

however resigned and uninterested the Minister of Health may be, the crisis persists, and it is in the areas that have been marked out during the course of this debate this afternoon, and one would only wish that we could somehow reach the Minister.

For two years, the Riverdale hospital remained with three floors empty because there were no nurses. When you want to expand in the hospital area in this Metropolitan Toronto vicinity, Mr. Chairman, one of the first things that the hospital superintendent and administrators will tell you is, "Where will we get the ward nurses from?" When you make a case-by-case examination of the Ontario hospital system, it is the registered nurses who are lacking in that system, in its efficient functioning.

No matter where one turns, the shortage is severe and compelling. And all the Minister can say is that this is part of the responsibility of The Department of Labour. That will not be an answer to the profession, it will merely depress them and increase the state of their militancy. I do not think that the Minister should feel that he has to drive the nursing profession to the wall.

I see no reason, whatsoever, that he should put them in that equivocal and untenable position. He should be on their side, speaking on their behalf to the administrators, working on their behalf with hospital boards, pressing all their demands on his colleagues in the Cabinet. That is his role as Minister of Health in this province, not to take such a high and mighty attitude towards the demands of a very reputable and very important professional group – daughters of members notwithstanding.

Mr. Chairman: I must remind the members that we are becoming repetitive in all the remarks. The member for Bracondale, please.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the hon. Minister has looked upon the Opposition here, as members who are trying to practice medicine without a licence and trying to give him the needle. If so, I suggest that he has missed the point.

When I arose last time, I was not trying to ridicule the hon. member. I thought I made some very sharp points, points that had merit in them, but I am afraid that the Minister has completely overlooked that. He is set in his ways that this is not his responsibility, and that seems to be his attitude.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that at no time have the members of the Opposition criticized the hospital schools or how they are operated. We know full well that circumstances have changed. We know full well, and appreciate, that teaching a person to become a nurse is a post-secondary education, and, like other educations, you do not expect people to be paid to learn, although they are receiving some allowance.

Those of us here in the legal profession, when we were going through law, had to be articled. I received $15 a week. I am sure that hon. members here who are in the profession and have been in the profession longer than I, will get up and say, "Look, I only got $5 a week, or I did not get anything." If you go back far enough, they will get up and tell you, "I had to pay to article with so and so."

We are not criticizing that, because we understand that it is a profession; you set up the capital facilities for it and you are teaching—you are giving them something.

The hon. Minister used the words "keen bunch". My goodness gracious. Thank heaven that they are a keen bunch or they would not be in that school, they would not be in that profession to begin with.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is nonsense.

Mr. Ben: It is so, because they go into nursing because they are keen, they are dedicated. The way they look at it is that they are dedicating their lives to tending for their fellow creatures. It is after they go through this course, that they find that they cannot live on that dedication, that they have to live on bread and they need money to buy the bread. It is then that they decide they have to seek greener pastures. As I say, greener pastures, where there is more of that green stuff we call dollars.

What we are suggesting to the hon. Minister is this. At the present time, the range is from $400 to $480. I dare say that a very small percentage of the nurses are in the $480 bracket. The majority of them would be someplace between $400 and $415 or $420, and I would again point out to the hon. Minister, that this is less than that received by those who belong to a labourer's union in the city of Toronto and Metro.

Telephone operators, the PBX operators receive more than these nurses do. Therefore, it is no wonder that they leave this jurisdiction, and they leave the nursing profession, to go off into either another jurisdiction or into another profession.

They are required to work odd hours, odd shifts, for what? Just so they can say: I am dedicated to the service of my fellow man? What we are trying to point out is this. You pay them a decent salary and they will stay in the profession. If they stay in the profession, we have to spend less money on schools to train nurses to replace these nurses that are leaving.

I am sorry that my hon. friend from Scarborough West has left, because he made the statement that you ought to be sticking up for or supporting the nurses. The truth of the matter is you ought to be standing up and supporting us, the public. What the public wants is hospitals that are properly staffed with qualified nurses who are content and happy in their jobs. That is what the public wants and that is what you should be giving them.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the nurses in the Brockville hospital applied for certification. The Minister stated the problem of nurses getting better salaries, better working conditions—this is up to them to negotiate with the hospital boards. Is that right? He said it was up to the nurses to negotiate with the hospital boards.

In Brockville, the hospital board fought the organization of the nurses to get supervisors and the head nurses included. They have been excluded. So all they have left in Brockville are the general duty nurse. All you are doing is forcing nurses to form a separate organization among themselves. They want to have their whole group—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have to point this out to you sir, again. This is not my concern.

Just briefly, to show you where it is not my concern, this organization was certified under The Labour Relations Act. That is the end, as far as I am concerned, because it became a matter between The Department of Labour, the hospital board and the nurses from there on in.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, Mr. Chairman. But The Labour Relations Act is not in the best interests of nursing, because it often excludes the nurses who want to be part of the bargaining unit.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North—I must point out to the member. Under The Department of Labour, when we had the estimates before us, we had the labour relations board, which is vote 1005, and that dealt with the certification of various unions. This is a labour matter, and I would ask the member if he will now please stay with the vote before us, vote 810.

Mr. Sargent: We will talk about nurses.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, but not certification.

Mr. Sargent: All right, we will leave that out. In the Napanee affair, which is current now, the chairman has resigned because of the treatment of nurses and five—including all the top supervisory people—have resigned. Mr. Lloyd Sharp, the manager of employment for the RNAO, is going down there and they are taking a positive attitude. They want to know both sides of the story. They are going to say, in effect, that if the nurses are not to blame, they are going to grey list the hospital.

This is a matter that the Minister should be concerned about and, apologizing to the House, I think it is important enough that we flog this thing to infinity, to get an intelligent sign of cooperation from the Minister that he has got some concern in this area. So we know the situation that is happening in Napanee.

The government has the power to give these nurses a working agreement to better their lot, and the Minister says that they are not allowed to have the same rights as teachers—to have effective legislation—because they can go on strike. But he says the nurses cannot go on strike.

The Brockville people have applied for certification—I cannot use that word—they have applied for an agreement that will work. So the Minister continues to look out the window and do nothing for the nurses.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I was able to find the figures, and I just want to put them to the House because I think it is illustrative of the point we are trying to make.

In the year 1952, the total number of students as part of the intake to the schools of nursing in Ontario, was 2,065, and the intake to teachers' colleges was 1,873. In other words, as far back as 1952, the intake of nurses was considerably in excess of the intake of teachers.

By 1963, the figures were: to schools of nursing, 3,052, and to teachers' colleges, 6,410. There was a steady acceleration as the nursing profession became ever more unattractive to the people who would wish to enter it. And that pattern appears to be

continuing, because it is corroborated by subsequent years, as I recall.

The statistics I have read are taken from the nursing branch of The Department of Health, The Ontario Department of Education and the college of nurses of Ontario, and they were in the registered nurses association bulletin when they were making their case.

No one can suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we do not need double the number of nurses we are presently graduating from whatever area, be it a nursing school, attached to a hospital, or a university nursing faculty. But the fact of the matter is, that when you analyze the two professional disciplines, the nurses' entry has fallen way behind the teachers' entry, because of the unattractive nature of the profession. Obviously, it is a humanitarian profession, obviously it does intestimable work, but it has so many offensive features in the process of training, that the nurses, the potential nurses, are subject to a deterrent—because of that training.

I would say, sir, that the evidence is clear and decisive in this field. The Minister simply must make a more adequate response because, for whatever reason he has not kept pace over the last 15 years, we are now feeling the crunch of that liability on his department's part.

Now that is our appeal and those are the figures which corroborate that appeal.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in leaving this part of the vote, so far as I am concerned I think it is a shocking thing that because of a technicality, this Minister will not allow us to discuss this very important subject. In effect, Mr. Chairman, he is throwing down the gauntlet and saying, "To blazes with the nurses."

He will allow the grey listing of hospitals, because now the RNAO knows he practically knew nothing about it, and they are going into—

Mr. Chairman: In fairness, the member should realize that the provision for negotiation of wages is under The Labour Relations Act.

Mr. Sargent: That is what I am trying to say, that because of a technicality we cannot discuss the nursing salaries.

Mr. Chairman: There is nothing to prevent the member from doing this under The Department of Labour.

Mr. Sargent: Do you want to bet?

Mr. Chairman: As the chairman, I know you can discuss labour relations under the labour relations board estimate.

Mr. Sargent: The chances of discussing nurses' wages before the labour relations board is very small. I just want to say that once the nurses of Ontario know that this Minister will do nothing on their behalf, then he is in trouble.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): I would like to make a nice, quiet plea to the Minister. In my community, and, I think, other communities throughout Ontario, there has been a directive, or at least an undertaking, by the hospital services commission to remove a great number of the people from the chronic wings of the hospital.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, we spent considerable time and effort in studying this situation in the committee on aging, and we are of the opinion, on that committee, that these people, who have reached the later years in their life and are unable to work or contribute to the upkeep of their keep in a nursing home, should come within the jurisdiction of the hospital services commission.

I was wondering whether the Minister was entertaining the thought of taking this idea to Ottawa to see if we could give these people some comfort, so they will not lose what savings they have in the latter years of their life—and I do not mean large amounts, I mean accounts of two or three thousand dollars that will go nowhere once they get into a nursing home. I wonder if the Minister has undertaken to do anything about this situation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we have, and we are continuing to discuss this with Ottawa, in the hope that at least we can broaden the definition of medical necessity, to include at least a certain degree of nursing necessity.

We recognize that there are many people who, when the medical necessity has passed, still need a good deal of more than just normal nursing care, more than commonplace nursing care. In the hope that we can work out an agreement to include at least certain degrees of this kind of disability, we are in continuing discussion with Ottawa.

I would point out, however, that this is not a directive from the hospital services commission. Persons are admitted to and discharged from the hospital on the say-so of their attending physician, or the medical advisory board of the hospital, because this is a

medical decision and must be made on the spot.

In the event that the commission might have occasion to believe that responsibility is not being properly assumed, they have the right under the law, and they do very occasionally exercise this right, to send in medical referees—but only medical people make these decisions as to whether a person should be discharged or not. I say they only rarely exercise this right and they did not utilize it at all in the past year. Very rarely have they done it because it is the responsibility accepted at the local level, by the medical personnel.

However, to bear up this problem that faces the member, as it does all of us, we are trying to work out a formula whereby we can extend hospital insurance coverage to those who, perhaps, need very little medical care but need a good deal of fairly intensive nursing care.

Mr. Worton: I think, Mr. Chairman, now that the Minister has set up nursing home regulations and they have to be approved, that this would be a very much simpler operation than previously, when he did not have any control over them.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, there has been some concern across the province on the requirements for admission to nursing schools. I understand it is possible in some of the schools, to gain admission to proper training with grade 12 level. I wonder if the Minister could tell me how many schools permit that admission?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot give the number. There are a goodly number of them, but we just had a very intensive review of these requirements and the recommendation has just come to my desk—and I have not yet had time to review it as it came while I have been dealing with my estimates—in response to my own belief, that at least some of the students from grade 12 in the four-year stream, should be eligible for entry into nursing.

This, I believe, has come back to me now, with a specific recommendation of the health manpower committee of the council of health. If this is so, then I intend to discuss this very thoroughly with the college of nurses in the hope that we can change the regulations to make that effective this year.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I would heartily support this particular position. It has been the experience of a good many people in local situations, that the young people who, perhaps, have not had an opportunity to continue through grade 13, are very good candidates for nursing. I know of at least one nursing school that has accepted them in limited numbers. A comparison of the results at the end of the course, and particularly following them on into their carrer, has indicated, very strongly, that their specific interest in this profession has more than made up for the limitation in their preparation at the matriculation level.

Naturally, we want the best qualified people we can get, but it seems to me that this matter of qualification should be extended well beyond the academic qualification. I believe that, too often, there are restrictions that are needlessly severe when we look at the requirements for nurses and some others in this province. I would be very interested in hearing the recommendations that the Minister finally makes to the profession.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on this one point we are in absolute agreement and as I state, it was on my own persistence or insistence, that this was considered. The chairman of the commission now tells me that the recommendation of the health manpower committee has already been placed before the council of the college of nurses for their consideration.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the hospital beds, under the hospital services commission, I would like some information—and I am sure it is available. There is a little hospital in Virgil and some of you may have been approached in the hospital services commission. They, apparently, by letter, had the authority to add five more beds to that little hospital because, at that time, there were not sufficient beds, and most hospitals do not have them. They did receive authority from the hospital services commission to add five more beds to this hospital, while they did not reconstruct the building.

After a period of time, they found that the hospital services commission had cancelled that order, or that privilege they had, for a period of time. Many of the patients—and I was approached by a doctor who came to me to tell me of their problem—feel that the added five beds did not overcrowd them, and they would like to continue with that service, to the patients in that area.

I have taken it upon myself—I am sorry the Minister from Lincoln (Mr. Welch) is not here—but I took it upon myself to speak with him. I thought that maybe he would have

had a better opportunity to speak with the Minister or the proper authority. He did tell me that he was looking into the matter and I am wondering whether they can be reinstated, to allow them the additional five beds they had in the past, by a similar letter that they did get in the first instance.

Would you, or some of your people, be acquainted with that problem and would they reinstate them?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, they are reinstated. Indeed, they were advised that pending the results of a complete regional study of bed needs and bed supplies, they would be left with this. But I would emphasize to the hon. member that these five beds are only temporarily approved, pending the establishment of adequate numbers of beds in the public institutions. But they are again temporarily approved, pending the outcome of the total regional study.

Mr. Bukator: I am satisfied with the answer. They have been re-established to allow the additional five beds.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes and they have been—

Mr. Bukator: I can understand that they ought to be, maybe one day, deprived of that, if you have sufficient beds in hospitals. But I do believe, and I know from people I have talked with, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that they are rendering a wonderful service, and I am glad to hear they have been reinstated.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I may ask the Minister, in the education of nurses, is he considering permitting students who would attend colleges of applied arts and technology by taking set courses in there, to qualify for admission to nurses' training? I know there are no courses at present in the various colleges, but I would assume, in the not too distant future, your department would have some type of paramedical course in these colleges, and the admission requirements to the colleges do not necessarily mean that an individual must graduate from grade 12. He must be, or she must be, at least 18 years of age and could enter the college with only a grade 10 education, but by taking a set course in the college, is the department considering allowing that individual to enter into the nursing profession?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think I should point out clearly, because there seems to be some misinformation about it, the department does not set the standards for entering into nursing education.

I became alarmed when they started streaming the post-elementary students, finding they were splitting two ways, I recognized that there was a great likelihood of us finding a shortage out of the academic stream to fill the places in our schools of nursing. It was because of that that I asked the manpower committee in the council of health to look at those students who were going into the four year stream, because I believed many of them would have the ability and the desire to go into nursing.

Now this was recognizing that there would be graduates of grade 12. I would be very hesitant to even offer an opinion about the grade 10 person who had gone into the college of applied arts and technology. I think it would have to depend on the courses they took in the technical college.

I believe the member for Scarborough West said something about other things besides academic attainment that should be taken into account. I agree with this most heartily, because maturity means a great deal. There are people who are naturally, and my hon. friend as a teacher is bound to recognize this, who naturally are slow learners and learn far more after they leave school—in a very short space of time—than they did while they were in school. This late developing maturity may very well fit them to take on work for which their academic attainments might not have prepared them.

Now as to what will come about in this regard, I really could not do any more than hazard a guess, because again I emphasize that my department does not set the educational standards for the entrance of nurses. The health manpower committee, from the standpoints of needs and supply, and the educational committee of the council of health, are both looking at all of these problems. It is our view that some of the parahealth services have demanded academic standards which are too high for entry into their various courses.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I was looking on the student who may have been a dropout. She has completed only grade 10 and has gone into the work force. The young lady may even have been married and then later on decided she would like to enter the nursing field, but not having graduated from a secondary school she finds herself handi-

capped. With the advent of colleges of applied arts and technology, the way may be arranged for her to get into the nursing profession where the college of applied arts and technology has a course in which the young lady could take this type of training and possibly be sufficiently well informed or educated to actually get into the nursing profession.

I know it probably is not in your hands, but I think your department could suggest to the colleges of applied arts and technology the types of courses that would enable the individual to eventually get back into nursing, because we are going to be confronted with more acute shortages in the future.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted at this time I would like to make a few general remarks about a report presented to the mayor and board of control of the city of Ottawa by the Ontario hospital services commission. This report is dated June, 1966, and I had a copy of it several months later.

The member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) yesterday dealt with the shortage of beds in the Ottawa area. This, I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, has been somewhat corrected by the opening of the Riverside hospital, but it is still a very serious problem. Now the leader of the new party, the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) mentioned yesterday the lack of facilities for patients who do not require active treatment but are unable to be discharged from hospitals, and require some nursing care.

Mr. Chairman, we have here two problems. First, lack of sufficient accommodation; and second, many of these patients cannot afford to pay the cost of a nursing home and consequently have to be kept in a general hospital.

I have conducted a survey in the Ottawa area in order to ascertain the number of persons who occupy an active treatment bed in those hospitals at any given period. As you know, Mr. Chairman, this is a pretty difficult figure to obtain from the hospital authorities. I believe, however, that this is as accurate as many of the surveys made by many departments of this government.

From that survey, I believe that on the average there is a minimum of 200 persons occupying active treatment beds who could be cared for in either a nursing home, a convalescent home or a rest home if these were available.

The total number of hospital days would total approximately 73,000, working from that figure of approximately 200; that is 73,000 days in the Ottawa area alone.

In taking an average of $30 and the difference between the cost of an active treatment bed and the cost of other facilities, I arrive at a sum of approximately $2,190,000 which could be saved in Ottawa alone by the Ontario hospital services commission if those other facilities which cost a lot less money were available. I think on top of that an additional saving of many millions of dollars in construction costs could be made.

There is, however, another problem which has to be solved by the government: The construction of those facilities.

Who puts up the money for them? The municipalities? I do not believe so, because Ottawa, with an increase of seven and a half mills this year and perhaps another increase next year, will not be in a position to cover the cost of these facilities. I am sure they will be very reluctant to put up the funds for that type of construction.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote an item that appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of January 13, where Controller Webber said that she had received a very favourable reception for a proposal that Ottawa should have another new hospital. I would like to qualify this for the Minister. I think there might have been a slight misunderstanding there, between this statement and the actual fact. I believe that what was meant was probably the construction of either a nursing home, or a rest home. Anyway, if you will permit, I will continue this news item:

> The city is seeking a semi-active institution of approximately 100 beds to fill the gap between the limited facilities of Island lodge and the present major active treatment hospitals such as the Civic, Riverside and General.

I think they should have added the Marie de Montford hospital.

> There are many older people in the active treatment institutions who do not need the full facilities of the major hospitals.

This goes back to the remarks of the hon. members for Wellington South. This is along the remarks that he made.

> But because they do need some degree of medical treatment they cannot be cared for at Island lodge. The new hospital would fill this gap and release a large number of active treatment beds for more

seriously ill patients, Controller Webber said.

I would like to ask this, would the commission accept the responsibility of paying for nursing home care for these patients? I know they do in some cases. Would the commission consider paying for nursing home care for patients over the age of 60, which form a large proportion of the patients?

This has been answered, I think, by the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to make a few comments on that report, particularly as to some of the recommendations that it has made. One of the recommendations was that the city of Ottawa, and perhaps the surrounding county, should pay a much larger share of the construction costs.

I know that this is a recommendation from the commission, but the commission also states that the federal government should have participation in the support of the Ottawa hospital. This has been mentioned in the past and I think it is very worthwhile mentioning it, because Ottawa, as everybody knows, is a one industry town, or city, and this one industry is the federal government.

The report of the commission says that the federal government has refused to consider special contribution to the city of Ottawa for purposes such as hospital support, for fear of establishing a precedent.

This is a grave accusation. I would like to know, perhaps from the Minister, whether this approach to the federal government has been made by the city of Ottawa, or whether it has been made by the province. The report continues:

> The commission has been advised that the federal government sees nothing exceptional in its relations to the city of Ottawa.

I think the same problem exists. I do not think we should single out the federal government, because perhaps the same problem exists right here in the city of Toronto, where there are a very large number of provincial government buildings. I wonder whether the government of Ontario, because of that fact, decides to give special grants to the Toronto hospitals.

There is another item that I would like to mention at this time, Mr. Chairman. I think I have spoken about it before, but I think it is still a very real problem. It is the problem of the three hospitals in Ottawa that have an unmanageable debt. This is a very, very serious problem and I think that it would be a good idea to mention some of the things that this report says about it.

First of all, the debt is considered as unmanageable because there were insufficient funds available to the hospital to discharge the debt in the period of 20 years, dated from 1959.

Further on in the report, it is mentioned that the hospital, because of the way it has been asked to refund this debt by taking any surplus from their rooms and taking the sisters' salaries, were unable to keep their equipment up to date. This is definitely mentioned in this report and I think, in this day and age, when a hospital is obliged to carry on the necessary services and is not able to obtain the modern, necessary equipment that modern hospitals require, then they are in serious trouble.

I think, at the time of the estimates last year there were a lot of things said about it in the Ottawa papers. I think that this is a problem that needs to be solved, and needs to be solved just as quickly as possible.

Another recommendation from this report, from the Ontario hospital services commission, is that the commission would like to suggest, for the consideration of the city authorities, that a policy be adopted for contributing each year from the tax rate, to hospital needs in the community.

I said something about it a little while ago, and I do not know whether the city of Ottawa has committed itself, but the report continues and says:

> This would be available to all the hospitals on the basis of need and could be used both for equipment and for building purposes.

Mr. Chairman, this report did mention the lack of community funds in Ottawa. I believe, myself, that if we go to the figures that have been mentioned in this report, which quote that the amount of money that will be needed in the Ottawa area as community funds, sir, or as donations from the community—either as amounts paid by the municipality or as contributions from the people of the area—would amount to well over $12,750,000.

I do not see how this amount of money can be raised in Ottawa and I think—it has been said before in these estimates—that, in this day and age, it is not possible to expect that kind of money to be raised at the local level. I personally feel, and I think this is the view of my own party, that the great bulk of the cost of new facilities and renova-

tions, and also of hospitals, should be borne by the provincial government—with an assist if possible, from the federal government.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out if the Minister has any comments on these remarks.

Mr. Chairman: To avoid some duplication, I should point out to the member that the Minister did make some comments, earlier this afternoon, about extending the hospital insurance coverage for nursing homes. Perhaps the member was not in his seat at the time.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not going to repeat that, Mr. Chairman, because that is on the public record, but I am going to speak about the Ottawa situation. I think that the hon. member is really more knowledgeable about the Ottawa situation as to be not greatly helped by anything that I can add, because I can only reiterate what has been made very widely publicized in Ottawa.

It has often been stated that the federal government should justifiably be looked to for, I believe, their contribution to Ottawa hospitals—and perhaps any other place in Canada. This is on a well established foundation because, in places where there are large industries, the community automatically looks to those large industries for support. I think of the city of the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Walker), one of my own neighbours. General Motors and the other big factories there, are automatically looked to, and automatically do provide very large donations to hospital construction, because they believe this is a social duty to their employees.

The federal government, is the largest employer in Ottawa, and it is not unreasonable to look to them for a special grant for hospital purposes and other social needs in the community where a very large number of their employees live.

The hon. member said—and I am quite sure he was hoping I would not have the right answer—have we done the same thing in Toronto? The answer is undeniably yes. Traditionally the government of Ontario has given special consideration to hospitals in Toronto because of this fact.

I really believe, though I am not certain it was ever put in those words before, that before the government was involved in statutory grants, the hospitals in Toronto, because of their particular needs, were given special grants. They may not have been large in those days but they were in comparison to the costs at the time. Of course, the province has steadily increased its support of hospitals all over Ontario, including Ottawa, till now we are providing two-thirds of the amount.

The hon. member has spoken about unmanageable debt. I do not know how any member, representative of the area of Ottawa, can come to this House and decry what the government of this province has done in respect of unmanageable debt.

We provide this money, ourselves, out of provincial funds, and for nine years now, to my knowledge since the plan started, we have poured something of the order of $1 million a year into four hospitals, three of them in the city of Ottawa.

These debts were incurred before there was a hospital insurance programme, Mr. Chairman, so the hospital plan cannot be blamed for this, no matter how it is turned around.

Last year, again almost a million dollars went into the unmanageable debt situation to assist the three hospitals in Ottawa—and in addition to that, an additional $500,000 was given to Ottawa General hospital to replace equipment.

The hon. member knows this because I recall, at least I am almost positive I recall, sending him a letter stating or outlining these amounts—either that or I put it on the public record during my last estimates, I think that was how it was done.

We did not take the sisters' salaries, let us get this straight, Mr. Chairman. This was an agreement, a business agreement entered into by the sisters and whatever board there was at Ottawa General hospital, St. Vincent's and Marie de Montford. This was agreed to as part of the contract but now, nine years later, of course we are being accused of taking the sisters' salaries.

Mr. Racine: I do not think I said that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, may I quote one of my critics a few moments ago? This is what I took from the member because he did specifically say they "took" the sisters' salaries. I think *Hansard* will show that.

Of course, we take the preferred income, we are doing this right along now because we are providing such a large part of the capital cost.

The hon. member points to the—I think he mentioned something of the order of $12 million as the local share of the financing required to bring the hospitals up to date. Amortize this over 20 years and it is not such a tremendously large amount. May I again, with some pride, point to the fact that my own

county has been doing this for years. We are building a new hospital in my community. Of course, it is small, but we have a very small county compared to the great city of Ottawa, and the total third that has to be found by the board is coming out of the county tax rate, provided by the county, because they believe this is good social legislation. This is how they have determined to finance their share of hospital construction.

The hon. member says that the great bulk of the hospital construction costs should be borne by the province; I submit to him that the great bulk is borne by the province, since we are now paying two-thirds of the total cost of capital construction plus basic equipment and furnishings.

This we have done without very much support from the federal government because they, once more, have re-affirmed their determination to stick to the old grant rate structure of 1958.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if he has undertaken any studies as to the cost of extending the Ontario hospital services benefits to dependents who may be still attending school, but are beyond the age of 21?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, we have studied it, but we just do not feel we can afford to extend it any further at the present time. We would point out clearly that as obtained when we extended the benefits to those between 19 and 21, we do not believe it can be limited only to those attending educational institutions. Any person who is dependent, for whatever reason, would have to be included and this, of course, makes the problem a little bit bigger.

It is difficult to justify just singling out one group—those who are attending school—when the need may be just as great, and probably greater, in the case of the others who become dependent in that age group.

I can only say it is being studied, but we simply cannot afford it at the present time.

Mr. Newman: Could the Minister later provide me with estimates as to the added costs for that extension of services? I do not want them from the Minister now, but maybe the hospital services—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I just happened to look them up a little while ago, in answer to a brief submitted by a municipal group. Depending of course what cut-off age you use, and I forget which—

Mr. Newman: I would take the suggestion the Minister mentioned, that all dependents—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, but the estimates would have to depend on where you cut off. Naturally, if you go a year further, it could be more and so on. The estimate would rise, but the group that we thought of, and I think we stopped at 26 because this is usually the maximum age of the average student who comes into the earning system—that is the student who is taking extensive post-graduate training—I believe we figured the amount we would lose would be something in the order of $4 million.

This would exclude the services they would require and might choose. This is difficult to determine.

Mr. Newman: I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have an area which I want to explore very briefly with the Minister.

Is there any policy on the admission of alcoholics to general hospitals throughout the province; more particularly, because they are the only ones with which I am truly familiar, those hospitals in the metropolitan area? Is there any particular policy by the commission in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, the commission does not make policy with respect to admissions; except the one criterion—it must be medically necessary.

I think I know what the hon. member is getting at and I can understand, rather sympathetically, what his problem is. A great many hospitals, a great many physicians, will not admit an alcoholic to the general hospital, they are difficult to handle.

But it does not matter what apology I may make for them, I cannot justify it. They are sick and they should be admitted. We try to emphasize on every hand and at every opportunity that the alcoholic is a sick person and should be admitted if he needs hospital care. Some hospitals still resist this for one reason or another, but under The Public Hospitals Act I think it is clearly stated that no person can be denied admission who needs hospital care, provided the space is available.

Mr. S. Lewis: I appreciate the Minister's position.

I have one further question: Is the wing added to the Riverdale hospital, I believe for the treatment of alcoholics, is that now open and supposedly functioning on a round-the-clock basis?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is open. I happened to sit at dinner last night with the medical director and I believe he told me they have eight patients now. They have just nicely got under way, they are going to have a very interesting operation there. It is the Hastings wing of the Riverdale hospital.

Mr. S. Lewis: Are they meant for emergency placement or for immediate placement of a man in an obvious state of withdrawal or extreme inebriation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I think that is their function at the present time. Later on it may be extended to the period after he has dried out.

Mr. S. Lewis: May I make two points, or relate two anecdotes for the Minister which—it is curious he should mention last night because one of them arises from last night—which might be of interest to him and which underline a situation I hope we will gradually sort out in Metropolitan Toronto.

One morning about six weeks ago I was phoned at the Legislature here from the office of a young man where someone was in the state of an alcoholic seizure. I guess it was a withdrawal seizure, I am not familiar with the terms.

They had endeavoured to have him taken by the alcoholism and drug addiction foundation at one of their clinics and had been told that was not possible. They had merely phoned. They had taken him physically to three general hospitals in the city and had been refused at each. He was finally taken by the Toronto Ontario hospital into one of the wards.

Last night there came a call to the clinic service that we run out in my part of Scarborough from a chap who was in a similar condition in a Gerrard Street pub, I guess one would describe it as such, and had requested help.

He was requesting assistance. He had himself approached the alcoholism foundation last evening and had been denied admission. He was in a very serious state of deterioration. A couple of well intentioned young men picked him up and took him to the Hastings wing of the Riverdale hospital at approximately 10 o'clock last night and they refused him admission. They then took him to the emergency ward at St. Michael's hospital and only under the threat of sitting through the night in the emergency admitting room was he finally given admission.

When I phoned St. Michael's hospital this morning the situation was so serious they expected to have him under heavy sedation for six days.

I gather in discussing it with some of my colleagues that this is a pattern that tends to repeat itself in the Metro area, that the general hospitals at any rate, and the Minister is quite right, are very reluctant to take an alcoholic even on an emergency admission and are not always as willing as one would expect to recognize the feature of sickness in this state. I think what is perhaps required, if I may be so bold, is a partial education campaign in this field, at least to put across to the public that most Ontario hospitals will readily take someone in under such a situation and that the Hastings wing is now available for such a situation.

As it happened, as one subsequently learned in the case of this young man, this was alcoholism with psychosis. He had been formerly in a hospital in another province.

I feel very strongly what is lacking here is knowledge in the public at large, and perhaps even amongst some of the administrators, of the other avenues open for treatment. No one could direct the people who were trying to cope with this very sick man. They simply, even at Riverdale, could not tell them exactly where he should be taken.

I must admit that those of us who were unskilled laymen in the field were equally at a loss, and I gradually gather that OH and Hastings wing are the obvious channels and that it would be worth putting this across publicly in some fashion.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think I should state that we are presently updating our directory of services and facilities and would hope to have that in the hands of all social agencies and physicians in order that they may be kept up to date with facilities.

The hon. member made a point that is most pressing and one on which we have been working—at least we thought we were working on it with some success—educating not only physicians but social agencies and hospitals that this is their responsibility.

Oftentimes, as I gather in the case of this person who turned to you for help, they can be very seriously and very dangerously ill.

It is a slow process. There is not any sense in my trying to convince members that we can wave a wand and change this overnight. Every one of my colleagues understands that

it is a difficult thing to train society to look upon the alcoholic as a sick person; but we simply keep on plugging away at it in the hope that we will succeed.

Mr. Ben: I just have a question of the hon. Minister. How many general hospitals in the city or Metropolitan Toronto area have detention facilities for the mentally ill?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to talk about detention facilities; in fact that has almost gone out of our lexicon. Psychiatric facilities are existent in nearly all of them actually. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I will have to get the specific hospital names. I read out a few of them the other day, but I can get them all for the hon. member.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask one question of the Minister: What does he suggest be done about asking a contribution of the federal government? Should that be done on the local basis, should that be done by the local authorities, or should the government of Ontario, or his department, participate in this request?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this should be done at the local area. In our thinking, any special grant they get would be part of the local contribution. When they are talking about our two-thirds and thinking of the one third, we do not care whence it comes; whether it comes from tax funds, donations, endowments or what have you.

Now we would support the local people if it would do any good. I think I ought to point out to the hon. member, though, it would do far more good if he went to see my counterpart at Ottawa and talked to him, because in some ways you talk the same language, politically at least. I have tried to get my hon. counterpart in Ottawa to agree to upping the grant at the federal level to meet our grant. If they would do that I am quite certain that Ottawa and all other places in Ontario would have a much easier job financing their hospitals.

I would suggest, in brief sir, that the hon. member might join with his local folk in Ottawa and go and talk to my counterpart in Tunney's Pasture.

Votes 810 and 811, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Health.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr Chairman, in this, my fourth presentation of the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions, I address the hon. members knowing that they have a greater knowledge of our work than when I made my first report to this Legislature.

Bearing this in mind, I intend initially to deal very briefly with our day-to-day operations and to report to you more fully on our philosophy and plans for the future. In this way, more time will be available to the hon. members for seeking detailed information on particular points during the question period. At the same time, the hon. members will be given a clearer picture of where we are going in the future.

This is a big question. I doubt if any field of government is so fraught with difficulty as as is our field—crime and its treatment, the field of corrections. There are almost as many philosophies and opinions as to the best methods, as there are inmates in correctional institutions.

Insofar as our adult institutions are concerned, those with whom we are dealing have all offended society by their behaviour patterns. With many of them, society has tried various solutions, but eventually insisted that they be temporarily removed from society. It is at this stage that we take over—after the judgment has been made. And we face the responsibility of dealing with these offenders in their best interests as well as those of society.

We accept our responsibilities. But as the hon. members will appreciate, ours is a difficult task in that we are carrying out a rehabilitation programme with people who are in our care involuntarily.

If a person is held involuntarily because of his behaviour—his attitudes—then it is obvious that our first and foremost task is to assist him to change those attitudes. Trade training, better education, industrial training, improved health—these are all additional helps. But basically, unless we can change the attitude of the offender, he will continue in his anti-social behaviour, even though we might train him to be the most competent mechanic in the world.

We must have a total programme, and we recognized this and set it out in our statement of purpose. We look to a complete involvement of all our staff in a programme of attitude changing.

As we intensify our staff involvement—as we train our staff to accept completely this role and be competent in it—we are optimistic about its success. Anticipating greater success causes us to examine the problems that will arise with such success.

If you convince a man that he should accept society's code and act upon it, then equally you must not fail him by preventing him from obtaining the necessities of life. If he needs education to fulfil his new role in society, then this must be available to him. If he needs training or re-training, then this must be available to him.

Having served the sentence imposed by the court, he must be in a position to take up a positive, purposeful role—to resettle in the community with employment, accommodation, family and friends. This is the goal of our total programme, sir. This is the success we aim for.

We know we need many things—buildings, facilities, machines—to make up our total programme; but it is not the things—it is not the bricks and mortar—it is the people and their inter-action that really matter.

During the past year, we have widened the whole concept of our staff development programme, leading towards a more effective correctional team. Early in December we completed our first 16-week course on counselling for the correctional staff of the Mercer reformatory for women. This is being extended and includes similar programmes in other institutions such as Guelph reformatory and the Brampton training centre.

Throughout our department, social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, and other members of our professional and administrative staff, are intensively involved in providing in-service training for correctional officers.

Generally, this works actively towards the integration of correctional and treatment staffs, which is accepted by penologists throughout the world as the key to solving manpower problems in the field of rehabilitation. As this integration develops, so will the group counselling programme expand and intensify throughout the department.

The hon. members are well aware—hopefully from reading recent annual reports—that many skilled senior administrators have been added to my department. In addition, our effective team has been further strengthened in the past few months, with the appointment of the following capable people:

Mr. Harold J. Doan, master of arts in psychology, bachelor of laws, as assistant to the administrator of adult male institutions.

Mr. William Connor, bachelor of arts, with one year in the department as executive trainee, as assistant superintendent of Kawartha Lakes school, Lindsay.

Mrs. Muriel O. Wildfong, registered nurse, specializing in psychiatric experience and completing her bachelor of science this year, as assistant superintendent, Mercer reformatory, in charge of Ontario women's guidance centre, "Ingleside", at Brampton.

Mr. Edmond R. Blomme, completing his bachelor of arts this year and with ten years' experience in the department, as assistant superintendent at Pine Ridge school, Bowmanville.

Mr. William Vrooman, bachelor of science, a professional engineer with wide experience in the industrial field, as industrial engineer of the department.

Mr. George Feher, architect, born in Budapest, Hungary, a graduate of the Technical University of Budapest in architectural engineering, as construction engineer of the department.

Mr. Chairman, I can confidently state that my department has a well organized, dedicated staff of specialists.

In every section of our department, our basic policy is to follow up a sound classification procedure with specialized centres and institutions to meet the particular needs of our many different types of offenders.

In training schools, we have a reception and diagnostic centre in the planning stages, which will coordinate with the expansion of facilities as outlined and announced in The Department of Health white paper.

Our present classification procedures are presented to you in detail in the classification chart which accompanied the annual report, and indicates the wide variety of programmes available for different types of youngsters. Two centres, to back up this programme, which have been developed and expanded during the current year, are the schools at Galt and Hagersville.

At Galt, our programme is designed to provide the services of a strong clinical team to those girls needing more intensive treatment and training.

At Hagersville, we are finding that the programme at White Oaks village is particularly suitable for the younger boys, who are inevitably in need of a very specialized programme which is appropriate to their problems. With the high ratio of staff, including house mothers on each team, we are able to ensure a very individualized treatment programme.

In the adult area, we have had tremendous expansion in our training centre programme, three additional centres at Fort William, Monteith and Rideau being added to those at Brampton and Burtch.

We have opened new forestry camps, which is further evidence of our intention to concentrate our efforts on small, cohesive groups. This is the way we have planned the new Vanier institution for women—a cottage-type setting which will enable us to have a detailed classification programme within the institution in order to provide specialized treatment for particular groups.

As the hon. members are already aware, the present Mercer reformatory has been designated as a reclamation centre for female alcoholics, and this group will be accommodated in the new Vanier institution.

This same philosophy of evaluation, classification and specialized treatment has been carried over in the planning of our regional detention centres.

These centres, which will replace the outmoded county jails, will have facilities for pre-sentence interviewing and assessment, and post-sentence evaluation, so that those people with specialized needs may be either kept at the centre in the correct setting, or, where appropriate, transferred to a specialized institution.

Agreements have been signed to replace 12 county jails with four regional detention centres. The counties of Frontenac, Hastings, Lennox and Addington and Prince Edward are building the Quinte regional detention centre near Napanee. We expect construction to commence on this centre by early summer.

Northumberland and Durham, Peterborough, and Victoria and Haliburton are planning the Kawartha regional detention centre. This plan is in the detailed drawing stage and should be put out to tender shortly.

Halton and Peel and Lincoln and Welland have signed agreements and the centres are now in the planning stage. Hamilton and Wentworth are preparing an agreement now. Further active consideration is now being given by an additional 12 counties to the replacement of their jails.

Coincident with these general developments, we have made a great deal of progress in specific fields such as education.

Academic education, under the direction of qualified teachers, has been extended to all institutions. Ontario Department of Education courses are used throughout. In this field we have experimented successfully with programmed learning—with team teaching.

Our vocational staff are providing a wider variety of trades—more of the people in our care are undergoing instruction at this time than at any time during our history—and the training they receive is accepted by certification.

In our chaplaincy service we have held another successful training programme, the only one of its kind on this continent, and we have more trained chaplains than ever before. In addition, we have built a number of new chapels—at Brampton, at Camp Hillsdale, at Mimico, at Guelph, at McCreight's forestry camp and at Glendale school in Simcoe.

We have extended our clinical programme. We are experimenting with longer and more intensive programmes in the treatment of the alcoholic. Our treatment of the sex offender has been stepped up and extended.

Our after-care programme, both for adults and juveniles, has been widened in scope; its number of branch offices has been extended; and this year we will provide all after-care services for the wards of the private training schools.

We have made much progress over the year and we have not allowed inaction by the federal government in certain areas to hold up our general progress. We have gone ahead in fields where we were able to act under the constitutional rights granted to provinces.

In the field of legislation, a great deal has been done. For instance, we have passed such progressive legislation as our new Training Schools Act and The Regional Detention Centres Act. However, Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the members we are not smug; we realize there is still much that can be done and we are prepared to continue to move forward and adopt further progressive, forward-looking measures and legislation and programmes as the need arises.

There are, however, areas in which progress can only be made with the cooperation of the federal government. These involve changes in existing federal legislation which would be of great benefit, but which legislative changes can be made only by the federal government.

In this connection, my department has repeatedly submitted proposals to Ottawa outlining recommended changes in federal legislation and our reasons for requesting them.

These recommended changes fall into four general subjects. They are: equalization of remission time; temporary leave of absence for necessary purposes; release dates; and

limits on total sentences to be served in reformatories.

The corrections system in Ontario attempts to provide custodial care only at the level which is necessary; in this way, we do not have too many people in maximum security. However, we have had certain problems during the past two years; specifically, we have had an increasing number of escapes from our institutions, particularly from Burwash industrial farm, which, in accordance with our classification system, is the institution accommodating recidivists with comparatively long sentences.

Most of these escapes have been unsuccessful and the escapees were soon back in custody. Altogether, there were 179 escapes from Burwash in the fiscal year, April 1, 1966 to March 31, 1967. Of the total of 179 escapes, only four were still at large at the end of that period and we have good reason to believe that many of these were only half-hearted escape attempts, prompted by other than apparent motives.

One main reason inmates with longer sentences have been escaping is the marked disparity between the amount of remission time granted in reformatories and that provided in federal penitentiaries. This difference exists as a result of changes made by Ottawa in The Penitentiaries Act, which increased the "remission time" granted to inmates of penitentiaries. These changes went into effect on April 1, 1962. Unfortunately, the federal government did not follow through and make similar changes in The Prisons and Reformatories Act—the Act which governs our activities—and an Act which only they can change, because it is a federal statute.

Mr. Chairman, let us examine the problem this has created for us—and presumably other provinces—where a man serving time in a penitentiary gets so much more remission time than a man serving time in a reformatory. I had a comparison drawn up, copies of which, I believe, have been circulated to the hon. members.

The essential difference is that in penitentiaries, a prisoner gets his sentence reduced by one-quarter of the total sentence under statutory remission, plus earned remission of one-tenth of the remaining time, that is three days per month.

In reformatories he gets one day per week earned remission only.

If two men were sentenced on the same day, say January 1, 1966, the first to two years in a penitentiary, the other to two years less a day in a reformatory, the man in penitentiary could be released four months and 10 days before the one in the reformatory.

If the hon. members will follow the chart which I have had distributed, this makes it fairly clear because the man in the penitentiary gets one day more of a sentence—two years.

If he is sentenced January 1, 1966, he has less his statutory remission of six months, less remission earned, of 54 days, and the discharge date would be May 7, 1967.

If he is sentenced to two years, less a day, in a reformatory and his date was the same date—sentenced January 1, 1966—he has less his good conduct remission of 104 days, and the discharge date possible would be September 16, 1967—as against the other man's whose discharge date possible would be May 7.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the penitentiary man would be getting out this weekend and the reformatory man has still four and a half months to serve—and remember, the only difference in these sentences was one day.

Naturally, most prisoners are aware of this disparity and it is a cause of great dissention among them and undoubtedly a big factor in the escapes.

Let me just quote from an actual letter sent by one of our inmates to his girl friend, telling her that he had made an unsuccessful attempt to escape. He said, and I quote:

> I will probably be going to Kingston for this. I hope so. I will be going for less time if I go to Kingston than if I stayed here. Right now I have 18 months left. If they give me six more months and send me to Kingston I will only have 16 months left and I can get parole on the 13 months. So I could do about seven or eight months and get out.

I think, really, that he was a little optimistic about all this, but, this is the way a would-be escaper is thinking, and in general, even though he was perhaps a little too optimistic, he had some cause for his optimism.

Is it any wonder, then, that these people make attempts to escape, and is it any wonder that they ask the judge, as you will frequently read in the papers, to be sent to penitentiary so that they can, as they put it, "get trade training"? Actually many of these men have repeatedly had the opportunity and facilities in a number of our institutions for trade training, and with their usual manipulative ways are using "trade training" as a catch-phrase for their own purposes.

We have submitted to the Solicitor-General of Canada, detailed suggested revisions for sections 19 and 20 of The Prisons and Reformatories Act, so that the remission time would be exactly the same in both the provincial and federal institutions.

Similar representations were made previously by us to two previous Justice Ministers in the federal government, starting with a request to the then Justice Minister, hon. Guy Favreau, and then discussions with him on these changes, as early as February, 1964. We are still waiting for some action to be taken.

No doubt the frequent changes in federal Ministers with jurisdiction over these matters has been partially responsible for the lack of action. However, we are hopeful that our latest representations to the hon. Lawrence Pennell will be acted upon.

In a letter, of November 14, 1966, Mr. Pennell thanked us for bringing these problems to his attention in what he described as, "a clear and constructive manner". He promised to discuss our proposals with officials of his department and to give us his views about holding a meeting with me and my staff to discuss them.

In addition to our general concern about escapes prompted by the difference in the two different Acts, we feel that the unfairness of this disparity further undermines the general respect for the law among our inmates, many of whom already feel they are being, as they often claim, "persecuted" or "not getting a fair shake".

This situation also raises questions concerning additional costs. The average cost of keeping an inmate in reformatories in our system is approximately $10 a day. Why should the taxpayers of this province be asked to foot the bill to keep a man in a reformatory for an extra four-and-a-half months? This situation is particularly ludicrous as it results only because a man received a sentence which was one day shorter than that of another man sent to penitentiary for two years.

In our submission to Ottawa, we have also proposed changes in The Prisons and Reformatories Act which will enable inmates in provincial institutions to be granted leave of absence when it is deemed necessary or desirable. We feel that a man who must remake his life with his family and friends will have more hope of success if he is given greater opportunity to maintain family relationships while incarcerated. This may require that he be permitted to visit his home when pressing family matters make this advisable.

Our suggested changes in federal legislation would include permission to leave the reformatory, subject to our Deputy Minister's approval, with or without an escort, depending on circumstances, for such humanitarian reasons as attending the funeral of a loved one.

Permission for a temporary absence might also be granted, in the interests of rehabilitating the inmate, for such purposes as attending a training programme in the community for a period during each day, or for interviews with prospective employers. This would all be done while the prisoner is still residing in the institution.

Obviously, these changes would help to extend our rehabilitative efforts. Such leaves of absence would assist in giving the inmate confidence that he can take his proper place in society by trusting him in the community before he is finally released from serving his sentence.

These changes in legislation would also assist in reducing recidivism by providing an inmate with training which might not be available at the institutions. In addition, they would permit an inmate to be interviewed by a prospective employer prior to his release so that he would have a better chance to have a job available upon expiration of his sentence.

Another recommendation in our submission to the federal government is that when the term of a prison inmate expires on a Saturday, a Sunday, or a statutory holiday, he be permitted to be discharged on the previous working day. On the face of it, Mr. Chairman, this may not seem to be a recommendation of particular importance. But I can assure the hon. members that to the inmate and to his chances of rehabilitation, it is of considerable significance.

When a prisoner discharged from a local jail—and we are thinking mainly of those released from local jails in this recommendation—arrives in a city or town on a weekend or a holiday, he is at a considerable disadvantage in attempting to re-establish himself in the community. He cannot look for a job until one or two or three days have elapsed.

This legislation will permit him to become established in a job immediately after discharge. Also, rehabilitation assistance is not readily available to him on the weekend or a holiday, as it would be on a working day and such offices would be closed.

Finally, we have made detailed proposals for amendments concerning the maximum length of sentence which can be served in a reformatory. The enactment of such legisla-

tion will mean that no one will serve a sentence, or a combination of sentences, in a reformatory that exceeds two years less one day.

I think the maximum of two years less a day, and the reasons behind it are fairly obvious to hon. members.

People in reformatories serving sentences which are inordinately long because of consecutive sentences are a most disruptive element, especially if they are in institutions where they see a constant stream of inmates with shorter terms coming and going. We believe that if they must serve this long sentence, then they are more stabilized when serving it in a penitentiary which is geared for such longer terms.

As I have said, these are detailed and specific legislation changes which we have submitted to the hon. Solicitor-General of Canada. They are, we think, appropriate to most provinces; but are obviously designed to deal with a sophisticated system of corrections such as we have in Ontario, to deal with problems which we must solve if we are to make more progress.

I am certain that hon. members will appreciate that I have reported upon a year of solid progress, which has been accomplished by a most dedicated staff.

Mr. Chairman, we owe our thanks to a great many people—to the members of my advisory boards, planning committees who voluntarily give their services; to the aftercare agencies, members of service clubs—all of whom work with us as a team in this field. But most especially, we owe our thanks to the staff who have carried out these programmes, who have enabled us to progress by their untiring efforts, by their total commitment to the rehabilitation of the offender, so that we may carry out our part for the benefit of society in the fight against crime.

I commend to the hon. members, Mr. Chairman, the approval of the estimates of my department for the ensuing year.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the member for Bracondale, I am sure the members of the Legislature would like to welcome the school group from Mount Carmel public school in the township of Mersea near Leamington in the great county of Essex.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): In rising to speak with reference to the hon. Minister's estimates, I would first like to say that I agree with many of the statements that he has made, especially pertaining to his opinion that his department is a difficult one because of so many varied opinions in other jurisdictions and from other sources. I agree with him in that.

I also will agree that he has a most difficult department to cope with in that he is not dealing simply in units of stone, brick, mortar or automobiles—he is dealing with human beings.

I am very flattered that he has a goal, but what disturbs this speaker and the members of the Opposition is that these goals have been around for many years and each time a new Minister assumes this portfolio he reiterates the goals as if they had suddenly come into being and then starts to recite the progress he has made toward attaining them —year after year after year.

In my humble opinion, Mr. Chairman, year after year we find ourselves right at the beginning; because for every forward step this government takes toward real reform, somehow they seem to take two steps backward.

Now I applaud the hon. Minister's department for the forward steps, because there have been many of them—and they have been forward. Nevertheless, after one counts up these steps and measures the stride, the end result is that he is still further back than when he started.

Perhaps I should start at the middle of the Minister's address in the hope that I will cut my own address off short of 6 o'clock.

I want to discuss this business of the comparison of remission time or good conduct time. The hon. Minister quite correctly makes the point that most of the escapes that some people attribute to laxity in his department are not in fact legitimate attempts at escape. Most of them are, in fact, an endeavour to circumvent the differences in the time to be served by getting into a federal penitentiary.

The Minister cites this as a reason to change the existing law, to change the difference between the time a person would serve if he were sentenced to two years—thereby going to a federal prison—and if he were sentenced to two years less a day thereby going to an Ontario reformatory. I think this is proof positive that perhaps the Minister himself or through being ill-advised by the people he mentioned, has lost sight of the purpose of these two apparently varying pieces of legislation.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, there may be a reason for this which is beyond the hon. Minister's comprehension. If we are to take this sheet that he has submitted, in the one instance the caption reads "penitentiary"

coming from the Latin word "punishment", and the other is "reformatory" or "reform". It is quite conceivable, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps our magistrates are not as stupid as it appears on the surface.

For example, these figures that the Minister has been so kind to supply to the members of this House, although not in exactly this style. The commencement date was not January 1, 1966, and the dates of discharge May 7, 1967 and September 16, 1967. These figures appeared in the magistrates' *Quarterly* some time back. I read them with interest. The magistrates were pointing out to each other through the medium of this publication why many prisoners are asking the magistrates: "Please, your worship, I would like to get at least two years. I want to go to penitentiary and learn a trade".

The magistrates have not been fooled by these tricks. They have been able to calculate, they know that under one system the prisoner is going to receive his discharge sooner than he is under another system. I would also point out to the hon. Minister that the magistrates in this province are appointees of this government, and since this government has been in for such a long time, I would venture to say that 95 per cent of them, if not a higher percentage of them, received their appointment because at one time or another, they were loyal to the philosophies of the party in power here. I am not trying to criticize them in any manner, shape or form for it having so been.

I am only making this statement to indicate that they have been appointed by this province and, therefore, if they have any concern for the outlay of money, then, under normal circumstances, one would expect them to sentence people to the penitentiary where they will become the financial responsibility of the federal government, rather than to reformatories where they will become the financial responsibility of this government, the government which appointed the magistrates.

The hon. Minister has been kind enough to draw to the attention of the members of this House how much it costs this government per diem per prisoner, because these magistrates who were appointed by this government are sending the prisoners to reformatories rather than federal institutions.

Therefore, I think one would be inclined to sit back and ponder why these magistrates send some people to reformatories and others to prison. I suggest perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that these magistrates must realize more often than the hon. Minister and his advisors, that there is a difference between punishment and reformation, that when they send a person to a reformatory they have in the back of their mind a hope, albeit a faint one, that by so doing some reformation will take place.

When they sentence a prisoner to two years less a day, they feel that the extra time that he will serve by reason of his being sentenced to a reformatory will help the people charged with the responsibility of trying to reform this individual, the people in this Minister's department, to do this job.

I refuse to accept that it is simply a matter of flipping a coin mentally, heads you go there, tails you go there. Surely we must give the magistrates a little credit for having some reasoning power in this regard.

We place great stress on pre-sentence reports. I think it is admitted that more pre-sentence reports are being asked for and being received by magistrates prior to sentencing the accused than they have in the past. Not enough to be sure. As the hon. member for Downsview pointed out not too recently, there appears to be some criticism from The Attorney General's Department when too many of these reports are asked for. Nevertheless, these reports are being asked for and received. And if they are being asked for and received, I am prepared to assume that those who ask for them and receive them are perusing them and giving them consideration. Their decision to send a prisoner to one type of institution or another is based on their consideration of these reports.

So let us not be too quick and say we must change this system because the supposed evil of it is that if they are sent to the reformatory for two years less a day, they spend more time there, more time behind bars than they would if they went to a penitentiary. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, these magistrates are doing the hon. Minister and his staff a big favour. Perhaps they ought to be applauded for this, because obviously the rate of recividism is much too high.

Perhaps the Minister does not have these people within his control long enough to achieve the desired object. Perhaps the consecutive sentences of two years less a day are imposed in the fervent hope that some day the reforms department will reform some people, and the one they are sending there at the time will be the one reformed.

But just to slough it off and say that these people should not be there if they have more than a total of two years to serve should not be bought that easily.

I would point out to the hon. Minister that last year when I rose in this House, I was of the same opinion as the hon. Minister, that it was an evil to send people who had more than one term of two years less a day to a reformatory. It was wrong. They were wasting their time here.

Since then, and I think it fair to admit it, Mr. Chairman, I have had some second thoughts. I have now come to the conclusion that they definitely should go to a reformatory if they are sentenced to two years less a day and receive more than one sentence consecutively. On the other hand, I am not prepared to accept in whole the hon. Minister's proposition that anybody sentenced to a number of consecutive sentences which would exceed two years automatically ought to go into a federal prison.

As the hon. Minister said, there are varied opinions on this subject. That is abundantly clear to anybody who dwells on this subject. One reason why I detest being a critic of this Minister's department is that I cannot make up my mind which course to follow—there are so many courses open. Every time an author puts his signature to the last chapter of a book, another concept is born, another idea. Which path are you to follow? Whose ideas are you to accept? Whose ideas are you to reject?

People who write on the topic of reform change their minds more than the parable about changing your shirt. So I sympathize with the Minister in that regard. But because I do, because I feel that from my own personal conversations with him, and perhaps I should not inject personalities into this debate, but I have had conversations with him on a personal basis, I know that he is a dedicated and a sincere man. For that I applaud him. But the fact is that when he gets up in this House and makes a statement to point out that there are differences of opinion and it is a very cloudy topic, for that reason, he ought to pay attention to his own words and not become too dogmatic in his approach.

As I have said, this is one subject on which perhaps he was just a little too dogmatic. Perhaps the solution he is suggesting may get rid of these inmates sooner and, thereby, make a better looking statistic in this glossy gimmick that is put out. He could then point out, like the federal government, that we had 1,000 people less in our penitentiaries for the year 1966 than we had in the year 1965 and the *Globe and Mail* can write a little box editorial saying the new method works, we have got fewer people in prison—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is—

Mr. Ben: But the *Globe and Mail* did write, and I wrote them a little note to point out it was true there was a reduction in our prison population in 1966, that is the federal prison population, of roughly 1,000 inmates, which works out to between 12 and 13 per cent. But I also pointed out to that illustrious editorial board that at the same time, the incidence of crime in the Metropolitan Toronto area, and I presume in Canada, rose by 12.7 per cent. I was bold enough to ask whether there was any relation between the two figures, that the crime in this area rose by almost the same percentage as the number of people in prisons declined. I am not saying they do, but there again they were guilty of a rather dogmatic statement.

So by adopting a common scheme for abatement of time to be served for good behaviour, we may be accomplishing nothing more than releasing people onto the streets sooner for them to commit another crime, the sooner for them to get back within the hon. Minister's jurisdiction. It is possible and it is not possible, it is just an idea I throw out to you. Do not be too quick to buy this.

I must say I applaud the hon. Minister in his thoughts and intentions regarding temporary leave and discharge on Friday should the discharge day fall on a Saturday or Sunday. Perhaps, since this is a good idea and I adopt this thinking—that we want the prisoner to reach the area to which he is going on a day when he can accomplish something—one ought to leave himself a little more leeway. Taking into consideration the distance the discharged person has to travel, some could be released on a Thursday, others could be released on a Wednesday so that when they reached their home town, or their destination, they would have available to them, what the hon. Minister has referred to, a working day, a full working day if a working day is necessary in order to re-establish himself.

It is quite conceivable that even though discharged on a Friday, the former inmate may reach his destination on that Friday, that so-called working day, but find that nobody is working any more because he arrived too late.

I also applaud the hon. Minister's intention with reference to temporary leave, because that was a sore subject with me last year. I also noticed that there was something

that the Minister did not mention, and that is pay for these prisoners. When they do leave they have more than $20 in their pocket. I would remind the hon. Minister that he is on record as saying he was going to give consideration to payment to prisoners. I will dwell further on that subject later this evening.

With reference to temporary leave, it is high time that a prisoner was able to go out and make arrangements for employment, for accommodation, for schooling if necessary, or to get his family together if he has one, prior to the day that he walks out of those gates and they clang shut behind him. This is very laudatory, and I compliment the Minister. I just do not know how long he thinks it will take to implement this.

I do know, in speaking with the Minister of Justice the day he attended here—I presume for a discussion with the hon. Minister—that they have such a scheme in progress now where they make provisions for temporary release. I am not certain whether it is in the experimental stage or whether it is a definite programme with the federal government. Perhaps the hon. Minister can enlighten me. At any rate, they are now giving temporary release to inmates for the purposes stated, and for others, such as the example given of attending the funeral of a loved one. I presume that is but one example, I am sure the Minister could have produced more if we had pressed him.

I have already suggested some examples. For instance—if the man has a family who does not have accommodation which would allow for the husband to come back into the family unit, he could be given a week or two weeks to find suitable accommodation, place a deposit, arrange for loans, and prepare to have the family come back as a unit.

The hon. Minister mentioned death. I would suggest that an equally if not better reason would be a birth. If the prisoner is incarcerated and his wife is about to give birth, there would be therapeutic value in his being present when his wife is giving birth.

The hon. Minister has already mentioned employment. I think it is rather difficult to persuade a prospective employer to go to a reform institution to interview a prospective employee the way an employer at the present time goes to the University of Toronto. Again this would be a big step forward and I do hope it can be implemented.

May I interject here and just ask, when does the Minister hope this thing might occur?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this is all dependent on the federal government. I have not heard since November.

Mr. Ben: Very good, I will accept that.

It being 6 o'clock, the House took recess.

No. 87

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 4, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 4, 1967

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman, continued 3047
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3081

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1967

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

(Continued)

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, before rising for the dinner hour I made a statement that Tory progress was one step forward and two steps backwards. I got some guffaws and some laughter from the other side, so I think perhaps it might be in order to examine the record of The Department of Reform Institutions in the light of what has transpired—in say the last 10, 12, 13 years—and see just how much weight is carried by the statement of the hon. Minister as to the wonderful progress his department has made; or at least he has led us to believe his department has made.

In 1954, a select committee was set up to bring down a report. The short title was: "The report of the select committee appointed by the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario to study and report upon problems of delinquent individuals and custodial questions and the place of reform institutions therein".

It is a very interesting document; I enjoyed reading it very much. As a matter of fact, I was almost tempted to pull a fast one on the hon. Minister by just reading that report, because as far as I am concerned, it could have been written today. But I thought I had better not, because some of the members who were there at the time might still be around; they might recognize it, although I doubt it.

At any rate, one of the suggestions was that:

> More psychologists, psychiatrists and counsellors be added to the institutional staffs to guide reformative programmes.

It was also suggested that:

> Permanent employment of specialists to apply the best penological and scientific methods.

Now, what has happened since that time?

According to the 1954 select committee report, the department had no psychiatrists in 1954. Obviously things had to improve and they did to some extent, prior to the present Minister assuming the office.

In 1963 and in 1964 under his predecessors, Mr. Foote and the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett), the department had a staff of eight psychiatrists. Then came the age of enlightenment and progress to which the hon. Minister was referring earlier. The dark ages were gone forever, or so he is trying to get us and the electors to believe.

In 1964, the Minister's department stood still.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. member would like me to get him correct on the record. I was the Minister in 1963 and 1964.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): That long?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know it does not seem that long.

Mr. Ben: In 1964 the Minister's department stood still with eight psychiatrists. Then the hon. Minister began to distinguish himself for we see that his department had but six psychiatrists in 1965 and now, the 1966 report shows he has four psychiatrists. That is what I call progress.

Let us go on with a few more of his successes. Again referring to this select committee report of 1954, it showed a staff of six psychologists. By the time the present Minister's predecessor left office, the complement of psychologists numbered 11.

On his first play in 1964, the hon. Minister snapped up two more psychologists and three more on his second try in 1965. But then came the third down and the disaster, because in 1966 we see that there must have been a terrible cross-up in the back field. The hon. Minister has been nailed for a loss, because he is back with a complement of 11 and that is where he started from.

In 1954, for example, the field of social work was perhaps a more limited one than

it is now, since at the time the select committee made its report there were no social workers in the department. By 1963, the department had three.

In 1964, his department made giant strides forward and increased this number to five and a similar gain was reported for 1965. In 1966, I believe there was a Mexican standoff or something, because there is no change, but according to the Conservative theory this number should start to diminish at any time. We hope for the sake of the people in this province that they are not around to implement the next step of their progress.

Under the classification of counsellors, we find that for 1966 the department had only one. But that is not so bad because the department did not have any in 1965, although they had one in 1964.

Mind you, Mr. Chairman, they had two counsellors in 1963 before this hon. Minister diligently assumed office.

Although this statement may appear to flatter the hon. Minister's predecessor, the hon. Minister of Transport, it should be pointed out that the department also had two counsellors in 1954. I must again compliment the Minister on the progress being made in this department.

Let us take a further look at the progress of what I call the "Whiz Kids" in this department and examine the steps they have taken for increasing the educational qualifications for those people in custody.

The teaching staff now numbers 32 according to the 1966 report. In 1965 it numbered only 30 and in 1964 it was 27. In 1963 there were 29 teachers but in 1966 there were only 32; in other words the hon. Minister has made great strides and picked up one a year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would you repeat that last one?

Mr. Ben: I said you had picked up one a year. In 1965 you had 30.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Thirty what?

Mr. Ben: Teaching staff members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In 1966?

Mr. Ben: In 1966—I am sorry. In 1966 you had 32. In 1965 you had 30 and in 1964 you had 27. In 1963 there were 29. In essence, the net gain is three, from 1963 to 1966, or one a year. It is a very good job. I imagine you must have had scouts out looking for these and digging up all this talent.

We do find a somewhat more encouraging sign in the increase of training instructors. No really great progress, but the hon. Minister at least held his own. He started with 23 and finished, in 1966, with 29, which is 10 more training instructors than in the year the select committee's report was completed.

I am actually amazed how well the Minister has been doing under the circumstances. For instance, in 1964 he produced four librarians and they were kept around for 1965. Come 1966, abracadabra, a puff of smoke, and they are gone.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You mean we have no librarians?

Mr. Ben: According to your statistics here; you do not record there being any librarians. You may have them hidden, but they are not recorded in the statistics that your staff so conscientiously compiled.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I think they are reported.

Mr. Ben: I stand to be corrected as always. The number of "officers and employees, correctional officers, psychiatrists, social workers, counsellors, teachers, trade instructors, physicians, dentists, nurses, cooks, farmers, gardeners' assistants, stationary engineers, firemen, tradesmen, mechanics, industrial plant managers, shop foremen, all other employees, 22." They may be hidden in that 22, but I should think that a librarian had some status and would be worthy of at least being thrown in with the farmers, gardeners' assistants, cooks, chefs and chefs' assistants.

Before the hon. Minister counters with a defence—or an attempt at a defence of a sick, old and palsied administration—and tries to prove that there have been some advances made in the fields of reform and rehabilitation, I think he should read this report. Perhaps I may even make some references to it for him. For instance, counsellors. The report states that:

> The counselling service is under-staffed and, in overall effect, feeble. It is less than half-fledged, as is rehabilitation.

Mr. Chairman, the summary said "half-fledged." This means it is being furnished with feather ready to fly or growing feathers for flight. At least that is the interpretation I place on it.

The question here is, where has this counselling service gone? I do not think it has gone very far and, in fact, there are many who will dispute that it ever got off the ground.

I want to read into the record a portion of the official statement of the Canadian correction association entitled, "Criteria for treatment and training programmes in prison." Under a subheading of "Purposes", the article states:

> The purposes of the system as a whole can be stated as threefold:
>
> (a) to hold the individual inmate in custody for whatever period the court has decreed, subject to parole or other legal modification;
>
> (b) to take whatever steps are indicated to prepare the individual inmate for return to normal community living as a law abiding citizen;
>
> (c) on the basis of an active programme of research and experimentation and a constant review of all aspects of each institutional programme, to introduce those modifications and developments that are required to enable the prison system to function in accord with the best available knowledge in the field.

Now the Canadian correction association in this paper also points out that:

> A modern prison system programme can be operated only with the participation of staff who are members of the various treatment professions and who are skilled in the application of the treatment techniques developed by their respective professions. Although humane handling of prisoners by non-professionals is highly important, the services of skilled professionals are essential if inmates' attitudes are to be changed in any fundamental way.
>
> In order to attract and hold professional staff each prison must provide working conditions, salaries and facilities on a par with standards that exist in other fields.

I wonder if the Minister accepts that position?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Ben: He does? Then we can conclude that these desirable and ideal conditions do not exist in the hon. Minister's department, as his own figures point to a large turnover and a notable lack of success in reform.

Each year, as the hon. Minister knows too well, deaths are reported of inmates and each year, as this House knows too well, the hon. Minister rises to berate those who question the medical services available at institutions operated by The Department of Reform Institutions.

We appreciate his problems. It seems that in 1966, three doctors got sick of being associated with the hon. Minister's department and resigned. At least, that is what we would tend to gather from his annual report which shows that the number of physicians decreased from 15 in 1965 to 12 in 1966. Mind you, I do not think that that is too bad for the present Minister, since they had only 14 when he assumed office and only 10 in 1954.

One of the recommendations of the select committee report was that doctors and dentists be hired on a full time basis wherever possible and economical. We are now used to statements by the hon. Minister that certain hiring fees are not of his domain and, therefore, present shortages must be due to the hiring being uneconomical. Surely that does not make these appointments impossible?

On the next point, I have to give the Minister full marks. I truly congratulate him and I strongly suggest that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) get in touch with him. On taking office, the institutions administered by him had 11 nurses, but for the past three years of his stewardship, he has maintained the nursing staff at 13. I think all members of this House must recognize the hon. Minister's ability to hold on to his nurses.

In this magnificent tome, with which we are well acquainted, the editors provide us with a brief glance at the research being conducted in the field of criminology.

In addition to the departmental staff projects, we understand that various research projects are being carried out at the University of Toronto centre of criminology. As I say, we understand that projects are being carried out, but we are unaware of what these projects are, or what they seek to find. The centre receives the magnificent sum of $30,000 from The Department of Reform Institutions and a further $15,000 from The Department of the Attorney General.

Perhaps more information will be forthcoming on their ventures now. They may not be so tight lipped since they have received a grant of $150,000, to be spread over a period of three years, from the Ford foundation in New York.

However, it is interesting to note the statement made by the director of the centre of criminology, Professor Edwards, in an article carried in the *Globe and Mail*, and I think I quoted this once before. In this article, Professor Edwards is quoted as decrying the fact that, although crime costs Canada $400

million per year, only .1 of 1 per cent of that figure is spent investigating the causes of crime. I would point out that this $400 million is only for the administration of justice; it does not include the cost of articles stolen or property damaged and other similar costs.

We are also mindful of the fact that the Minister in his annual report, points out other research projects which we heartily endorsed on previous occasions, such as those at the universities at Guelph and Waterloo, so apparently he must have learned something from my speech last year. However, his dedication to research and investigation could be confirmed if he would tell us what actions have been taken on the recommendations of the 1954 select committee report, which includes some 142 recommendations. I am going to cover some of them at the present time.

For instance, recommendation 1:

> That the province should give every encouragement possible to establishment of a chair of penology at an Ontario university.

Has that been established?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what we did with the $30,000.

Mr. Ben: That is the chair, is it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is started.

Mr. Ben: That is the chair. All right. I continue:

> That the importance of the position of psychologist be recognized by a more adequate salary and adjustment of responsibilities and full consultations regarding future development of departmental programmes.

Now last year, the Minister told us that it was not within the scope of his authority to alter the salary structure and therefore he had difficulty obtaining psychologists. Has there been any change in that? Has the scale been increased?

Now we come to recommendation 10:

> That the Ontario reformatory at Brampton be renamed so that in name as well as function, it is clearly distinguished from other institutions—

Now, that has been done—

> —and that the industrial farm at Burwash be renamed Burwash provincial prison in keeping with the establishment of a policy that has handled only nonreformable recidivists.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member agree with that?

Mr. Ben: This is a recommendation that came from this House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I asked the hon. member whether he agrees with that recommendation.

Mr. Ben: If it is a place for nonreformable recidivists, yes. If the hon. Minister suggests that you have people there who are other than nonreformable recidivists, then I say that the Minister has been very negligent in the carrying out of the functions of his office, because he ought not to be combining or putting into one institution nonreformable recidivists with those who are capable of being reformed. So if the hon. Minister will give me the answer as to what type of inmates there are, I will be more than pleased to answer his question. Now:

> That salaries of institutional personnel be increased to a level that will attract a consistently high calibre of employee and will provide incentive for making a career in custodial and reformative work.

Has that been done since last year? I recall distinctly last year both Opposition parties strenuously objecting to the very low salaries that were paid to the people on staff in these various prisons.

> 19. That more psychologists, psychiatrists and counsellors be added to institutional staffs to guide reformative progress.

I think I have already given an example of this hon. Minister's progress in that regard.

> 24. That all guards be given instruction in a staff training school—

And I have it underlined here—

> —before assuming regular duties.

Before assuming regular duties. Has that been the procedure followed by the hon. Minister's department since 1954?

> 33. That all temporary structures for inmates' accommodation be replaced with permanent buildings providing individual cells rather than dormitories.

I am sure almost all hon. members know that that has not been done, unless since I last visited Guelph all the dormitories have been converted into cells.

Just skipping through them at random:

That The Department of Reform Institutions assume control and operation of all district, city and county jails in Ontario.

Do not tell me that these new district detention centres fulfil that particular requirement.

That The Department of Reform Institutions provide facilities for visitors, such facilities to consist of two sets of booths, each separated by unbreakable glass and supplied with telephones for verbal communication.

Well, if you have, it has been since my last visit to Guelph.

This is a question which actually does not come under this hon. Minister's department but I had asked the Minister of Health—I think it falls more in his jurisdiction, although it was contained in this report on reform institutions.

That general hospitals in all localities be encouraged to establish detention units for the housing of mental patients.

And there is another, 64:

That a full-scale reception centre be established to receive, study, diagnose and recommend treatment for all first offenders aged 16 to 25, male and female, sentenced to provincial institutions.

Has that been done? Well, if it has, the next question I would ask—the next recommendation is:

That the length of stay be six weeks to two months, except for short-term prisoners.

Did The Department of Reform Institutions establish a policy of providing accommodation in individual cells rather than dormitories in all adult institutions? I am sure that has not been done. As I say, this is 1954.

74. That the policy be established in all custodial institutions, including jails, of providing work for all able-bodied inmates.

We know that has not been done. I could go on *ad infinitum* until I get up to 142. The last one I read was 74. I guess, perhaps, I should have stopped at 71 and said I was half way through it. Now you can say I got more than half way through but I am sure we will find opportunity to get back to those recommendations.

Getting back to the universities, I think we would be most interested in discovering what financial assistance is given to the universities already taking part, and also what inducements are being provided to attract these students to the overall field of correction, a field that is sorely understaffed.

The Liberal Party does not advocate throwing money around in a helter-skelter fashion but we feel there must be some encouragement provided in excess of the $6,000 allocated in the estimates last year for bursaries. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I cannot find in this year's estimates the $6,000 for the bursaries; I would like to have my attention directed to that amount. I looked for it and I could not find it; it might be hidden in some other sum.

Much has been written and much has been spoken, especially earlier today, by the department and other authorities on preparing inmates for their return to the community. What is being overlooked to a large extent is the preparation of the public to receive these men, women and youths back to society once they have been discharged. Regular press releases are sent out by the information services branch of The Department of Reform Institutions. These tell us that the Minister has outlined his programme at the opening of some new centre, or we may be treated to attractive little bits of the Minister's speeches, or the release may announce appointments to the department.

This is all very fine for people who are more directly concerned with the field of reform. What we are concerned about is information to the public. Recently it was important enough for the Minister to justify sending out a press release prior to holding a seminar. One would also tend to believe that if it is of sufficient importance to send out a release prior to holding a seminar it should be of sufficient importance to prepare and send out a follow-up press release on what was achieved from the discussion which lasted four days.

I should point out that according to the Minister's own report for the year ended March 31, 1966, a total of 4,718 women and 53,512 men, for a grand total of 58,230 persons, were committed to regional and county jails. Total expenditure for operating these institutions amounted to $5,463,066.56 or $9.44 per day for each inmate. One would wonder what recommendations resulted from the discussions on food services for the county jails, for instance. At least you could tell us, are they going to receive beef instead of turkey for Christmas or turkey instead of beef?

The assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Penfold, was on hand; did he have any suggestions? What was resolved in the field of general administration? Were there any recommendations on the statement of purpose, about public relations and other topics?

A major complaint against the department has been that they do not and have not had a good public relations policy. Since most of these institutions are outside the major metropolitan areas, I am quite sure that the local press, according to our information, is not at all satisfied with the public relations policy now afforded by the department. There is a natural tendency for these county officials to be overly cautious in dealing with the press. Let us remember, the press is the main intermediary between the institutions and the public. What was suggested at this time for improving the public relations of these institutions? And were the newspapers and press advised of any recommendations? The Minister will forgive me, but I have to bring up this rather puzzling incident: The Toronto press carried a story of research being conducted by Dr. Taduesz Grygier, professor of the school of social work at the University of Toronto and director of research for The Department of Reform Institutions.

To jar the memory of some hon. members here—and I think some of them may need jarring—the Toronto *Telegram* of November 28, 1966, carried a story captioned: "Ontario report: treatment of delinquents criticized". This is written by Eric Dowd and the article led off with the paragraph:

> A probe of training schools for delinquent children in Ontario casts strong doubt on their effectiveness.

The Toronto *Globe and Mail* carried a story under the caption, "Reveal results of five-year study: Report stresses early treatment of juvenile delinquency".

The lead paragraph in this story states:

> Juvenile delinquency, like cancer, needs to be diagnosed and treated early.

The same paper also carried a story on June 11, 1966, which was headed "Criminologist reports: Study links 'bad' girls to 'bad' fathers." In this article the lead paragraph reads:

> Behind many delinquent girls there is an inadequate father, a study by a University of Toronto criminologist has shown.

Now, I think most of us here would be of the mind that the contents of this report would be of sufficient import to merit distribution or availability. We tried to obtain this report through the obvious bureau, which is that of the director of information of The Department of Reform Institutions, in January before the members assembled. It was not available from this source and it was suggested that the library of the centre of criminology at the University of Toronto would have a copy. There were none available at this source either. On a second occasion we sought a copy from the information director for The Department of Reform Institutions and it was again suggested that we try to obtain one from the centre of criminology. Once more the library at the centre was found to be without a copy and it was suggested that the director of the centre might have a copy for his personal use.

On February 24, we contacted the director, Professor Edwards, and although he acknowledged seeing articles in the press on the report of Dr. Grygier, he did not have a copy either. Finally, through a Ministerial decision on February 27, I received a copy of the text of the report from the Minister, along with a nice little note signed "Angel Grossman". I thanked him for it. That was a nice term. But let me tell you, if this is what you have to go through to get a report which is supposed to be public knowledge, then I suggest that in due course, in the fullness of time, as somebody is apt to say, the Angel is going to be a fallen one.

I know there is supposed to be a PR man working with the department. As a matter of fact, I just saw him earlier today, sitting back in his position in the press gallery. Surely at least the members of this Legislature are supposed to be able to obtain reports, important reports, for which this Legislature allocated money. The hesitancy with which this department assists the press in informing the public can be attested to by any number of reporters. There is a large difference between inviting the press to some trade exhibition and briefing them informatively when some eruption takes place within the government institutions.

There is another statement by this select committee, about giving information to the public. We in the Liberal Party believe that the information services branch should be immediately reorganized within The Department of Reform Institutions and a programme implemented to acquaint the general public with the aims and programmes of this important department. Much should be done in explaining the government's attitude toward the rehabilitation of the offender and helping develop public acceptance of those discharged or placed on probation or parole.

Offhand, we would suggest greater assistance for the press, radio and television showing the rehabilitative factors involved. Also, public education of this role could come through lectures to service clubs, parents'

associations and social clubs by qualified lecturers in the field of corrections, and by the preparation of films for distribution. Undoubtedly there have been some steps taken at separate institutions, but I can assure the hon. Minister that more has to be done than the inviting of service club guests to another outdoor luncheon or some similar tour. We think that the importance of maintaining the law and explaining this to our children is as important as promoting Elmer, the safety elephant.

Furthermore, we of the Liberal Party believe there is much to be done in this field. The public is now accepting alcoholism and other various forms of misbehaviour for what they are—illness. We believe that they will realize, when they become aware of what crime is costing them as taxpayers, how it is uprooting homes and scarring individuals, that they will demonstrate their ability to assist in the resettlement of so many who themselves believe there is little hope.

We must show that, as our society progresses we must be able to reach down, deeper into ourselves, to accept others who lack encouragement and assistance. We must and we will show how it is better for the public to rid themselves of past prejudices and how this will benefit our communities as a whole. This is what the information services should be helping to promote. This is what they are not helping to attain, and under a Liberal government this is what the informaiton services will be designed to accomplish.

In view of the numbers of trained professional personnel required for staffing the various institutions operated by The Department of Reform Institutions, we believe that the government's entire policy of recruiting should be thoroughly re-examined. The present efforts are proving now, as they have proved in the past, to be entirely inadequate in acquiring and keeping the necessary staff to carry out a thorough programme of rehabilitation and reform. Industry makes great efforts to secure the services of university-educated young men and women even before they graduate, and we believe that if we are to put an end to this seemingly endless debating over lack of qualified staff, then a recruitment programme should be placed under study without delay.

In line with this, we would also propose that a responsible member of the current staff be appointed to the post of heading such a bureau. The role of this office would be to increase contacts with the officials at our universities and colleges and the placement officers at our institutions of higher learning, to design a more efficient manner in obtaining the services of these young people for the department's services. It should be recalled here and emphasized that in the first year or so of college education, many students have not decided upon the career to follow upon completion of their studies. We think that this department, and perhaps others as well, should attempt to attract the interests of the students via various means, and by tours to hold the students' interest in the possibility of a career in correction or other related fields.

Considering the numbers of staff that are required, we believe that with such a programme the amount of $6,000 allocated for bursaries last year would prove to be miniscule in seeking out the future services of those so direly needed by our institutions. The Minister can claim that his department is doing the utmost to acquire these people already. We have no doubt that they are trying, but how hard are they trying? There is also the matter of what happens after these people enter the service of the department.

The Minister reminds us of the fisherman who spends day after day trying to catch the one big whopper which seems to defy all anglers in a favourite pond. Once the game is caught, for some reason, however, it is never netted or it swims away with the rod and line and the patient fisherman starts his wait all over again. I imagine that would be the definition of the Minister.

We also believe that the same holds true for many of the young people who enter The Department of Reform Institutions. Having spoken to some of these qualified young people, we were truly sorry to see how their dedication and devotion and optimism had withered away. We must ask ourselves why this dedication and devotion have withered away. Perhaps it did not wither, quite possibly it was strangled by the chains of the administration.

While we agree with the hon. Minister that the majority of the staff and administrators are in agreement with modern concepts of reform and rehabilitation, we also believe the hon. Minister would agree that there is a strong possibility some members of his staff, even at the higher levels, often do not pay more than lip service to the higher principles which are laid down. As a result of this retrogressive feeling, and from speaking to some of these young people, it is my opinion that they leave

the department feeling their idealism was misplaced and their efforts were not truly condoned by administrations of some institutions.

We are not harping on this fact, but we do regret that the department is not always, as a result, able to retain these needed services provided by the younger members of the staff. Perhaps the older staff members should be cautioned on some occasions, that the services and philosophies of this department by needs must always be evolutionary and that the institutions will be there, greatly changed, after they have retired.

A Liberal government, within a year from taking office, shall be implementing a programme of expanded assistance to students to attract them to the field of corrections. We shall also be implementing a recruitment programme to attract our graduates and future graduates to this field. We shall also be attracting them for positions of summer employment to introduce them into the practical aspects of reform and rehabilitation. And the Liberal government of 1967-1968 and ensuing years shall award bursaries for students in honour courses after completion of their second year, and also for graduate students which will provide for employment following completion of their university studies.

The official Opposition has, on all too many occasions, been accused by the multitude of Ministers of Reform Institutions as not actually having any real interest in this field but rather of exploiting various incidents for possible political gain. Sometimes as we Opposition members strive to obtain the facts on the operation of The Department of Reform Institutions, we are given to wonder how the Minister behaves and what comments he makes in view of the Opposition attempts. We can well imagine the Minister broadly beaming as he states, "We have nothing to worry about. The Opposition members, both the Grits and the Kneedeepers cannot find anything out. After all, our staff past and present are obligated by their oath of secrecy. And if they do find anything out, we can always discredit the staff members who had the nerve to talk. As for the inmates, who would believe them anyway? After all, those guys are in jail, are they not?"

It is an odd thing, as I pointed out last year, that the inmates and ex-inmates always tell the same lies. What was equally as strange, as I found out later, is that the discredited staff members and those who resigned voluntarily had much the same story to tell, and we are inclined to believe that the Minister does not know all former staff members who resigned still with good employment records.

As we have demonstrated, it is so difficult to obtain a true and accurate picture of the operations of this very important department. We should also realize that when a man or woman offends against society, they do not only harm themselves but so many others among their families and friends. We can well imagine a number of sleepless and disturbed evenings others experience from the action of the offender. The offender's family, relatives and friends are given cause to ponder and to reason how they might have helped if they had been able to detect certain signs of behaviour and project these toward the time when a fateful event took place.

Those of us here who have seen these offenders appear in court, who have counselled their anguished families and who have witnessed the stigma of failure, and we who have later dealt with and tried to help these elements of society, are not going to stand idly and indifferently by while being accused of not possessing a conscience, and of being "four-week experts" and "headline seekers".

We in the Opposition, as has been evidenced on previous occasions, realize our responsibility and we do have a conscience. We are not dealing with bags of feed, trucks or vegetables or bales of cloth. We are dealing—and that is all members of this House—with the past and future of not only those who are placed in custody, but also of those who wait outside for their return.

The hon. Minister has admitted in his many speeches that no one knows all the answers and that all the answers will never be found. He made that admission today when he referred to the various opinions. Fine, but we must strive to find all these answers. There should be no end to the search for these answers, because it is a problem that every succeeding generation will face.

It has been said that man possesses the ability to find answers to all the problems that confront and harass humanity. We, in the official Opposition, urge all members here to join in a united effort, enlisting themselves and their support to free uncounted thousands of the present and future generations from the burdens and stains of incarceration and denial of dignity. To date the government has not been able to have a united effort. We want to help, because there are still prisons full of people. Something must be done. These various opinions must be reconciled in one manner or another.

Last year in my speech, I stated and I want to re-state now that the problems we face with today's youth are staggering, but they should not be frightening nor impossible, except for the timid. As in the case of many of our resources, this government has remained unaware of their proper uses. It applies today as it did last year and, I imagine, the report in 1954 said just about the same thing.

I made a few other statements last year about our youth being tired of politicians believing that youth is the greatest investment for the future of this nation because obviously, if we say it, we do not mean it. At least, this government does not. They are doing nothing about that whatsoever. I was amazed when reading the report of the Ontario select committee on youth, what little there was on children in custody and delinquency responsibility. It came in toward the end of the volume. As a lawyer, I have always been impressed by the commonsense judgments that have been shown by the jury of equals. The longer I witness this, the prouder I become of this magnificent judicial institution. The average man or woman has a much greater sense of reliability and responsibility than one would be given to think when we dwell upon the many ills of our society. Let us not forget that these same people provide and protect the myriads of benefits that we all enjoy and that, Mr. Chairman, is what we represent as our eyes survey this House. We are assembled here as representatives of these people, drawn from almost every walk of life. And it is these members, Mr. Chairman, who, we believe, are capable of making most rational and intelligent judgments in our whole field of correction.

We have experts who agree with the present approach. We also have experts who disagree with this same approach. We have experts who do not know if the approach is proper, and we have experts who wonder and want to find out what is right. And most of all, we have an electorate who wonder and we even have those who will disagree. Conclusions arrived at a few years back, as I stated earlier this evening, are now suspect. I remember, after returning from overseas, that the professors at the university told us in psychology classes never to take the belt to the child. I presume some of these same professors have experienced fatherhood and since have been karate-chopped by their own offspring and perhaps now advocate sterner discipline being used on their obstreperous child.

We of the Liberal Party of Ontario feel it is time to re-examine the whole thinking as to the administration and purpose of The Department of Reform Institutions of this province. There has been a select committee and the department has completely ignored the recommendations of that select committee.

It is our unanimous opinion that a concerted effort in research into the effectiveness of the present system must be undertaken. From this research and cross-research, let us have recommendations and let us have more differing opinions offered from all sources concerned. As a result, the Liberal Party of Ontario proposes that a select committee be established by this Legislature to hear representations and provide recommendations for a policy that will provide the future guide lines of The Department of Reform Institutions, and be implemented.

This select committee would hear representations and accept briefs concerning among others, the following points:

1. Changes in the programmes needed for the treatment and rehabilitation of all offenders.

2. Changes that should be made in planning for the facilities to be used for treatment.

3. Adequate training and its entire implementation for all staff members.

4. Improving conditions for custodial personnel and in-training programmes to improve their qualifications and value to the overall effect of the department.

5. Ways and means of best returning discharged inmates into the community.

6. Outlining a training programme for those members of county and regional jails who will be absorbed into the service of The Department of Reform Institutions, and devising a system considering their previous service.

7. Submissions by residential schools and educators on the best manner in which to implement academic and trades training, and the physical plant needed to provide the maximum in results.

8. Representations from physical education and hobbies and crafts instructors on programmes that would make the best use of inmates' free time and how beneficial programmes could be implemented into the present system.

9. Special attention to the benefits to be realized for the inmate population by providing school courses using programmed learning

methods which would make for greater student progress and which would help them realize that they can quickly compensate for any previous lack of education.

10. Set definitions as to when offenders should be removed from institutions and be placed in public health institutions. We are particularly concerned here with individuals of a lower level of intelligence who cannot make their way in society, just as others of a higher level of intelligence are equally as incapable of meeting the same demands.

11. Examine studies and seek opinions and representations on the value of sending women to reformatories and jails since their crimes are generally those of a moral nature rather than offences against the criminal code, and they are seldom habitual offenders.

12. Re-examine the entire approach toward drug offenders, alcoholic offenders and sexual deviates.

13. Enlist the support of The Department of Health and The Department of Education in pooling or sharing personnel for therapeutic treatment.

These are some of the points that have to be covered.

In view of the successes of the parole representatives in assisting so many in the resumption of acceptable social behaviour, the Liberal Party proposes that these services be overhauled and enlarged upon to the extent that a maximum number of persons may benefit from these noble aims and efforts. The Liberal Party stands on record as providing the means for a thorough investigation into this service so that further methods may be devised on how this all-too-important segment of the correction system may play an even greater role in helping society find greater answers to one of its most distressing problems.

In releasing inmates from our institutions at the most opportune time to aid in their readjustment under the supervision of this branch of government service, we feel most important steps are being taken with the utmost benefit to the inmates and to society as a whole. We believe that the wise counsel afforded by such an excellent staff is of far greater benefit if the inmate is prepared than to retain this individual in custody exposed to influences of a less beneficial nature.

The record of parole officers in our opinion is perhaps the greatest and most significant stride ever taken by Canada's correctional systems.

There is an expression that if one has a job to be undertaken, then give it to a busy man and it will be done, and at the present time I would say this applies to our parole staff.

We would also suggest that if a reform system set its sights on preparing inmates for assuming their normal role, then a greater realization would be inherent in accepting parole into the reforms programmes in entirety.

As much as the custodial staff and therapeutic staff are involved with inmates from their introduction to our institutions we believe the role of parole officers is no less great.

For this reason we are inclined to believe that newly received inmates should meet with parole representatives as soon after their admission as is possible. Such advice is then provided on attaining parole, no doubt would assist these offenders in taking greater advantage of the counsel and facilities provided by the institutions and indicate how they can best aid in their own discharge from direct custody.

Dischargees under the supervision of parole are not only benefiting their families by contributing to their support and assistance but are also a saving to this province.

We of the Liberal Party believe, and we presume other responsible members of this House support us, that the time has come to take stock of the whole process of corrections. If we believe that alcoholics can be helped and made worthwhile citizens, then we must also apply the same attitude towards our reforms system and its end products. To accomplish a greater degree of rehabilitation will not come easily. But when we view and consider the comments of Professor Edwards of the centre of criminology that crime costs this nation $400 million per year—a moderate estimate—we must reject any propensity towards lethargy, inattention and indecisiveness.

Delay can be damaging and has been damaging and only prolongs a situation that at present is attended by all too much misery and anguish. Too often there is too much spoken on this important matter and all too little attempted or accomplished. Discovering effective solutions to the manifold uncertainties in this area will not come easy. Problems are not met by backing away from what faces us. To niggle over costs would result in negligence in our responsibilities.

I tried to inform the Minister and his assistant earlier that this is the reason my

address here has been so long, because I do not propose to be niggardly or haggling when we come to the estimates. I hope to say most of what I have to say now and let the estimates go through, because we are not going to reduce them by nit-picking and haggling when important work should be done.

The past is littered with examples of where effort and resources were lacking in meeting difficult situations. In this case the situation awaits prompt consideration now, and that is why I hope the House will give it.

Mr. S. Lewis: I anticipated a rather lengthy dissertation from the member for Bracondale. That is why I endeavoured to find a moment or two of recreation and inspiration from the gallery, Mr. Chairman. Primarily recreation, I assure you, sir. As it is, I am, as it were, filling in for my colleague, the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young), who is at this moment gathering very pertinent information relevant to this department, for all the sub-estimates which follow. I shall therefore be relatively brief.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, as others have said, that one must perforce begin by complimenting the Minister. That is difficult for members of the Opposition from time to time but I do it with full voice. There has been a notable change in the intentions of this department over the last three years, and there has been a notable trend in terms of its Ministerial responsibility. This has been a Minister who not only runs his department but speaks publicly, as well, on varying occasions in areas of social concern. He is the Minister of the new morality, the Minister of the mini-morality. Some of us will prove that he is a Minister of amorality in certain areas over the next 24 or 48 hours in the context of the department, but I appreciate the effort on the part of this Minister to convey to society as a whole, not only the thrust of his department but the values and trends and morals which he would like to see animate the society. It is something which not all of his colleagues do, and though we take issue with him it is at times refreshing at moments—amusing but often interesting.

This department over the last three years, Mr. Chairman, has shown exceedingly good intentions, it has indeed increased its staff, albeit unexpectedly at times, as when the Toronto psychiatric hospital ran into certain difficulties in transfer to the Clarke institute and many people left to assume positions in the department that they might not otherwise have assumed. Also, there was its general re-orientation as a department under a new Minister who brought to it the energy that each new Minister—placed in this portfolio—brings to it.

One of the things that disturbed us profoundly on this side, Mr. Chairman, is that despite the recognition that this Minister has tried harder than any of his predecessors to give some relevance and justification to this department of government, the department has been an abysmal failure. I do not use that phrase in the context of the civil service, which, as far as I am concerned, is doing a job of dedication that is almost indescribable; and I do not do it in the context of the Minister's own intentions. I do it in the context of the Tory party and the Tory social philosophy.

The department has been an abysmal failure because, as far as the Minister can go, he has reached the outer limits of the Tory philosophy and it is obvious that this department will never do the reforming, rehabilitative, reconstructing human job which has to be done in this field of corrections and penology. And with all the goodwill in the world, Mr. Chairman, this Minister will be forever frustrated and inhibited by the insensitivity of the Treasury board and the Cabinet benches who will never have time—no matter what the feeling and the sentiment, and no matter what the objective—for vesting in this Minister or in his very capable civil service, or in this general area, the kind of money, the kind of interest, the kind of support, which he obviously must have in order to function reasonably.

The point is that, despite all the new trappings at the periphery, despite the injection of one or two additional psychiatrists, one or two additional psychologists, one or two additional social workers and two or three additional nurses, despite all of this and the upgrading, minor though it may be, of staff wages in general, despite all of this, the essential rationale of the department remains the same. Willy-nilly, it is a department of correction, it is a department which is essentially a punitive environment and cannot be altered until the department disappears entirely. It is particularly punitive, obviously, Mr. Chairman, in its juvenile institutions, although after reading a fascinating thesis—as yet unpublished—like the study of Guelph, "Society behind Bars", one begins to realize that the punitive nature of the department and all that it leads to is manifest in the adult centres as well as in the juvenile.

It is simply not viable, Mr. Chairman. The Department of Reform Institutions is simply not viable. It will always have serious, nay crippling, lacks in all the important areas. By virtue of its position at the bottom of the social service pyramid that government recognizes, it will never have sufficient professional staff to do the kind of intensive therapeutic work which they would like to do. By virtue of the insensitivity of The Provincial Treasurer's Department and the civil service commission, it will never have the kind of staff and kind of money for the staff which will allow them to do the sensitive, human relating job which is required in any reasonable environment.

It will always have, and will always persist in having, the large, barren, sterile, oppressive institutions which many members of this House have visited. No matter what their cleanliness, no matter what their orderliness, no matter what the sense of devotion that is obvious within these buildings, they will always reflect an essentially hostile and sterile environment to those who are sent there, or consigned there by the courts.

As a department, it will never have adequate probation services to carry the load. It will never have in any sense a sufficient caseload to allow a man to do a job; and there is nothing more depressing or demoralizing to the well intentioned probation officer than the case-loads which many carry in this Minister's department.

It will never have the money for per diem expenses, as this fancy report indicates, which will allow it to do the work satisfactorily. Indeed, next to the per diem we give to the Ontario hospitals, Mr. Chairman, this department is discriminated against most criminally by government—and I use the words "criminally discriminated" for obvious reasons.

This Minister will never have, Mr. Chairman, the full support of the Cabinet because it is a grudging support. It is an involuntary support because in general social areas like the rehabilitation involved in reform institutions, the Conservative government has invariably dragged its heels and has invariably taken steps with the greatest reluctance in the face of an overwhelming social need. That is manifest in this department, as it is in every other department, like Social and Family Services and Health and certain aspects of the Attorney General and Education. The areas of human response are the areas of greatest delinquency where this government is concerned, and obviously a small sort of adjunct, called Department of Reform Institutions will never receive the status it deserves in the context of rehabilitation of human beings.

Indeed, even in those areas which are not so intensively involved, that we hear less about, even in the areas of reconstructing the jails and developing regional centres, even that moves with an almost unbearable slowness because of the view that this Minister's counterpart has of this department. Let us face it, Mr. Chairman, we go through the county jail situation session after session. I have no doubt we will come to it again in 48, or 72, or however many hours, and we will once again hear the recitation of the number of years and the Minister's amicable, earnest defence of an indefensible situation.

The whole department simply is not viable, Mr. Chairman. It simply is not receiving the support, and if ever—I repeat—if ever that was demonstrated it is demonstrated under this Minister—and I hope I do not do him ill. I hope I do not do him an injustice to say to him that if it was not possible for this Minister to achieve the rehabilitation and reform of The Department of Reform Institutions, it simply is not going to be possible. And it has failed under his stewardship. Therefore one says, for this party, Mr. Chairman, and repeats what we have said before, that what we must have is a total dismantling of the department. If we are "just to oppose", with the Liberal Party, our attitude toward The Department of Reform Institutions, it is a very simple attitude. We would abolish this Cabinet post; and being reasonably charitable—assuming the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) wishes its abolition before this session comes to an end—I have no reason to believe that he would do otherwise with the present Minister than to make him report on the Niagara parks commission, or something equally compelling to this Legislature, and report annually thereafter I am sure. No doubt he will do it with all the verve that he gives to his present post.

But the dismantling of the department is an inevitable result of what has happened here. I can see no alternative. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, many other groups are coming irresistibly to the same conclusion. The youth committee thought, if not profoundly, at least genuinely, about the state of The Department of Reform Institutions and came to the conclusion, unanimously, Mr. Chairman—with 10 Tories on that youth committee and one of them now a Cabinet Minister without portfolio; as a matter of fact; there were three Cabinet Ministers on that youth committee, at one or another point in time. The committee came to the conclusion that training

schools should be removed from The Department of Reform Institutions and placed in another government department—a department of youth, if the government sees fit to act upon our recommendation, or The Department of Education in the interim. But they said the schools had no place in The Department of Reform Institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Was that unanimous?

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Wells) did not say that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You had better read that again.

Mr. S. Lewis: Was it not unanimous?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You have not done your homework.

Mr. S. Lewis: Did he dissent? Well, knowing that equality reigns in the Tory ranks, I would assume that the Minister gives as much status to the backbenchers as he gives to a Minister without Portfolio and as I recall it, the other nine Conservatives voted unanimously for that aspect—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know you want to be factual.

Mr. S. Lewis: Fine, I stand happily corrected.

Equally senseless, Mr. Chairman, as keeping training schools within The Department of Reform Institutions—and I will come back to that in a moment—is the alienation of this department from so much that is intimate to the quality of its service. When the Minister began his lead-off, one of my colleagues drew to my attention that he made the point of saying that this department begins when sentencing ends. That is precisely the absurd dichotomy which one perpetuates with The Department of Reform Institutions, because if ever there was a field where sentencing should be tied intimately into what happens to the inmate or prisoner, or consignee afterwards, it has be in one general department of government, not divided the way it is now.

Similarly in the fields of treatment, Mr. Chairman. Health, Social and Family Services, and Education have all kinds of resources which this department does not have and will never be able to call upon. The department is also isolated from the juvenile and family court structure, indeed from the court structure as a whole. It would not be unfair to say that many of the magistrates in the juvenile and family court—certain of them here in the Metropolitan Toronto area—look with a certain apprehension on The Department of Reform Institutions, with a very real unhappiness on the whole training school apparatus and on the entire procedure of corrections that goes on under this Minister's aegis.

In the field of education, Mr. Chairman, where there is so much that should be a part of this Minister's department, again another department has a great deal more skill, a great deal more knowledge, a great deal more sensitivity to call upon.

As a matter of fact, when one thinks, Mr. Chairman, that the legal aid bill has finally become law, and that one has therefore the end result of a judicial system and a jurisprudence in this province which would be worthy of the name, it becomes ever more compelling that our correctional features be tied in with The Department of the Attorney General on one hand, with The Department of Education on the other, and with the department of youth on the third, and thus remove this anomaly, this unhappy and damaging anomaly from the scene entirely, in the province of Ontario. I look at this report again, Mr. Chairman—the Ontario plan in corrections and the training school plan in corrections, or the Ontario plan in training schools, however it is marked—and think of what an irrelevant kind of document it is, and how badly fragmented this whole issue of reform and rehabilitation have become by virtue of this department.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a couple of specific things about the harm that is caused by the maintenance of this department, in some of the things that it has done over the last several years, even under the present Minister. Indeed, the member for Bracondale pointed out just how marginal are the gains that have been made. If there was anything that was a real contribution in terms of what he put to this House, it is the marginal nature of the gains and there should not be any self-congratulatory optimism on the part of the Minister or on the part of his senior staff, because in the context of what other government departments are doing in this area, the Cabinet has given you short shrift. The Cabinet has treated you shabbily.

Mr. Chairman, in the field of juvenile corrections—something that I do not pretend entirely to understand but at least know a trifle about—the same patterns that were evident 10 years ago and five years ago and three years ago, are evident today and it is an exceedingly depressing historical kind of flow

which allows these things to continue without any alteration. One looks in this report today and finds that in the province of Ontario for the fiscal year 1966 in The Department of Reform Institutions, there were 171 youngsters 12 years of age and under in this department's jurisdiction.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that is social barbarism and should not be tolerated by this Minister. If there is anything on which he is prepared to persuade his colleagues, it is the reckless absurdity of placing 8, 9, 10 and 11 year old children in this kind of a correctional context. I do not care whether it is Hagersville or Guelph or St. John's training schools, they are all equally inappropriate in the context of those youngsters' needs. Very few of them, let it be said—as any analysis of juvenile court records will show—have come to the court for reasons other than unmanageability or difficult behaviour or unhappy environmental situations. Year after year members of this Legislature visit individual institutions. We visit Guelph, Galt and St. Mary's and a little earlier, three or four months ago, I had occasion to visit St. John's training school in the company of a consulting psychiatrist. I spent a day there from very early morning until very late afternoon, and covered every single inch of St. John's training school in the process, I think it is fair to say, and talked at some length with both the staff and the brothers who were in charge.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that with all the goodwill in the world—and heaven knows there is enough goodwill at that training school—and with all the devotion in the world—and the same holds true for that—that training school is a defeating, humiliating environment for a large number of youngsters. And although the pleas have been made to government, time and time again, to do something about it, nothing is ever done. This training school is equipped to handle 180 boys, and in the department's report I notice, in simply scanning it, that in the year 1962 there were 229; in the year 1963, 190; in 1964, 219; in 1965, 205; in 1966, 200. This training school is almost always overcrowded at its critical moments and never has sufficient professional staff to handle the problems.

What are the problems? St. John's, Mr. Chairman, as it turns out, has been a place for consigning seriously disturbed behaviour problems. Frequently a quarter of the population falls into this category, and all St. John's training school has—and very able he is, as every member of this Legislature knows—is Dr. John Rich, a consulting psychiatrist, who goes down one day a week to conduct certain interviews and to discuss with staff some of the insoluble problems they face in dealing with and relating to youngsters.

I sat in on a session, and there is about it a sense of frustration that cannot possibly be put into words. When I talked at some length to Brother John, the social worker, and Brother Philip, the psychologist, all they could voice was the sense of despair they feel at trying to handle a situation which is simply beyond human grasp, and the refusal of the department to face up to what is happening at St. John's in precisely the same way it is happening to every other training school across this province. I, too, only read the press accounts of Dr. Grygier's study; I did not read the intimate details and I think that perhaps the press account put a construction on his study which was not entirely merited —or so I understood. But nonetheless, whatever material is available tends to demonstrate that the training schools are inadequate environments for this kind of children.

Let me just read into the records—and these specific instances were never used in the press, Mr. Chairman—some of the cases that they attempted to cope with at St. John's, remembering that there is almost no professional staff at all, just a lot of very earnest and exceedingly dedicated personnel.

A youngster aged 14—

I am quoting from a memo—

> —sent by Dr. Rich to the Minister of Reform Institutions and the Minister of Health two years ago and to whom no attention was paid.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not true!

Mr. S. Lewis: It most certainly is true, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do not say it is until you hear the facts.

Mr. S. Lewis: I will be glad to hear the facts, but fortunately I have some material from the Minister of Health with me so that I do not put a construction on it which is not valid, and if there were 40 disturbed youths in 1965 in an intolerable situation—and let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that all we have done in the intervening year is to run considerably down hill. For example, a 14-year old boy.

> —a behaviour problem since the age of three and had always made a poor school adjustment. Some possibility of brain damage at birth. Refused admission by Thistletown because he was too old and also

refused admission by TPH. Recommended to Smiths Falls but unable to get in. He had fits and made violent attacks on the property. He had to be kept under anti-convulsives in St. John's training school. Sent to St. John's from Thistletown.

This is an 11-year old—

Considerable efforts were made to help this child but he has been unable to form close relationships. He continues to show provocative behaviour toward peers. His emotional development is primitive. A tranquilizing medication has helped to reduce his explosive behaviour. Sent to St. John's.

Now a 16-year old boy, with very serious problems of sexual deviation. He was in the Ontario hospital, Hamilton, which recommended at least a two year project with weekly sessions. The mental health clinic reported:

It would be unthinkable to put him in St. John's. It would be unfair to the Christian brothers because he would be a menace to the other boys.

He was, however, sent to St. John's.

A 13-year old lad:

This boy was a lifelong problem. At age 8 the school remarked that he had no home training and that he mistrusted all adults. The Toronto child adjustment services reported that the Toronto school system has no placement for this boy and he is too disturbing to remain in the system. Thistletown could not take this youngster. Sent arbitrarily and automatically to St. John's.

And so it goes, Mr. Chairman, one case after another of consignment to a training school where all that the staff could feel was a total helplessness in the face of this kind of automatic government insensitivity, and that is the pattern, is it not? That is the pattern of corrections in the province of Ontario.

A run of training schools is set up; one never thinks of constituting them as proper environments; one never thinks of, in fact, destroying them—and I mean that physically—of breaking some of them up into small units so that there could conceivably be some human relationships that go on in that environment. One simply allows the pattern to repeat itself endlessly despite the erstwhile and devoted efforts of Minister, staff and leading advisors.

All the factors that were true of St. John's, Mr. Chairman, are true of all of the other training schools in the system. As I say, members have visited sufficient of those schools to know. Indeed, sir, I gather that it is only in the last year that the socially rehabilitative experiment of solitary confinement is finally being abandoned in the training schools for 11-year olds and 12-year olds and 13-year olds. And I say to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that again the answer lies in removing the department, the answer lies not in trying to reform the unreformable.

I note, Mr. Chairman, moving to another area, that in the report on commitments to city, county and district jails, it shows that 50.5 per cent of the commitments are made for more than a third time in the pattern in this society. One again asks what kind of rehabilitative procedures can possibly be pretended in city, county and district jails when over 50 per cent of the inmates are there for the third time or more. In this study—and I think we should allude to it more in the sub-estimates than in this estimate, Mr. Chairman—"Society behind Bars", in its analysis of the situation at Guelph again the same truly unsettling pattern emerges, that this is not a Department of Reform Institutions in the sense that the word "reform" means anything, this is a department simply to handle a vacuum into which no other area of government is prepared to move, and to tax all the skills and all the capacity of a great number of people for an endeavour which in the final analysis tends to be self-defeating.

That is the problem, Mr. Chairman. The very modest gains that are made with individuals within The Department of Reform Institutions, however many in number, never serve to acquaint the society as a whole with the basic social problems involved and to receive from government the money, the kudos, the support, which such a concern should have.

I am reminded of a report of a speech by Dr. Bruno Cormier, associate professor of psychiatry at McGill University, and director of the university's clinic in forensic psychiatry at a conference in June of 1966, when Professor Cormier said: "Prisons are satellites built by a free society which punish without reforming."

He said that the loss of liberty, for whatever reason, is a traumatic experience that leaves no man untouched and that loss of liberty inevitably induces emotional regression. And the nature of this regression, Mr. Cormier points out, demands that in order to handle most of the prison population, juvenile or adult, in this society it would be necessary first to remove them physically from their

present environment in order to make any kind of realistic impression in a rehabilitative sense.

Now what we in the NDP would do, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. We would in fact dismantle the department, we would in fact bring all the youngsters who inhabit the training schools at the present time into a series of small treatment centres in various agencies in various other departments across the province.

We would remove many of the adult establishments and bring them under The Department of the Attorney General, or The Department of Education, so that the full resources of major departments of government could be focused on their needs.

One could involve the methods used so often throughout Scandinavia, to which my colleague, the member for Yorkview has alluded on countless occasions, of open institutions, and an entirely new attitude towards penology and the approach to the rehabilitation of the offender, where one can count on the fingers of one hand in any given Scandinavian society those punitive elements which are so prevalent in this society.

I want to suggest too, Mr. Chairman, that it would give an opportunity of tying The Department of University Affairs and The Department of Education tightly in with the whole reforms or corrections environment. It would not again segregate reform and have reform coming cap in hand to seek from Cabinet—as it did in the days of the present Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope), as it did in the days of the present Minister of Transport, and as it does in the days of this Minister—to seek the grain which the Cabinet colleagues are prepared to scatter in their wake, with a great deal of condescension and lack of understanding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Minister in closing, and I want to make it very clear to him, that the import of my remarks stem from the sense that even under his stewardship—and I use the word even advisedly—this department has failed, this department has reached a dead end. It is achieving a little more with a few more people but it is in no sense undergoing the internal revolution financially, in terms of staff and in terms of community relationships which is required in order to transform corrections in Ontario.

It maintains all the punitive, archaic predispositions of corrections in the province of Ontario for the last 20 years and although it has a senior staff at once learned and sensitive, it has not been able to break through the resistance and hostility that are so obvious everywhere in this society. And it certainly has not been able to break through at the level of the ordinary guard or custodian or counsellor who works within any given institution, juvenile or adult.

The greatest contribution the Minister of Reform Institutions could make to this field is to rise in this House and say, "Mr. Chairman, I voluntarily disclaim my department, I voluntarily suggest that it should be divided in ways through which we can effect treatment and rehabilitation of offenders and I would be glad to have the stewardship over one of those ways but in no sense can the present situation be construed as viable and can it be said that we are treating the offender adequately in the province of Ontario."

My suspicion, Mr. Chairman, perhaps unfounded, is that the Minister will not grant this Legislature that experience; that he may try for whatever few short months are left to his tenure, to hold on to his department with all the strength at his command. I wish him well in an impossible job because he, with his own particular brand of Toryism—a little more social Toryism perhaps in this field than any of his colleagues, has run directly into the wall of prejudice and insensitivity which characterizes that Tory regime and that Tory Cabinet but he will never get anywhere—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Completely false; that is 100 per cent untrue.

Mr. S. Lewis: As a matter of fact, it even characterizes the member for London South in the area of social issues.

And I say to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that he will always be frustrated, he will forever run into a series of impasses because of the unfortunate environment in which he himself operates.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, first I would like, in dealing with the comments of the hon. member for Bracondale, to thank him very much for the manner in which he began his remarks in being so complimentary about myself. However, as I suspected it did not last too long.

There were some comments made by the hon. member for Bracondale in respect to remissions. I think he implied, whether he meant to or not, I am not sure, that I suggested that the magistrates really did not know what they were doing when they were in fact giving some two years less a day and some two years, and so on. I did not mean to

imply that at all. The point I was trying to make of course was that the escaper does not rationalize it that way at all. All he feels is that there is a great deal of injustice; that the fellow next to him in court got one day more of a sentence and serves perhaps four and a half months less in time. Of course, this does not do any great deal towards rehabilitating the man.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister to rest assured that I understood his analysis of the situation and I agreed with his analysis of the situation. I did not imply that he thought the magistrates did not know what they were doing. He gave what I thought to be an accurate description of the thought process of the people who attempted to escape so they—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. member of course went on to say that the magistrates were appointed by this government, the implication being that we should tell the magistrates what they should do in this respect.

Mr. Ben: I am saying that one should keep in mind that if magistrates were not giving proper consideration to this matter, they could possibly decide on a political issue and send an inmate to a federal institution to save the provincial government money. They do not do this, so I presume they give weight to all matters that come before them in deciding what the sentences ought to be.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right. I am sure the hon. member would not want to give a wrong impression either in that respect. I am sure I understood him correctly, and perhaps he did not mean that, but he seemed to imply that magistrates were doing this deliberately because they wanted some prisoners to go to the federal penitentiary; because they wanted them there for punishment, rather than giving them the other term, which would send them to a reformatory for reformation. Am I correct in my assumption there?

Mr. Ben: Is the Minister saying that what I had said was that the magistrate may be sending some people to federal institutions as a form of punishment and others to a reformatory with a view to reform?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Ben: That is what the Minister is suggesting that I said and I hope that is what I said.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what you did say.

Mr. Ben: I am hoping that is what I said—that they have in mind that in one case they punish and in the other case, reform. They send one to a penal institution—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, this is what the hon. member was saying.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you could conclude your final remarks and—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. members have asked questions and they are entitled to an answer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is what I presumed the hon. member had said and I am rather surprised, because I certainly do not accept the proposition that at the federal penitentiary they do not carry out rehabilitation. I presume they do their best—I know they do their best there—to rehabilitate the same as we do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there was some talk about pay for prisoners and that sort of thing. I thought the hon. member was going to bring it up later, but he said he probably was not going to.

I would again inform the House, as I have in the past, as I did last year, when we appointed the trades and industries advisory committee, that this committee, as well as the Minister's advisory committee on the treatment of the offender, have been studying pay for prisoners, and in conjunction with that, having the prisoners pay a portion for their keep as well. This is under very active study, as a matter of fact, at the present time. I want to assure the hon. member of that.

He made some reference again, and I am sorry I have to keep repeating that, about releasing people with only $20 and so on. The $2 a month which is allowed to every inmate when they are released is in the regulations now and they are old regulations.

All the regulations are being revised now. We have been reviewing them for the last year. It is quite a weighty job. As far as we are concerned, that whole thing can come out. Giving them $2 a month is meaningless, because they get the kind of help that the rehabilitation officer feels they need, whether they are entitled to $2 or $10 or $20. If, in the view of the rehabilitation officer, this person needs some help—be it financial, or be it

some help with accommodation, tools or employment—if he is a properly motivated dischargee, he gets all the help he possibly needs. So the amount of money he is entitled to by the regulation really has no bearing on it at all. I want to assure the hon. member of that.

One thing I am surprised at—the hon. member is usually pretty good at his research and I am afraid he failed a little bit in this instance. He gave some figures, which were rather startling, about how many psychiatrists, how many psychologists, and how many teachers we had at this time. I could not keep track of the exact figures, because he was quoting them rather rapidly. I do not know how many psychiatrists he said we had in 1963 or 1964. If he has them in front of him, if he will repeat the figures, I will correct them for him.

I think he said that the number of psychiatrists which were employed by the department in 1963 or 1964, were something in the neighbourhood of four or five. Am I correct? In any case, the number presently employed by the department is 17.

The number of psychologists—

Mr. Ben: Presently?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Presently.

Mr. Ben: Full time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, we do not need full time psychiatrists. I think anyone who is in this work knows we do not require full time psychiatrists in all these posts.

Mr. Ben: I am sorry. That may be. I think perhaps, with all due respect, that the Minister ought to stick to the facts. I never stated that any number were presently employed. All my references were to this report and the report that I have before me indicates that there were four psychiatrists. It is quite possible that today you have 17 psychiatrists.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think the hon. member—

Mr. Ben: All I am saying is that my statement was taken from the hon. Minister's report on page 41. The number of psychiatrists—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman I will clear that up for the hon. member if he will give me a moment. He was reading the staff of the adult institutions only. But the total staff of reform institutions consists of 17 psychiatrists, 19 psychologists full time, 11 part time; social workers, 12 full time, two part time.

I think the hon. member said we had 32 teachers. We have 105 teachers, some of the best qualified teachers in the province, because of the new contract hiring system which went into effect about a year and a half or two years ago.

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I accept the Minister's figures, but I would just point out to the hon. Minister, so he will be accurate, that although the hon. member for Scarborough West covered the juvenile institutions, I did not. My references throughout were to the adult institutions because I accepted that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that the hon. member deliberately did anything to mislead the House. I just wanted to make sure that the record is clear.

We have 29 trade instructors. He mentioned something about librarians; we have five full time and one part time librarians. There are 76 rehabilitation officers. Six full time physicians, 27 part time physicians, 40 full time nurses, and two part time nurses. I thought I had better put that on the record.

Mr. Ben: How many of those were for the adult institutions? It is in the report. If you want to find the figures, you will find them on page 41.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Some are interchangeable. They do not all necessarily work for the adult institutions all the time, and the others for the training schools all the time. This is the staff of the department. They can be used in practically either case and sometimes are.

There are some other matters—I do not think they are too important—concerning the 1954 report of the select committee. There are many things in the report of the select committee with which our department does not agree and, as a matter of fact, it clashes with our statement of purpose today.

For example, it was no doubt as a result of the report of the select committee, as I mentioned last year, that Millbrook was established where it was and is a maximum security institution. Because of the report of that select committee. Today, we would not build a Millbrook where it is.

Mr. S. Lewis: It makes you wonder about select committees.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suppose at that time that seemed to be the right thing to do, but

as the hon. member for Bracondale has stated himself, philosophies change and, in this work, they change very rapidly.

I want to say something about the apparent difficulty the hon. member had in getting his report. Really, the only problem was that there was a limited supply. It is a very thick report and it is not of interest to anyone except a person who is interested in the work. He has admitted himself that all he had to do was call me and he got one immediately. I do not think there is any point in spending all sorts of money putting this together, and distributing it widely. It is available to those involved in this field.

Mr. Ben: I will buy that, but should not the centre of criminology have had a copy? I will agree that perhaps—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They should have had a copy—

Mr. Ben: That is something that only people that are interested in criminology may read, but do you not think the centre of criminology ought to have one?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, and if they did not have one at that time, it was probably a matter of what you might call logistics. I think Dr. Grygier at that time was away. He was in charge of it.

Mr. S. Lewis: It should be sent to every home in St. Andrew-St. Patrick. It is an awfully good document.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You think I should do that, with my name on it?

Now I am a little puzzled too, Mr. Chairman, on the one hand we were criticized for putting out too many press releases and making too many speeches. On the other hand, they say we need to do something about our public relations. Really you cannot do—

Mr. Ben: Oh, who was critizing you for too many press releases?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have done everything we can to publicize the work of the department and interest people in the work of the department. We have started on a programme—which is working well—of having meetings with magistrates regularly, with the police and with after-care agencies. We have published pamphlets for the people in the work and the people who are not in the work, telling them about our work. We have been on radio, on television, and I have even exposed myself to the open line—the hot line procedure—to answer questions. But we cannot help it if only the sensational makes the headlines. We do the best we can to tell them of the work we are doing.

There is another statement that was made by someone, I think it was the hon. member for Bracondale, that we have a tendency to discredit staff members who disagree with us. I do not recall ever discrediting staff members and I would like to disabuse the House of that. If the hon. member is referring to an occasion when there were two or three correctional officers, I think it was two or three years ago, whom we discharged because we did not like the way they were conducting themselves in their capacity, then all I can answer the hon. member is they went to the grievance committee and the discharge was upheld. Now that is not discrediting the staff. If the hon. member can tell me of any member of our staff who was discredited by me, I would be very pleased to know about it, because I do not think there has been any complaint of that nature.

He also went on to talk about having a special committee to study all these things, and so on. I think, in the first place, most of the things that the hon. member said he would like to have studied by this committee we are already doing. In accordance with his own comment, there are so many opinions and so many philosophies which change so quickly in this work, I do not know what would be gained by having another such conference and having another thousand opinions which, by the time the report is printed, will be outdated and will accomplish nothing. I have no objection to it at all. As a matter of fact the Canadian corrections association is constantly having these meetings. We agree 100 per cent with the statement on philosophy of the Canadian corrections association which the hon. member read into the record. They have complimented us on our statement of purpose and our plans.

The hon. member mentioned something about psychologists and so on; we are paying psychologists considerably more than we did in 1963. Again, I would like to remind the member that I was appointed to this post in August, 1963, which is not to say that the advances in this department began only in 1963. All I want to do is get the record straight.

Mr. Ben: The Minister is being immodest there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am trying to be modest.

Mr. Ben: He is being immodest.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He talked about bursaries and so on. In this budget and in these estimates there is sufficient money for six training fellowships of $2,000 each.

Mr. Ben: It is double this year, is it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think this was raised from about $1,500 three years ago. I do not recall what it was last year, but we could have that information—

Mr. Ben: It is $12,000, is it, now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is always a pleasure to listen to the hon. member for Scarborough West. He is so articulate and he is so able to give out with beautiful sentences, except that this year one of the special phrases of the NDP seems to be "the outer limits of Tory philosophy". This is the new one, and I suppose this is going to be the new slogan. I do not know where the idea comes from that I have been frustrated by the Treasury board. It would be a simple matter for me to use the Opposition and its criticism to nag the Treasury board by saying "Now you see the trouble I get into because they say you are not treating me right," and so on. I say now what I said last year—I have been treated very generously by the Treasury board. This is in all honesty. There are very few things the Treasury board have refused me. All one has to do is look at the money that has been allotted.

Mr. Ben: It is shaved a bit.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the first place, general expenditures this year compared with 1964, have gone up from $19 million to $30 million, a sizeable increase. This does not even include capital expenditures, just those I can think of right off the top of my head—the new Vanier institution which runs into millions, a new inter-denominational training school in Sudbury, millions of dollars for regional detention centres. There is $2 million in the estimates this year for whichever centres we will begin this year, and a commitment for far beyond that. There is going to be a new assessment and diagnostic centre; there are numerous others.

In about three years, this is a tremendous amount of money to add to this department and I have been refused very, very few things. I cannot ask for everything at one time; I must be reasonable, of course. There is not a Minister in the government who could not spend $100 million more than his budget in any one year, if he wanted to spend it. Of course, we have to think about the taxpayers, too, and priorities. I can assure the hon. member that I am getting at least my fair share of the taxpayers' money to spend in this particular department.

There is one thing that does bother me more than anything else and that is the hon. member's suggestion that this department is at the bottom of the scale. I disagree with that wholeheartedly, and to the constant reference to the department as being punitive. I know the hon. member could argue that he means punitive in the sort of philosophical sense. In other words when you have, for example, adult institutions, you have inmates, and some inmates in some institutions which are maximum.

One could argue there is a certain punitive approach in that institution because obviously you are not doing as much for them as you would be doing for others in more open institutions. If he wants to say that it is somewhat punitive to have youngsters in a training school, in a more secured and structured setting, that is a matter of opinion. But the hon. member is intelligent enough to realize when he uses the term "punitive" that in the public's view the word implies such things as being locked up and possibly whipped and mistreated in other ways.

If the hon. member is correct—that in the eyes of the professional disciplines this department is at the bottom of the scale—I suggest he address his remarks to those professional disciplines.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am sorry. I think *Hansard* will show I said that in the eyes of the priorities of the government the department is at the bottom of the scale. I would not suggest—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can assure him that it is not. As a matter of fact, the amount of money that has been allotted to this department in the last three years and the programme we have is a perfect example that it is not at the bottom of the scale. The constant repetition of this could make it very difficult to get highly trained staff. I do not want to get into a real argument with the hon. member, but I think if he were in my place he would resent the suggestion that it is hard to get top-flight staff because of this, because I have top-flight staff here.

Mr. S. Lewis: Sure you do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Very top-flight staff, and they are attracting many more to the department. The less we talk about this department being at the bottom of the scale,

the more these professional people will come into the department, as they are coming in now. I think we had better stop talking about it being at the bottom of the scale because it it not so in my eyes. It is not, in the eyes of my staff, nor in the eyes of my colleagues. They are just as progressive as anyone else in this field on this continent.

The suggestion that the regional detention centres plan is moving slowly puzzles me; it really does. I realize it is the Opposition's job to criticize, but how anyone could possibly justify the statement that this is moving slowly is beyond me. Here is a system of county jails which has lasted 100 years, an entrenched system which is very difficult to change. This new policy was announced perhaps, three years ago. We have to deal with numerous counties—I think some 33—we have to have conferences—we have never bothered to add them up. We have had so many conferences, so many meetings with county councils, the members of which have to go back to their respective councils, municipal councils; meet again; sometimes elections intervene and you get a new council. We have spent hundreds of hours—literally hundreds of hours—across this province meeting with these people. We have at this time, less than three years after it was announced, been able to get agreement signed for at least one-third of all of the county jails—it must be more than one-third now. I think we could, with all due immodesty, suggest that this is making very rapid progress. I think all of us should be proud—and I was very happy—that the counties and their officials took this progressive view; it was going to be an impossible task, and it has turned out not to be impossible. In a very short while we will have this whole province covered with new regional detention centres.

Mr. S. Lewis: How many regional detention centres are built?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: None are built. I announced the plan about three years ago in a speech. At that time I did not even have the policy laid down by the Cabinet as to how much I could offer. I might call it a "flyer" that I was putting out to see how it would be received.

I attended two or three other meetings; we made a few more speeches and we sort of felt our way. Then it looked as though it might be acceptable. I went to Cabinet and got approval that we would pay 50 per cent of the cost of construction—a pretty progressive approach for a Treasury board that is not supposed to be giving too much attention to this department.

Mr. S. Lewis: After 100 years, we can hope—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now we have to meet with these counties. They have to meet together. In some cases, there are four counties and those counties have various municipalities and they all have to agree to these things. It is a very difficult thing. Even if they agreed and it was all established, one year after I had made the first announcement that we were prepared to do this, it would be doubtful if there would be one built today. It is very difficult to have buildings done today.

These people have to decide upon the proportion each county is going to pay; who is going to raise the debentures. They have to agree on what will go into an agreement; they have to decide upon a site, which is very difficult in many instances, and we have overcome all that.

Perhaps I should read it into the record. We now have the groupings committed: Quinte, which is replacing the county jails in the counties of Hastings, Frontenac, Lennox and Addington, and Prince Edward; Kawartha, representing Northumberland and Durham, Peterborough, Victoria and Haliburton; Maplehurst, representing Halton and Peel, and probably there will be another county involved in that agreement; Niagara, Lincoln and Welland and Hamilton Wentworth is now in the process of signing an agreement. There are others such as Carleton and Ottawa. Active consideration is presently being given for the replacement of 12 jails; Carleton, Prescott, Lanark, Oxford, Russell, Brant, Leeds, Norfolk, Grenville, Haldimand, and many of the others. It is moving along very rapidly—

An hon. member: When will the first one be built?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, we have not. The ones with which we reached agreement are the ones I mentioned.

Mr. S. Lewis: It is like Mercer, you know. One hears endlessly about the result that is never achieved.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is achieved. As a matter of fact, I think the tenders went out today for the Vanier institution.

Mr. S. Lewis: That took four years!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course. I stopped it myself at one time for the reasons I outlined a couple of years ago. We were not sure because of the statement made by the federal government. Then we redesigned it so that it could be used for something else in case our responsibilities were changed. Then I stopped it again because of the costs. We had it redesigned again because we do have to think about costs and it is going to tender today or tomorrow.

The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) has advised me that an announcement went out today. I think he had promised originally as a sort of deadline, April 28, and today is pretty close to it.

So these things are accomplished. It is pretty hard to get these things done today because of these various reasons.

The final thing, this business of St. John's. This school is overcrowded. It is one of the problems inherent in our system because we have different schools for Roman Catholic children. There are three training schools for Roman Catholic children—two for boys and one for girls. If we did not have that system, this problem would not apply today.

This is going to be helped a great deal by the new school which is being built—an interdenominational school—as an experiment, in Sudbury.

Mr. S. Lewis: For how many?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For 120.

Mr. S. Lewis: A large unit?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The cottage type, and it will be interdenominational.

These are some of the problems with which we have had to struggle, but we are attacking them and we are not avoiding them by any means. As far as Dr. Rich suggesting that I did not answer his letter, I not only answered his letter—I think there was some delay in answering his letter—I could read the correspondence but that would merely prove that I had ordered an investigation into the matters which he raised. Unfortunately there was a delay from February to August before he got his reply which apparently was held up until we had the report of my training schools' administrator. There should have been an acknowledgment go out in the meantime which is my usual practice, but I do not know why Dr. Rich said that he had never had a reply to it, because he did.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am not as worried about the reply as I am about what action was taken in terms of the situation that was revealed to you. I do not much care whether he received an acknowledgment or not, and I suspect that since he is not a prima donna, his sensitivities were not offended. He would like to know what you are doing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member knows what we are doing about it. The Minister of Health's white paper should go a long way toward solving this problem. We hopefully will be able to assess the youngsters a lot better before they are assigned to a training school if, in fact, they will be assigned to a training school, and they will be sent to the proper setting at that time.

As a matter of fact, it has been suggested that my new Training Schools Act was the cause of all this. I know it was and I knew we were taking this chance because, as hon. members will recall, I said the "moment of truth" will arrive when the judge has to give his reason for the committal. Now, some of it has been caused, in my view, by the fact that some of the juvenile court judges do not want to give a reason because they cannot think of a good one. They do not want to send them to a training school so they take an easier way out and send them to the children's aid society hoping that they will get into some other place.

My honest feeling is that when the chips are down and we have the system established of the regional health units and our own diagnostic and assessment centre, for most of those youngsters who are in training schools today it will be found that that is the best place for them.

Perhaps if more recognition of the good work of the training schools had been accepted in the past, and perhaps if more treatment centres had been encouraged for the training schools system itself, we would be saving a lot more money than we will be doing in the future.

Mr. Ben: It is a real condemnation of the Tory administration!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not a condemnation; it is a condemnation, perhaps, of the kind of criticism that is constantly being laid against the training schools system. If everybody keeps knocking it and saying it is "punitive", and so on, it is most difficult to get public acceptance of a good system.

Mr. Chairman, I say without equivocation, that the training schools system in this province is one of the best on the continent.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, about the business of taking the training schools out of The Department of Reform Institutions. Perhaps it might be just as well for the members to know that the training schools system in 1928 and 1929 were under The Department of the Provincial Secretary, in the reformatories and prisons branch. From 1929, they were in The Department of Public Welfare until 1937; in 1937 they went back to The Department of the Provincial Secretary; and this government in its wisdom in 1946 decided that there should be one department and one Minister exclusively responsible for this work.

There is no doubt that that was one of the major progressive moves in this work ever done by any government. I give a great deal of credit and a great deal of admiration to the hon. George Dunbar who was Provincial Secretary at that time and pushed this policy.

Now, somebody is always suggesting, in order to criticize the department, put it into welfare, put it into education, put it someplace else. In other words, constantly be scrambling and unscrambling eggs and never getting a real integrated system. This is precisely what would happen if we took the advice of the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis: It is a segregated system.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, what are you going to do when you segregate it? You are going to divide an already short professional staff. We are all short of professional staff.

Mr. S. Lewis: No—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, just a moment. If you take the training schools out of the reformatories branch, we are going to have to find more professional staff for the reformatories or more professional staff for the training schools to do the duties which now many of them share. We are having enough difficulty now. What is this going to accomplish? As a matter of fact, it will be working in the opposite direction, in my view.

Not only did this government—and Mr. Dunbar in his day—make a very far-sighted move, but the hon. members opposite have been quite prone to quote the United States President's report on law enforcement and the administration of justice. I have heard a lot about this, this year—the challenge of crime in a free society. It is a wonderful report. The hon. members have quoted from it and said: Why do you not do that?

This report, in fact, tells the United States, all of the American states, that one of the best things they could do for this work is to combine juvenile and adult work in this field into one department. This is exactly what they say.

Mr. Ben: We have been telling you there should be one department to look after investigation of crime, the apprehension, trial, sentencing, incarceration, reformation and rehabilitation of the individual.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On page 162 of the President's report, it states and I quote:

> Today, progressive programmes for adults resemble progressive programmes for juveniles, but more often than not they are administered separately to the detriment of overall planning and of continuity of programming for offenders.
>
> The ambiguity and awkwardness resulting from this division is nowhere more apparent than in the handling of older adolescent and young adult offenders who often defy precise classification and are dealt with maladroitly by both the juvenile and adult correctional systems.

Further, on page 165 of the president's report I quote:

> There is a growing appreciation within the field of the irrationality that runs through much of the correctional practice today of having such sharp lines between institutional and community treatment between juvenile and adult programmes.

I repeat: "the irrationality of having sharp lines between juvenile and adult programmes."

Mr. Chairman, considering this constant suggestion that we divide and separate and dismantle the department, I do not know what you would do with the adult offender. Would you then go backwards, according to the President's report?

As a matter of fact, we just have to look at the Canadian system. Hon. members will recall that I said about three or four years ago that one of the big problems in the federal system today was that it was a tiny branch—the correctional system, the penal system, was a tiny branch of a huge department of justice, and that the sooner they get down to getting a Ministry to handle the penal system alone, the better it would be for the whole problem. They did precisely just that. They made a new Ministry, appointed the Solicitor-General, who mind you, does have one other branch, the RCMP, but they now

have the Solicitor-General, the hon. Mr. Pennell, to handle this work, exclusively.

Now, they could see that what we have done here was the right thing to do. The report of the President of the United States says it is the right thing to do. What is the sense of fragmentizing more and more? I suggest to the hon. members that they cooperate with us to make the training school system, as well as the adult system, more meaningful, give it more meaningful programmes by supporting it.

Mr. S. Lewis: It cannot be done.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course it can. I just have to point out to the member our Hagersville, which he himself has complimented. It has been a tremendous success so far, and this is the direction in which we are moving. Now, you would fragmentize that again, put it into another department again, where it might be a small branch of that department, where somebody who, perhaps like the hon. member, may feel it is the bottom of the barrel, it is the bottom of the scale, and say, well, who wants to bother with that, you know, like the Ministers of Justice in the federal government used to feel. They gave the field of penal administration very little attention because it was much more glamorous to be the Minister of Justice than the man in charge of penal institutions, and this is precisely what has happened.

This is a very important department and I am proud to be associated with it because it is doing one of the most important works in government today. I am proud of the fact that I have a wonderful staff to help me with it.

Mr. Chairman: Can we proceed to the votes?

On vote 2001:

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, can we, on the main office vote, deal for a moment with some of the policy issues which have been raised?

I do not think we need prolong the vote at any great length. I simply want to say to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that again what we have—and he may well be vastly more knowledgeable in the area now than some us on this side—is a matter of conviction which is a very real difference of social philosophy.

Let me deal with them separately for a moment. In the field of juvenile corrections, the mere perpetuation of juvenile corrections in a separate department defeats the essential rehabilitative purpose and will always do so, because of the construction which this society puts on that kind of department. The greatest service you can do for the rehabilitation and treatmnt of those youngsters is to dismantle the present training school environment and bring them all within—I would think personally The Department of Education is the most appropriate setting. There can be various alternatives which might equally be appropriate.

You know there are societies, Mr. Chairman, in this world—Scandinavia being a good example—where there are not even any juvenile courts because the society finds the whole concept of juvenile courts and consignment of juveniles to serve sentences in a given environment unpalatable. There are some civilized societies that reject the whole premise of arraigning youngsters before a magistrate in a court under the age of 16, or at the age of 8, 9, 10 or 11. I think it would be a reasonably good objective for this society to model itself on that kind of social principle, and to recognize that if you have got a juvenile with a problem, whatever his problem may be, it is best coped with entirely away from a so-called correctional environment. I do not care how well-meaning that environment may be.

I would think that there can be all kinds of small cottage units with different kinds of treatment concepts applied to them, totally withdrawn from the correctional field. If the Minister is offended by the word "punitive", let me assure him that I used it in the theoretical sense, I did not use it in the personal sense of corporal punishment or any such context.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, is the segregation also of the adult institutions from an area as fundamental to everything—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member would just let me answer that at this stage?

There is a tendency always to find some other jurisdiction doing a much better job than we are here. I have been to Scandinavia. I have been through the system. It is no more a success than ours is. As a matter of fact, one of the problems they have—I think really Professor Edwards mentioned in one of these reports—is that it is left to a welfare committee who apparently expect someone else to do something about it. In other words, he was not too happy with what he had found there.

But what I found there was that there was a great deal of resentment. As a matter of fact, they put their youngsters who would normally go through our juvenile courts because they have committed offences, in the same kind of an institution as a youngster who has not really committed an offence. In other words, I say philosophically, I agree with this if it can work. In other words you try to take the taint of delinquency off that youngster.

Mr. S. Lewis: Precisely.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think we have espoused this as a policy in our new Training Schools Act, but saying it and accomplishing it is an entirely different thing. Scandinavian parents are very highly incensed in many instances at the fact that they have a youngster in an institution with another youngster who, in fact, is there because he committed a crime. It is not quite that simple.

The effect, when you get down to cases and try to find out how much more success they have had and you ask them, you arrive at the same answer that we really do not know.

There are other problems. We need not go into them tonight—their attitude towards sex and how that makes their system a little less tense in their penal system, even in the training school system there. Our population would never condone it. I do not want to go into this and I do not think there is any necessity for it. All I tried to tell the hon. member, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. S. Lewis: Just a moment, parts of our population would never condone what?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would say the very large part of our population.

Mr. S. Lewis: Let us not project what the population will condone.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, does the hon. member want to go into that?

Mr. S. Lewis: Yes, fine. Because the youth committee also had certain—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I wonder what the youth commitee would say about this. I go into a training school in one of the Scandinavian countries, I do not want to say which one because they have their problems and we have ours—

Mr. S. Lewis: Do not worry, they will not be offended.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If we are going to cooperate with each other, learn from each other, we do not want to set up any antipathies.

We go into a training school and the situation is such that it is obvious the youngsters could be engaging in homosexual activities. So I speak to the superintendent. I say, "Now, are not you afraid because of the system you have here"—and I will not go into the detail—"that your youngsters may be engaging in homosexual activity?" He says, "So what? This is part of the experience of every youngster." Does the member want us to suggest that for our society? It is not acceptable here.

Mr. S. Lewis: To state the reality is not to demand that society openly embrace it. Is the Minister suggesting that our training schools for youngsters or adolescents do not produce the possibility?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, but I say we would do everything possible to avoid this. They say they do not bother with it, they do not see there is any problem with it. This is part of the experience of growing up, they say, so they do not bother with it at all. If the hon. member wanted to get into a philosophical discussion, I was prepared to do it. All I am trying to point out is the philosophy of a progressive approach in this field. We have it here just as well as the hon. member has it on the other side of the House.

We have a progressive approach. We want to do the best we can and not within the, as he calls it, the outer limits of Tory philosophy. Nor do we necessarily want to do it within the inner limits of the New Democratic Party philosophy, either.

Mr. S. Lewis: Socialist.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Socialist philosophy. What we are doing is with good common sense and experience—with all the experience we can get, practical experience and experience from our researchers.

Now the hon. member must know that that is the truth. I am repeating myself, but we have one of the few Acts on our books, the new Training Schools Act, which is probably one of the few Acts in North America based purely on research. I think this is evidence of the progressive approach that we take in this field.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, could I just add something to what the

Minister has said? Part of the Scandinavian approach is fundamentally different in actuality, while the Minister may be searching for the same thing in theory. That is, the emphasis upon catching the small child who is perceptually handicapped and giving him treatment at that level—of getting the emotionally disturbed child and giving him attention by specialists in the field. We have not even approached that kind of actuality in this province yet.

I think this is where much of our failure comes. These youngsters who are perceptually handicapped, and then when emotionally disturbed—perhaps because of that and because it has not been caught—we simply then graduate these kids into juvenile delinquents and then later into criminals. I think that is where the emphasis has to be placed more and more as time goes on.

This Minister has to find ways and means, in cooperation with the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) and the other members of his Cabinet, to find the specialists, to train them, to do the job in this field of prevention at very early ages. I think this is an emphasis that the Scandinavians can teach us and where they have made some real progress, where we have not to this date.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think we are moving in that direction. I think the hon. member will appreciate that.

Mr. Young: How fast, though?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I continue with my annual plea to the Minister, to make a grant to the St. Leonard's house in the community of Windsor? There is no need for me to elaborate, the Minister knows the type of work they do. He knows they have a recidivist rate in their organization as low as 26 per cent, even though they may deal solely with first offenders. Surely the work they do in the community and the fact that their type of operation is slowly becoming a nationwide organization means that they, as an organization, deserve financial assistance from The Department of Reform Institutions.

I know the Minister will tell me that The Department of Social and Family Services do give them help. Mr. Chairman, their programme keeps expanding because of the needs. They find themselves in need of financial assistance so that they can continue their programme and expand it so that the individual leaving one of our institutions has a place to go. They are contemplating a building programme, the establishment of a residential home. They are going to need $100,000 for that. Mr. Chairman, the Minister can show his interest in them by seeing that they get a fairly sizeable grant. The S. S. Kresge foundation thinks so highly of them that they made a grant. Surely, Mr. Chairman, if an American organization can do that, the Minister can do likewise?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will take that under consideration.

Mr. Newman: Under serious consideration, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I never take anything under consideration unless it is serious. If I were not serious, I would not take it under consideration.

Mr. Newman: I hope the Minister gives it a little more consideration than he did last year.

Does he not believe the organization is doing a good job?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, we believe in the organization or they would not be getting government funds today. If the hon. member wants my honest opinion, I would rather see the organization carry on its present work for a little longer without going into any great expansion because you need a lot of experience in this field. Father Libby is doing a very good job, but when they start to expand at a rapid clip, we have to be careful to make sure that it is our responsibility in this particular field, to help financially. We would like to give everybody a lot of money but the taxpayer wants to know that what we are doing is the right thing. There are other halfway houses which are doing the same kind of work. There will be some help. Father Libby has been asking for some money—I think he has asked us—for a grant for counselling services. We are opening a regional office in Windsor and it is quite possible that the counselling services we may offer St. Leonard's house may preclude the necessity of giving them cash for this purpose.

Mr. Newman: I am very pleased to hear that because, in their out patient programme, they started in 1962-1963-1964 with a total of 142 interviews and the last year they were up to 2,367, so you can see they are doing a real job.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can assure the hon. member I read every report they send out.

Mr. Newman: I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Chairman, I would again like to compliment the hon. Minister on the progress his department is making in establishing these regional detention units in various parts of the province. I realize these involve an agreement between two or more counties or two or more districts before these projects get under way. In many cases, in spite of the generous assistance from the province and direction from the department, it takes some time for two counties to agree on a site or to get their preliminary plans under way.

This seems to be the case, Mr. Chairman, regarding a project for Halton and Peel. I think it is called Maplehurst. The hon. Minister mentioned that another county may be involved in this particular institution. I wonder if he could explain that a little further, and also, whether there is any holdup in the preliminary steps such as the selecting of a site or whether there is any indecision at the county level as to preliminary plans and when this project and the construction will get under way in this particular area?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, while I have the opportunity and if the hon. members do not mind my mentioning it, I have been advised that, according to the records that we have been able to keep, I have attended 42 meetings on regional detention centres to date.

Mr. S. Lewis: Is that all? Just 42?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In answer to the hon. member's question, Maplehurst detention centre board has already done considerable work in obtaining a site and has just about purchased one—they are in the process of purchasing one, I take it. A board meeting in June will consider an architect and our department has been invited to attend the meeting.

With reference to the other county—it is Dufferin county, I think—they are now negotiating with Dufferin county to lease space on a *per diem* basis, or something of that nature, which will eliminate another old county jail.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, just so that the hon. member will not go back 30 miles with his head in the clouds, I would draw your attention to the fact that the select committee in 1954 recommended that The Department of Reform Institutions assume control and operation of all district, city and county jails in Ontario.

Now, Mr. Chairman, previously the hon. Minister made a statement that policies change as to thinking in the matter of reforms. This does not concern policy and the operation of training schools or reform institutions; this concerns a government act, a physical act, as to who shall take over the operation and responsibility for these jails. This was in 1954, and nothing was done.

Now the Minister—three years ago—came out with a statement that regional jails were going to be built. Not one has been built to date. He implies that it takes a long time, and for three years this has been going on. I would point out to this House and to the hon. Minister, that it took 10 years to do nothing on that recommendation 51, which is the recommendation of a select committee of this House, sir. This committee was controlled by the government in power and the majority of the members on that committee were of this government's party. For 10 years, you did nothing! Then you started to do something. Three years have gone by, and you can get up here and say that you have attended 42 meetings, but there is not a single detention centre in this province.

Furthermore, when you do get it, you are only going to be paying half of the cost. In the recommendation that was made 17 years ago, it was suggested that all this be taken over by yourself.

I hope that the hon. member for Halton will not go back with his head in the clouds. He is tall anyway and he just goes to the clouds, so—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know what that has to do with the hon. member's question—

Mr. Ben: I thought it was just a question, but when he started complimenting the Minister, I did not think that compliments were due him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member might as well know, even if we are that slow and we are negligent, this is now up to Halton and Peel. They are going to be building their own detention centre with 50 per cent of the cost being contributed by us.

Mr. Ben: If the government had carried out this recommendation that was made 17 years ago, you would have had to have 42 meetings with officials from different counties, because you would have been in the control of all these jails. All you would have to do

would have been to get a mirror and talk to yourself—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I agree that that would have been the case.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2001 agreed to?

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I should let this go by without again protesting about the haphazard way in which this regional jail programme is going forward. It is unrelated to the whole concept of regional development and regional government which we have been talking about in this House for a long time. The Minister has tried to get adjacent counties to go into this and now this year he found that he had to introduce legislation to allow a county or a government unrelated to the other physically, to come in on the plan. This again does violence to the whole concept of regional government.

Mr. Chairman, I again call to the attention of the Minister the absolute necessity for him to get together with the Minister of Municipal Affairs particularly, and work out a plan whereby this province is going to advance in a rational, reasonable way toward regional government. That regional government then would have the administration of these detention centres. I cannot see that any progress has been made. We have some reports from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but those reports are not related to the development that seems to be taking place in this field.

The other thing, of course, that has already been said, is that progress seems to be very, very slow in this field. I wonder if the Minister can tell us when these three that now have been agreed upon, are actually going to be built. We seem to be able to build a cloverleaf on highway 401 at Spadina and it sits there partially unused for years—it is costing $14 million and $15 million at the present time—and yet we cannot seem to speed up the rehabilitation process at the very beginning, at the place where these people come in to the system. Surely we could ask for more speed than this.

When will these first three be done? When will they be ready for operation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I am in consultation with my colleagues in respect of the regional areas. The hon. member should understand that it is not quite that simple, because the areas do not necessarily coincide with the requirements of a penal institution.

For example, we have a policy not to build any institution which will accommodate more than 200, so we have to take density of population into consideration. They just will not conform, in many instances, with the regional areas as we have been talking about them.

Mr. Young: You might have to find two in that area, but it—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, but that area may require—if you kept within that particular area—a jail of 250, and we refuse to do this. We have this policy and we refuse to go beyond it.

Incidentally, that is one of the most progressive policies in the world as far as I know—and I have been around a bit. This is the only jurisdiction where we have laid down a policy—and it is an expensive one—that no institution will be built which will accommodate more than 200. We are now, as hon. members know, bringing down our own reformatories as rapidly as we can so that we can reach that ideal.

Now as far as the progress made to date of the regional detention centres, construction at Quinte and Kawartha is expected to commence in the early summer, 1967, and Niagara in the late fall of this year.

Mr. Young: So these should be ready for occupancy by the time the next—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I cannot say that. The hon. member knows the problems there are in construction today. I am happy with this. If there is anything I am really happy about, it is the progress that has been made here, even though I cannot say that there is a building up. I hope I have made clear enough the difficulties inherent in this plan and, incidentally, that we are also dealing with a completely new kind of building. There is no precedent for this sort of a building. It is a prototype and we had to start from scratch because the facilities that are going to be provided at these regional detention centres are something completely new. This took time.

As the hon. member knows, we have a planning committee of specialists in every field—law, architecture and after-care agencies and all the various people who would be involved in this sort of thing.

The prototype came to this committee and we had all of their views as to transportation and all that sort of thing. It was something completely new and had to be done right;

that took time. Now, we are well away and it is moving very quickly.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister if one set of plans will do for all of these or will there be architects for each one—different architects for different plans? Or is there going to be a standard plan worked out which you feel is the prototype of perfection as far as you can see it? Then that plan can go forward. In other words, once you get the plan established, once you get the architectural drawings done, those drawings can apply to all the other centres, and you do not have to wait for another set of architects to draw another set of plans.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am afraid at the moment that that would not be practical, because while they can provide a prototype, they are different sizes. There are different areas where there are usually more minimum security prisoners than there are maximum security prisoners. Each one really has to be planned separately.

Mr. Young: But that would not need a separate set of architects, would it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Each group of centres provide their own architects.

Mr. Young: This holds things back and then keeps—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know on paper it would sound easy to make one set of plans to apply to everybody, but it just does not. For example, minimum security prisoners in one area might be engaged in the kind of an operation which would not apply in another area. For instance, they may be doing market gardening in the one area; in another area you may have to have a satellite out of the institution where they might be doing some conservation work in a camp, something of that nature.

The architect works with a prototype and from that makes changes which are required for the particular area.

Mr. Young: Does the advisory committee then sit on each one of these and work out these variations?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The architects of the areas, the regional detention centre areas, are in consultation with the consulting architect of the planning committee and representatives from the planning committee.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this vote, I would like to revert to the discussion for a moment. I would like to do it here—and I assure the Minister I will not raise it again under vote 2004, since we have been discussing this this evening to some extent.

If, in fact, Hagersville is considered to some degree a model for the department and the new construction at Sudbury will be along the line of cottage units—it has been accepted that these are more desirable environments for the handling of the young offender, indeed that word is misplaced, the youngster who has been confined there for whatever reason—if they are considered more desirable, what are you going to do about all the other training schools in the system?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we will have to work towards this as an idea. It is going to take considerable time. For example, we are incorporating Ingleside into the new Vanier institution system, which can be done very easily. What we will do with the others we will have to plan.

It may be that we may decide that we will use that for an adult institution, or perhaps a clinical programme in the future. We have lots to do before we get around to worrying about what we are going to do about the other schools, because at this moment we have schools which, the hon. member has pointed out, are overcrowded and we have to solve that problem before we can turn ourselves to those schools which at least do not have an overcrowding problem.

Mr. S. Lewis: Curiously enough, Mr. Chairman, or perversely enough, I am not that much concerned by the overcrowding. I am concerned, but in some areas the population is not so great that it inhibits whatever programme is there.

I am much more concerned about the facilties, particularly the special facilities, upon which these institutions can draw for the purpose of providing the rehabilitation and treatment or therapy for the youngsters involved. What we know to be the case at St. John's and what we know to be the case at the other male and female juvenile institutions, demonstrates that within the present environment under the present staff complement, the job simply cannot be done, and it is unlikely that in the foreseeable future it will be done. That is really the main thrust of our argument—to bring it into an area where it is more easily facilitated.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where?

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I have suggested another department. If we want to empty Galt

and leave that building as a memento to what should not be done in juvenile correction, then I would agree to it. We will turn it into a museum of some kind and take conducted tours. We will turn it into a Centennial centre of science and technology—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Has the hon. member been to Galt recently?

Mr. S. Lewis: Not recently.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I think you should go there. You would find a decided change.

Mr. S. Lewis: Do you mean they have changed the interior?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, no! There is quite a treatment programme going on there.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I am not talking about the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And the facilities.

Mr. S. Lewis: If I remember the grounds, the observation unit and the diagnostic unit were near the gates at Galt. I am talking about the big plant for detention. But that more appropriately comes under—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Suppose we close it down. Where would you put the kids? Where would you take the youngsters?

Mr. S. Lewis: Right!

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order please! I am going to suggest that this particular discussion should take place under vote 2004. Are there any other questions under—

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am endeavouring to—

Mr. Chairman: I point out to the member I was listening to his remarks, and when he came to discuss the actual institutions, the way they are laid out, I thought that his remarks should come under vote 2004.

Mr. S. Lewis: You are right, sir, and I just did that by way of allusion, and I do not need to dwell on it. I am suggesting that at large, overall, the institutions are inimical to treatment and largely irrelevant. Then the Minister asked what would the alternative be? The alternative would be to give power to a department, like The Department of Education, because education and training is the vehicle for treatment for most of these youngsters, or should be, either for treatment of one thing or another. The Department of Education could very speedily, in new sites and in new areas, construct small cottage treatment units and small treatment centres. It could buy homes in given communities.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If they could do this, why cannot we?

Mr. S. Lewis: That is a very good question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right. It is a matter of priorities. We have got quite a big programme on. We are moving as quickly as we can, having regard to the various duties and the various problems we have. We are building a new school in Sudbury.

Mr. S. Lewis: I appreciate that Mr. Chairman, but I think that the basic problem is that one could never justify to this Cabinet—in terms of its priorities—the need to rescue a large number of youngsters from the inevitable damage being done them in this environment and placing them in another entirely different kind of milieu. That will not be done because of the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I had no trouble. I got Hagersville when I asked for it.

Mr. S. Lewis: There is no difficulty in buying—everyone knows the way the Ontario housing corporation is building houses all over the province of Ontario. You could acquire some of those, and if you could not, for some reason—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe we will.

Mr. S. Lewis: Maybe you will. Maybe that is a good idea.

Mr. Chairman: Order! It seems to me that the member is again out of order. I do not like to interrupt him, but let us stay with vote 2001 until we can carry it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well Mr. Chairman, I am endeavouring to do so, sir. The basic import of my remarks is that I suggest to the Minister you could facilitate the transfer of these youngsters into a more suitable environment virtually overnight, instead of leaving them there for five or 10 years—with all the inhibiting features—by putting it into a government department which could provide a more adequate response. It is not the question of social views of homosexuality, or mixing of the sexes, or all the other things that are supposedly dominating and flourishing in the other societies. That is not the problem at all, Mr. Chairman. The problem is the basic viewpoint on the part of government towards

the youngsters involved, and that the viewpoint at the moment is simply antithetical to making the changes we have suggested.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2001 carried?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, the Minister said in his opening remarks that he wanted to deal at some length with the future philosophy of his department in this field, and I would like to interject very briefly what seems to me to be the problem that he runs into, and perhaps an area in which he can find some of the solutions.

He purported to indicate that it was almost an insoluble problem, that there was for practical purposes, a philosophy for each individual—a philosophy of treatment for each individual, or an equivalent number for each individual that was within his system. If we speak for the moment about the juvenile offender, and I think my remarks probably apply with varying degrees of relevance to other areas of the Minister's institutions, what we are engaged in doing, so far as I can see, is simply saying that a given individual at a specific time has been behaving in a way which merits the punishment of the society.

We cannot get into the argument as to whether society is right in punishing that form of conduct. What we are doing is punishing a form of conduct. We are making the punishment by way of taking that person out of whatever environment or whatever circumstances he has been in normally, and putting him into a situation where by and large you increase by reason of the incarceration and by reason of the traditional system the stresses and tensions under which that person lives. Therefore, you have immediately, because of the system, created not an insurmountable, but a very serious problem which has to be overcome before you can even begin to deal with the specific conduct which resulted in the person being within a custodial setting of the kind the hon. Minister has.

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me, I hesitate to interrupt the member, but it seems to me that his remarks are being directed to the institutions over which this department has oversight and, therefore, I cannot find anything in vote 2001 on which the member would be speaking. Therefore, I must suggest to him that his remarks more appropriately can come under vote 2004.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I thought that it was under vote 2001 that we spoke of the broader concepts that are involved in a particular department before we got down to the specific details. I do not know of any place where we can discuss what the hon. Minister said was the main theme of his remarks if we do not do it under this vote.

Mr. Chairman: Of course, the member understands that the Minister opens the discussion of the estimates with a statement. This is followed by a statement from the critics from each of the other two parties and then we proceed into the detailed discussion of the votes. I regret that I cannot find a place in vote 2001 where the member's remarks would be in order.

Mr. Renwick: Is the Chairman suggesting that there is no place in these estimates for any other member to engage in any dialogue on such matters?

Mr. Chairman: I suggest to the member that he might speak on vote 2004.

Mr. Renwick: I am not speaking about any specific institution, Mr. Chairman. I am speaking about what the Minsiter said—

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that there was to be one lead-off speaker per party.

Mr. Renwick: I am not speaking about a speaker per party. We are attempting to engage in a dialogue in the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, if you will bear with me, I think this is of sufficiently significant importance to devote a little time to it, without having a niggling step by step progression through the particular items that happen to be printed in the book.

Mr. Chairman: I suggest to the member that he might give his cooperation in this matter and speak on what he intends to discuss on the later vote.

Mr. Ben: Well, Mr. Chairman, I find this conduct objectionable and obnoxious. It was made clear at the outset that we were not going to be niggling on these estimates. We agreed in principle with most of the concepts of this Minister. It is true that he made his address. It is true that a member of the Liberal Party made his address, and it is true that a member of the NDP made his address, except the hon. Minister did not stop there, he got up in rebuttal.

We did not continue having a dialogue but waited to get to the first vote. If you keep on banging that gavel you are going to get a sore arm. Although I said that I was not going to be niggling, I will get up on

every item and I have got reams of material here. So stop banging that gavel and interrupting, or you are going to be here all night.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: I am just warning you, you are not the Chairman of the whole House, somebody else is. Now, keep your hand off the gavel and let us have a discussion.

Mr. Chairman: I will only point out to the member who has just spoken that there are rules in this House which we endeavour to follow. I have not banged the gavel, I have endeavoured to be courteous to all members.

Mr. Ben: Not since you put your arms under your armpits.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. May I suggest that the hon. member for Riverdale could very well discuss this under vote 2002 where we are dealing with rehabilitation?

Mr. Chairman: Are there any further matters under vote 2001?

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, under vote 2001 there is a grant of $30,000 to the centre of criminology, University of Toronto. This is a department which I think is very important. I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on the $30,000 which is, I think, the same amount as a year ago?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is the same amount. This was a grant which we provided for the establishment of the centre of criminology at the time of its inception and it is the annual grant.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, is that centre enlarging or is it static?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I believe is is enlarging, but it is enlarging with other funds as well, and I think quite properly. There are other people and other jurisdictions which benefit from the centre of criminology.

Mr. Young: So the Minister feels that the $30,000 is adequate to give that centre the scope it needs as it is supplemented by other funds?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would say this is all we are prepared to grant them at this time.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, that grant—the $30,000 from The Department of Reform Institutions—was one of the original grants to the centre of criminology. Since that time—and particularly I think last year and certainly this year—in my estimates it was noted through The Department of the Attorney General that additional grants have been supplied to the centre of criminology.

We have had discussions with The Department of Education, and I think some grants come from there generally to the university and some of them I believe, sir, are allocated to the centre of criminology. I certainly know that they go direct from The Department of the Attorney General and discussions have taken place between The Departemnt of Reform Institutions. The Department of Education and The Department of the Attorney General to see if the grants might be consolidated, so that the whole amount would appear in one sum.

Mr. Young: It may be done next year—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But they have been increased this year.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Has the government given any indication to the chair, sir, as to when we might possibly terminate these proceedings this evening in view of the early meeting of the House in the morning?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I think we might continue until about 11 o'clock.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest it would be determined by the progress we make on vote 2001. I would say we may be anxious to get a few funds voted for the Minister.

Mr. Ben: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the hon. Attorney General returning to his seat. If he had been here earlier he would have heard mention of a grant made by The Attorney General's Department. I believe it is the magnificent sum of $15,000.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Some members did not seem to be aware of it.

Mr. Ben: Perhaps they also were absent from the chamber. I also pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that the Ford foundation gave a grant of $150,000 to be disbursed over a period of three years, so it works out to $50,000 a year. In other words, a foreign body, not even in this jurisdiction, gives more money to the research centre for carrying out this vital work than this government seems to see fit to do.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would suggest it is very proper that they do so. The money did not all come from the area in which the Ford foundation is now located.

Mr. Ben: I am sorry, I did not hear the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I suggest it is very proper that they should do so. We very much appreciate the grant. Some of the money which goes to the Ford foundation probably came from this side of the border, I think, and it is quite proper that some of it should flow back this way.

Mr. Ben: Indeed it should, Mr. Chairman, I only make this comment to point out that they give more than this government sees fit to do.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this evening we were discussing the question of present pay for the inmates. The Minister, in his usual inimitable way, got up to point out that they just do not receive $20 on their discharge, these inmates of prisons in the province of Ontario, but that they also receive some other benefits.

This is a typical way of getting around the situation, because again he tried to gloss over the real principle behind paying prisoners. This was not simply to give them pocket money when they leave the institution, because, as the Minister pointed out, certain items are supplied to them. The purpose of suggesting pay for prisoners was stated in the *Canadian Journal of Corrections*, Volume 7, No. 1, which was issued in January of 1965. In the same month of the same year, the Minister, after having read this or having had it brought to his attention, stated that:

> Proposals for minimum hourly wages of labour unions for jail prisoners were termed interesting yesterday by Allan Grossman, Ontario Minister of Reform Institutions.

And then he speaks of the proposals in the following paragraph:

> Mr. Grossman said he had been studying for some time the idea of prisoners receiving wages equal to 20 per cent of the minimum on the outside. Ontario prisoners receive six cents a day as pocket money upon their release.

In other words, in January of 1965, the Minister made a statement that for some time he had been studying this situation and this problem. Today he states that last year he appointed a committee to look into it. The fact, however, is, that prison pay and discharge provisions in Canada were directed to the Minister's attention by the, as I say, Canadian corrections association. The reasons that they gave for recommending payment for prisoners were not simply so they could have more money at the date of their discharge:

> It is highly desirable that all inmates of a prison be fully occupied during a normal working day. In this context fully occupied is defined to include therapy sessions, scholastic education, vocational and trade training and maintenance, as well as prison, industrial production. The need for recreation activities during the non-working hours is recognized. There are several reasons why it is desirable to keep prison inmates fully occupied.

And then it goes on to give some reasons:

> (a) Since the purpose of the institution should be to prepare the inmate for his return to normal community living, it is important that as much time and effort as possible be spent on such preparation.
>
> (b) It is an unhealthy and incapacitating thing in itself to be left with long periods of idleness.
>
> (c) Prison discipline is more easily maintained when the inmate population is fully occupied.
>
> (d) Any money the inmate earns can be used to enable him to meet what would be considered normal financial responsibility in a general community, such as defraying the costs of maintaining himself in the institution, maintaining his family in the community, building a fund to help him during the initial period after discharge, paying income tax, unemployment insurance and hospitalization premiums.

They do not pay hospitalization premiums, but this would be after their discharge.

> The possibility of compensating the victim of his crime might also be considered. Such priority would have to be established among those possible uses.

The Minister tried to lead us to believe the sole principle involved was whether or not he had money in his pocket at the time—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not at all.

Mr. Ben: That was the implication that the Minister tried to give, intentionally or otherwise. If the Minister had been honest in the first instance, he would have pointed out the benefits that flow from paying inmates—that it is not the amount, it is the habits that are formed; that they get used to working and

being paid for it. The article goes on subsequently to show how the prison systems operate on this principle in other jurisdictions. For instance on a federal level:

> On admission to penitentiary each inmate is automatically grade 1. Here it is 25 cents per working day. He must remain three months on grade 1 when he may be upgraded to grade 2. He is permitted to spend 15 cents but he must save ten cents.
>
> In grade 2, he gets 35 cents, of which 25 cents may be spent and 10 cents saved.

They go on to grades 3 and 4, and they give certain credits. The same applies to some other jurisdictions, for instance, British Columbia. I will grant you that some jurisdictions pay nothing. But it is the principle involved, that they are learning good work habits and the fact that a reward follows hard work. They are also able to save some money for their families.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Precisely what I—

Mr. Ben: It was a fact that the Minister tried to gloss over this.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not do that at all.

Mr. Ben: He may put up his hands in horror and say he did not; I say thou didst.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister would comment briefly on three matters.

Item 5, the advisory committee; I would appreciate an explanatory comment from the Minister on that item.

Item 8, an explanatory comment on that item, and on item 9, the grants. I would like the Minister to indicate whether any societies have made applications and been turned down for grants, or whether the amounts which have been allocated for the various societies are in the amounts which were requested; and the method by which the Minister determines who is entitled to receive a grant under this item.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is the Minister's advisory committee on the treatment of the offender, the regional detention centres planning committee, the training schools advisory board, and the trades and industry advisory committee.

The other question was as to whether there were any other applicants for grants.

Mr. Renwick: The one intermediary item is a brief explanation of item 8, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Compassionate allowances?

Mr. Renwick: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is when there is an injury in one of the institutions, which it is felt some compassionate allowance is called for. For instance, at the Millbrook plant someone may injure a finger or lose a finger or something of that nature and a compassionate allowance is made for that purpose.

Mr. Renwick: I think what has confused me, Mr. Chairman, is the reference to permanently handicapped inmates or wards. I assume that is when a person within one of the Minister's institutions suffers an injury in some way which produces a permanent disability over and above the award that he might receive through the workmen's compensation board.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He would not receive anything through the workmen's compensation board. We use the workmen's compensation board for the purpose of establishing what compensation he should get and on this basis we make the grant.

Mr. Renwick: That is interesting, Mr. Chairman. I was not aware that that happened. Does the board then use the same general system that it uses for assessing awards in industries which are covered by the board?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Generally, they make a recommendation to us on that basis.

Mr. Renwick: To some extent, Mr. Chairman, does the amount which is then awarded to a particular person who has been disabled, say at Millbrook in the operation for manufacturing licence plates, bear some resemblance to the award which a person would have received in industry for that kind of permanent disability?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, approximately.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, is this the place where the trades and industry advisory committee and its work would be discussed or would it come at a later time under one of the other votes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I guess it could be under this vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Young: The question in my mind, Mr. Chairman, is how successful that advisory committee has been. I understand they have

held some meetings. I wonder if the Minister could tell us just how far it has gone and what their function is, what they are supposed to do and what they have achieved over the past year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Generally, the committee is to examine our industries and our vocational training, and decide on the basis of its findings whether they are up-to-date having regard for today's requirements insofar as the vocational training and the industries which are carried on in the institutions are concerned. They make recommendations for the purpose of bringing them up to date. The committee, with the added recommendations of the Minister's advisory committee in the treatment of the offender, is also considering pay for prisoners for the work they do and all the other matters which would be related to that, such as charging them for their keep. In fact they would be considering the matter of compensation for victims of their crimes and so on.

Mr. Young: Have they made any recommendations—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, they have had a difficult task becoming oriented to our work, to find out in the first place what the problems are in the institutions and to go there and see what we are trying to do, and what we mean by rehabilitation and how it can be accomplished. I think this has been, up till now, the biggest job they have done. It is very difficult becoming acquainted with what is involved in corrections. They have been making regular reports and I think we will find that within a few months, we will have some specific recommendations from them which may appear before the House here.

Mr. Young: It seems to me that a year is quite a long time to operate and they have made no recommendations as yet.

Do they bring under their supervision the matter of apprenticeship training? Are they studying the whole relationship of apprenticeship training to the application—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is the specific problem which they are attacking at this particular time.

Mr. Young: How much progress has been made up to this point, in the matter of apprenticeship training? This is something I raised four years ago, I think, in connection with this and at that time we were assured that there would be real progress made in relating the training in the institutions to apprenticeship. I understand that some credit has been given on a day-to-day basis, or something of that nature. I wonder if the Minister has any observations to make as to the progress which had been made even before this advisory committee came on the scene.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Arrangements have been made, Mr. Chairman, for them to get credit toward their apprenticeship for the work done in the institutions. This has been going on now for some time—I think about a year, no, two years—and this is well integrated now. It is a fairly well-oiled system there.

Mr. Young: Has the Minister any idea how many such credits have actually been awarded?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not have those figures handy, but I will get them for the member.

Mr. Young: I would appreciate knowing how many credits have been awarded and in what fields, because I think it is important to know the progress that has been made in this apprenticeship field in the institutions.

Vote 2001 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we have three speakers in the Budget debate and we will resume these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.10 o'clock, p.m.

No. 88

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, May 5, 1967

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 5, 1967

Question to Mr. Robarts re the commission of Mr. Justice Parker, Mr. Renwick 3085

Questions to Mr. Wishart re Dr. John Porter, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald 3085

Statements re extension of benefits under the new capital grants plan, Mr. Davis 3086

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Singer, Mr. Root 3087

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Harris, agreed to 3103

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman, continued 3103

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 3111

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1967

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery, students from Lakeview public school, Grimsby. I regret that I do not have the name of the boys and girls in the east gallery, but they are welcome here just the same.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Will he enlarge the terms of reference of the commission of Mr. Justice Parker to include the three cases listed by Dr. Shulman yesterday which were outside Metropolitan Toronto, and will he also enlarge the terms of reference to include the status of coroners in Ontario?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to discuss the question, as I have said in the House before, of enlarging the terms of reference with the commissioner if he asks me, but to date he has not asked me. It would have to be done in conjunction with him.

I rather doubt that I would enlarge the terms to meet the last portion of the member's question, namely, the status of coroners in Ontario, for that is not the purpose of this Royal commission. It has been set up to investigate certain allegations made by Dr. Shulman, and of course what the member is asking here is another matter entirely and which might very well, if it were necessary to be gone into, be studied in ways different from the appointment of a Royal commission.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Opposition yesterday asked about the inquests which had been assigned to Dr. Porter. There are four in number: Demetri Holkidis, whose death occurred on March 31 of this year; Clarence Taylor, whose death occurred on April 16; Eino Nitkinen, whose death occurred on April 12, and Ferman Connanda, on April 1.

The question also inquired as to what improper procedures Dr. Porter had carried on, and to this I would simply say that the inquests which he had conducted were completely disorganized; witnesses were asking questions of witnesses; there was discussion without any control; and the inquests were not properly conducted in any way.

I had not wanted to say this about Dr. Porter, but it is necessary to say so in order to answer the question and to explain the action which was taken. Therefore, as I said before, we are trying to assist this doctor—who is a very junior coroner—by giving him advice so that he will be able to continue to take inquests and to handle them in a proper way. At the same time, every facility is being afforded to him to continue his research into traffic death fatalities.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Attorney General if he intends to reconvene the inquest that Dr. Porter has already conducted using the procedures that the Attorney General designates as out of the ordinary?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have not seen the transcript of that inquest. If it became apparent that some of the evidence was lost or not properly presented, or if there was something lacking, I would do so, but I have not had an opportunity to consider that yet.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent) asked a question yesterday concerning the recruitment of police, intelligence officers, the usual police personnel and cadets.

I would simply say to him that we do all those things now.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General is in a position to answer the questions relative to Dr. Porter that were asked yesterday by the leader of this party?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I thought, Mr. Speaker, that I had answered them at the time.

Mr. Bryden: He asked a number of questions and my recollection is that you answered some of them.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister answered numbers 4, 5 and 6.

Mr. Bryden: There was one of them that follows almost directly out of the answer that was just given to the leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I should be glad to answer it now if I could recall the question.

Mr. Bryden: I regret that I do not have a copy of it, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have a copy of it. It asks: "For what period has coroner Dr. John Porter been relieved of his duties?"

He has not been relieved as a coroner at all. He has been relieved of the taking of certain inquests. That is part 1 of the question.

"Where, and for how long, will the retraining take place?" That is, advice and assistance being given to him by the acting chief coroner and by the Crown attorney. It will depend on how quickly he is able to accept the training and show that he is able to conduct the inquests.

Part 3 of the question reads: "If the supervising coroner's objections were regarding Dr. Porter's unorthodox procedures, could these not have been corrected either by advising or instructing him to return to normal procedures in future inquests, instead of being relieved of his duties?"

As I pointed out, he is not being relieved, except that he is not being asked to take all traffic cases, and he is being retrained.

I answered 4, 5 and 6 yesterday. Question 4 read: "When was Dr. Porter dismissed from his role as coordinator of the research project into traffic fatalities?"

He was not dismissed at all.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I wish to announce an extension of the benefits of the new capital grants plan to all capital projects which were approved during the calendar year 1965-66.

The House will recall that on February 20, 1967, I announced that the introduction of a new method of calculating approval of capital projects for grant purposes would result in substantial increases in the proportion of capital expenditures by boards eligible for grants. The new plan was effective for all final approvals given after January 1, 1967. The school boards throughout the province have enthusiastically endorsed the new plan whereby the government has absorbed a much larger proportion of the capital costs of the new schools.

It will be recalled by the House, Mr. Speaker, that on January 1, 1965, legislation establishing larger units of school administration in the province became effective. As a result, many of the newly established boards decided to build central schools to replace the older, smaller institutions. This development has gone a long way toward providing equality of educational opportunity for students in many areas where formerly it was not possible to do so.

Because these boards showed initiative and a desire to improve their facilities and programmes, a substantial number of them received final approvals for their projects prior to January 1, 1967. The extension of the benefits of the new method of calculating approvals for capital projects to include all those given in 1965 and 1966 will recognize the efforts of these boards to provide better facilities, and will substantially reduce the costs to be borne at the local level.

Since the change will apply to all boards, it will substantially reduce the amount payable by them for capital purposes, and the boards in rapidly developing areas will be in a better position to meet the demands of increasing school populations.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, use some specific examples to illustrate the extent of the change, it will indicate the significance financially for the local boards.

Where a board received an approval in 1965 or in 1966 for a capital project, the amount of that approval will be increased by approximately 50 per cent for an elementary school and approximately 100 per cent for a secondary school. If, for example, approval was originally given for a ten-room elementary school in the amount of $200,000, the approval will be revised to $300,000 or the actual cost, whichever is the lesser.

In the case of a secondary school where the final approval for a 30-room school was in the amount of, say, $750,000, the approval will be revised to $1,500,000 or, once again, the actual cost, whichever is the lesser sum.

The payment of grant on debentures for these projects in 1967 and for all subsequent years, will be based on the revised approvals. So that the benefits of the revision will also extend to boards which send their students to schools under the jurisdiction of another

board, the proportion of the fees paid by the "purchasing" board that is eligible for grants will be increased from 15 per cent to 20 per cent.

The cost of the revisions will increase the government's grants to the local boards in 1967 by an amount estimated at $6 million and reduce the obligation of local boards by a corresponding amount.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would permit a question. I did not understand clearly. Would this apply only to final approvals given after the first of the present year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is retroactive, Mr. Speaker, and will apply to final approvals given after January 1, 1965, so that approvals and construction that went on in 1965 and 1966 will be eligible on the basis of the new capital grant regulations that were to take effect as of January 1, 1967.

Mr. Nixon: So that would mean that there would be money going out from your department to finance schools that are already built and in operation. I wonder if the Minister could tell us approximately what the additional budgetary requirement would be.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I said at the end of my statement, Mr. Speaker, we estimate it will be approximately $6 million for this current fiscal year.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, through you may I introduce to the Legislature 160 students, the finest people to be found anywhere in the province of Ontario, from the city of Barrie—Barrie north collegiate.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I just received a note that our guests in the east gallery are history students from the Barrie north collegiate institute.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before getting into the two or three themes that I want to deal with at some length I thought I would tell you for a moment or two about a meeting I was at last night in the new provincial riding of Sarnia. The attendance at that meeting—it was a Liberal nomination meeting, by the way—was about six times the attendance of the meeting that took place there the night before when the candidate for another party, I think the Conservative Party, was nominated. It was interesting. We chose the man who will be the next member for Sarnia.

The thing of significance to this House, Mr. Speaker, is that there were several messages that I was charged to bring back to this House and to the member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) in case he had missed the messages from his constituents. I thought, sir, that you would be interested, and certainly the member for Lambton West would be interested, to know that his people are not very happy with the fact that he has not been able to produce reasonable highways in the Sarnia area.

A big and important municipality that has, they were telling me, the highest per capita income of any municipality in the province, and they just do not have any proper highways to allow the people to get into that municipality. I cannot understand, sir, but they are not very happy with the representation their member has given them in that he has not been able to produce these results.

There are several other messages, too—they are not very happy about the pollution of the St. Clair River that is just at their front door there and they thought that their member from Lambton West might have been able to do something about that. In fact, they are so unhappy that they came out in six times the numbers last night than they did the night before to express their dissatisfaction. It is a pity that we are going to have to say goodbye to the member for Lambton West so soon.

It is a sign of things to come, Mr. Speaker. This is really not the purport of my message but I thought it was well worth delivering the message I was given last night. I had to; as my leader says, it was my duty to bring that before you, sir.

The next point I want to deal with is the question of divorce. My colleague from Wellington South (Mr. Worton) has over the years put motions on the order paper in his name and has asked questions. Just the other day he asked a question of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), dealing with the whole approach of this government insofar as divorce problems are concerned. Now, we have had

interesting debates about this and I can remember the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Eagleson)—I am sorry he is not in the House now—standing up the last time my colleague's resolution was debated and pounding his desk and saying, "Let us vote now; let us say that Ontario stands for divorce reform."

Then we tried to force the vote. The member for Lakeshore voted, of course, with the government to postpone any decision. This is the way these things happen, unfortunately, but I got a little new courage and little new hope out of the contents of the Speech from the Throne. You will remember, sir, that there was a promise in the Speech from the Throne that an investigation would be made, and as a result of that there would be a decision made by this government as to what ideas they would have about divorce reform in the province of Ontario.

The Speech from the Throne was delivered on January 29 and this is May 5, and nothing really has happened. Surprisingly, nothing at all has happened. There has been a committee sitting in Ottawa, a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons; they have been receiving representations from all sorts of people, and from all sorts of governments across the country. Fascinatingly, not from the government of the province of Ontario.

When my colleague from Wellington South asked the Prime Minister a day or two ago about what the attitude of Ontario was insofar as divorce was concerned, he said to him here in the House, "Well, I was thinking of setting up a select committee to discover whether or not we had an attitude and to discover whether or not we were going to make any representation." But we have no select committee, sir, and apparently we have no attitude. The Prime Minister was quoted, I presume correctly, outside the House in connection with this same subject, and he expressed some surprise that those fellows in Ottawa had moved so quickly. He acknowledged that there would be some difficulty at this stage in the session setting up a select committee, particularly in view of certain things that appear to be happening about an election or some sort of talk like that. It might be quite difficult.

Sir, surely the time has come that the government of the province of Ontario must take a position in this regard. As you know, sir, and I am not going to go into an elaborate discussion of the laws of divorce in the province of Ontario, divorce is a federal topic. In Ontario the divorce laws are governed by The Divorce Act, Ontario which is a federal statute, and it would appear pretty obvious to me that no federal government is going to change The Divorce Act, Ontario without the consent and unless it was at the request of the government of Ontario.

Now, it may well be, sir—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): The Ontario government will make their own decisions and forward them to the dominion government when completed.

Mr. Singer: All right, the hon. Minister of Mines would be among the first to rise in his place in high dudgeon if any federal government dared to change an Act called The Divorce Act, Ontario without consulting the government of Ontario, and I would agree with him. I am sure the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) would agree with him. But the point is, sir, when this committee in Ottawa makes its report and if and when it is acted upon by the federal government where does Ontario stand? Surely the time is long overdue that this government makes up its mind. Are we content? Is it the view of the Prime Minister that we are content with the present divorce laws? One is forced to come to this conclusion, because there has not been, other than this one sentence in the Throne Speech delivered on January 29 any indication on the part of this government at all that they are interested in divorce reform in the province of Ontario. Certainly, sir, there is not going to be any divorce reform come to the province of Ontario unless and until this government takes the stand in that regard.

I am not going to speak about all of the arguments that indicate there should be divorce reform; we have debated that on several occasions. Those people who are suffering because of our old-fashioned, antiquated and peculiar divorce laws can get small comfort out of the fact that this government is not even prepared to wrestle with the problem; is not even prepared to conduct the inquiry that was mentioned in the Throne Speech.

Another subject I wanted to deal with very briefly, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the recent pronouncements by the chiefs of police and their views as to what the criminal laws might be, and how they might be changed.

I was pleased to see that this Attorney General, very quickly when asked his position, took what I think is a sound position in regard to the major recommendations made in that brief. But I think, sir, it is worth repeating that most people in the province of

Ontario could not countenance for a moment the enactment of laws along the lines of these major recommendations. It is not sufficient to say it could not happen in any Legislature or Parliament in Canada, because, sir, in 1964, it almost happened in Ontario.

The ill-fated Bill 99 said little different from what those major recommendations were and it was very interesting, sir, to note that when the member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Cass), the then Attorney General, the man who introduced Bill 99, was asked what he thought about it, he said, and I hope I am quoting him correctly, I am sorry he is not in his seat, but if I am quoting him wrongly he can correct me at a later time. He appeared to say, "Well, those recommendations were a little radical and perhaps the public are not ready for them yet, but someday it may be that we will need laws of this kind in this province."

I think, sir, therein lies the danger. Therein lies the danger of giving away our civil liberties, or letting them be taken away by overzealous policemen, or by politicians who get careless—by people who sit in Legislatures and pay no attention to what can be going on insofar as our laws affecting the liberty and rights of the individual are concerned.

It is shocking that an important group in our community—this association of police chiefs—should recommend that the police be given power to jail individuals temporarily to prevent them from committing crimes. I think an illustration they gave is that, when dignitaries or very important people might be meeting, the police should have the power to pick out certain people they are suspicious of and lock them up for fear that something might happen. What a negation of our ideas of liberty and freedom in this country.

Almost as shocking is the suggestion that there be a provision that would enable the police to search private homes at any time without the regular rules applying. A terrible thing, sir. The reason I am repeating these things, notwithstanding—and I complimented the Attorney General for his position in this—is that I do not think that these things can be said too many times. We have to be watchful. We have to be alert.

The thought, I say, of searching people's homes without warrant and without the legal safeguards that are there now. The authority to arrest persons found loitering in the halls of an apartment building. They asked for the return of the lash, the ability to punish youngsters between seven and 14. All this sort of thing. Well, sir, I say it is a shocking abandonment by this important body in our community of what should be a real concern for the preservation of the rule of law. We must say—we must repeatedly say—that the policemen are not the law makers and this is not a police state. But the politicians are the law makers and the politicians must be constantly on the alert to prevent even the remote possibility of statutes like this becoming part of the laws of the province of Ontario, or of this country.

In a recent editorial in the *Globe and Mail*—and I thought a couple of paragraphs could well be read into the record—referring to the late Dean Wright, of Osgoode hall, the editorial writers quote this section from one of his speeches:

> Why, he asked, in a famous speech in 1962, should we not have the best men dealing with the lives and liberties of hundreds of citizens, instead of reserving them for the more erudite subtleties involved in the hierarchy of the courts, which are still based on the value of dollars in cases which come before it?

And then they go on and refer to Dean Lederman, who is another law dean now at Queen's University, and they take a paragraph from one of his recent speeches. They say this:

> The primary agencies for making these adjustments are the Legislatures and the courts, so that, in the end, the best constitutional guarantee of justice we can hope for are those that safeguard the democratic character of our legislative bodies, the high quality and independence of our courts and the fairness of procedure in both. In particular, an independent judiciary of high quality would seem to be a necessity for the tasks of adjusting, and also safeguarding, the inner boundaries surrounding the essential core of our freedom.

The message is a very obvious one and it is a very simple one, but it has to be repeated and repeated and repeated. Our freedoms are important and we have to be prepared to stand in our places as frequently as is necessary to make sure that these freedoms are guaranteed—that we do not get carried away by the overzealousness of people who we charge with the responsibility of being policemen, or even of being Attorney General.

I wanted to turn to one other subject, sir, and this one is the one I am going to spend a little time on—that is, the whole question of the rules of this House relating to sub judice. This bothers me and has bothered me

ever since I came into this House. I just do not understand what we are trying to achieve with the rules that we have that relate to the whole question of being sub judice.

What sense does it make, sir—and this goes back to my remarks dealing with these recommendations of the chiefs of police and my concern with the preservation of liberty. What sense does it make, sir, if the rules of this House stifle debate in matters of public concern—stifle debate within these chambers when a Mr. Cauley of the workmens' compensation board can go outside the House and make a speech concerning matters that we are prohibited from talking about inside this House? When the judge in charge of the commission says, "Well, I am not sure"—no I am sorry—when the Prime Minister said, in answer to a question from my leader, "Well, I do not know, perhaps it was unwise, but I have no opinion as to whether or not he was in contempt or in breach of any sub judice rules." Does it make any sense, sir, that in this forum we are barred from discussing matters that are of great public importance? This forum is supposed to be dedicated to debate, to public discussion and we have just been carried away by an ancient Latin phrase which seems to be applied. I do not take you to task, sir. I take the rule makers to task. I take those people to task who use these rules for their own ends and those are the people who sit on the government benches.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): That is not true.

Mr. Singer: You will just see how it is true as my argument unfolds.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): I am checking to see if—

Mr. Singer: Oh, the member is back. I am glad he is back, I am sorry he was not here earlier but he can read *Hansard* and see what I said about him.

The fact is, sir, that these rules have been used, and are continuing to be used, to stifle debate about matters of public importance in this Legislature. People discuss them outside the Legislature and nobody does anything about it. Nobody wants to do anything about it. But here, where we are supposed to have freedom of discussion, where we are supposed to be entitled to get answers from those gentlemen who inhabit the Treasury benches, do we get answers? No. No. We have rules. We have rules that say we cannot talk about these things.

Let me go into some of the history of this whole question. The classic statement of the modern law of constructive contempt—and that is the whole sub judice rule—is that of Lord Harwicke in the St. James Evening Post case in 1742. This is how far back we get when we try to look to the reason for what we are presently doing:

> There are three different sorts of contempts—

said Lord Hardwicke—

> One kind of contempt is scandalizing the court itself. There may be, likewise, a contempt of this court in abusing the parties who are concerned in causes here. There may also be a contempt of this court in prejudicing mankind against persons before the cause is heard.
>
> There cannot be anything of greater consequence than to keep the streams of justice clear and pure, that parties may proceed with safety both to themselves and their characters.

That statement of fact, of law, of good common sense, certainly applies today. But we have interpreted this out of all reasonable proportion. What Lord Hardwicke was talking about was the protection of people in court, so that they will not be prejudiced. As my argument goes on, you will see, sir, that even this right must give way to the right of public discussion, freedom of speech, the importance of the function of legislators.

In spite of Lord Hardwicke's tripartite division of the law of contempt, the law has, in fact, developed along only two streams, the first being contempt by way of scandalizing the court and the second being contempt by way of prejudicing the parties to an action by comment either on the parties themselves or on the subject matter of the action while the cause is pending.

This latter has come to be known as the sub judice rule. The sub judice rule reflects the dual social interests that people are not to be deterred from recourse to the courts by fear of suffering abuse, and that nothing shall prejudice the disposition of causes according to the law and solely upon the relevant facts as produced in a court of law.

The rule, however, runs counter to another social interest, namely that the public and the press shall enjoy an unfettered right to speak, write and have published their views on any and all social questions of the day—the public and the press. And if the public voice is stifled when the voice of the legislators are stifled, then we lose a very essential part of our freedom.

The Australian courts have been quick to note this conflict and to evolve a balance of these two interests. The basic statement of the Australian jurisprudence in this regard is that of Sir Frederick Jordan, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, Australia, in 1937. And he said this:

> It is of extreme public interest that no conduct should be permitted which is likely to prevent a litigant in a court of justice from having his case tried free from all matter of prejudice. But the administration of justice, important though it undoubtedly is, is not the only matter in which the public is vitally interested; and if in the course of the ventilation of a question of public concern, matter is published which may prejudice a party in the conduct of a law suit, it does not follow that a contempt has been committed.
>
> The case may be one in which as between competing matters of public interest, the possibility of prejudice to a litigant may be required to yield to other and superior considerations. The discussion of public affairs and the denunciation of public abuses, actual or supposed, cannot be required to be suspended merely because the discussion or denunciation may, as an incidental but not intended by-product, cause some likelihood of prejudice to a person who happens at the time to be a litigant.

Well, there is a statement that I think is so true and so applicable. We have been carried away with the false idea of what we are trying to protect. We are not weighing the importance of public discussion as against the other important matter, the fair trial of an action that is pending before the courts. And having adopted this other idea, as we do in our rules in the House, then those rules are being used deliberately I say—and I charge the government—to stifle public discussion by members of this Legislature of matters of great public concern, and it has been done time after time after time.

> It is well settled that a person cannot be prevented by process of contempt from continuing to discuss publicly a matter which may fairly be regarded as one of public interest—

Well, it may be well settled outside the courts, but it is far from settled in this legislative chamber:

> —by reason merely of the fact that the matter in question has become the subject of litigation, or that a person whose conduct is being publicly criticized has become a party to litigation, either as plaintiff or as defendant, and whether in relation to the matter which is under discussion or with respect to some other matter.

I may say, sir, that in Australia, this statement, this very important statement, this succint summary of what the law is in that country in any event, this very clear view of Sir Frederick Jordan was quoted and expressly endorsed again by the high court of Australia in the year 1954.

I always thought as a lawyer and as a student of law that basically our common law in Australia and Canada and in the province of Ontario were much the same and came from the same background; moved in the same directions. We enjoyed the same freedoms, we tried to protect the same sort of things. And I say what we are doing in this Legislature with our sub judice rule is a perversion of this right for freedom of discussion.

In New South Wales at that time, and for two years previous, one of the liveliest—and this is how this statement came about—and most contentious public issues was the state of the New South Wales police force. Charges of corruption and police brutality and demands for a Royal commission to investigate the charges had been rife throughout that period. In short, the methods and the morality of its police force was the state's No. 1 public issue.

Early in 1954, "S" had been arrested and charged and his trial had been set for later that month. At about the same time, "R" was arrested and his trial also was set for late March. On March 9, the *Daily Telegraph* published a statutory declaration made by "S" in which he alleged to have been beaten by the police after his arrest, and that the beating had been administered in order to force him to sign certain statements, which he had ultimately done. The effect of this, of course, was to deny the voluntariness of the confessions he had evidently made earlier, a matter on which the court would have to rule at his trial.

The effect of "S's" declaration was electric. The following day the Premier of New South Wales rose in the Legislature to announce the appointment of a Royal commission to investigate the charges contained in "S's" declaration.

On March 11, two days later, the Sydney *Morning Herald* published a similar statutory declaration made by "R" in which he, too,

alleged that he had been beaten and forced to sign certain statements against his will.

While disclaiming any opinion as to the truth or falsity of R's charges, as indeed the *Daily Telegraph* had done in publishing those of S, the Sydney *Morning Herald* asked the Premier to widen the terms of reference at the Royal commission in order that it might investigate the charges made by R, as well as those made by S.

Both papers were charged with contempt of court and found guilty by unanimous judgments of the New South Wales Supreme Court. Both papers appealed to the high court of Australia.

The cases, re Consolidated Press Limited, *ex parte* McRae—the *Daily Telegraph* case—and re John Fairfax and Sons Limited, *ex parte* McRae—the *Morning Herald* case—were heard consecutively in the commonweath's highest court. In both cases, they quashed the finding of contempt against these two newspapers. The court held that what the papers had been concerned with was the issue of police morality, and in the words of Chief Justice Dixon, a subject which "was plainly a matter of great public interest and of great public importance."

"The guilt or innocence of Rigby," said the chief justice in his statement in the Sydney *Morning Herald* case, "—was a matter of complete indifference—" to the paper—

> The existence of pending proceedings seems to us to be a mere accidental circumstance which cannot make criminal a publication in no way concerned with those proceedings, but made *alio intuitu*.

To the same effect, the judgment by Mr. Justice Fullagar in the Sydney *Daily Telegraph* case, said this:

> An essential feature of the present case, as of the Herald case, is that the pith and substance of the matter published is not directed at, or concerned directly or indirectly, with any legal proceeding.

Now, sir, this is the essence of this whole argument. Surely we, as legislators, cannot be stifled in our right to discuss matters of public importance as we are, repeatedly, by these outmoded and deliberately ill-used rules that we govern ourselves by. This is the matter that I am trying to get through; this is the point I am trying to make.

Unfortunately, Canadian jurisprudence with respect to the sub judice rule and its potential for infringement of freedom of speech and press is very different. The rule is rigidly interpreted and strictly enforced with no balancing of interest or recognition of possible jeopardy to our freedom of speech and the press.

At this time, I think we have got to say, and as I said in an earlier part of my remarks, we have to be so zealous and jealous in guarding our rights of freedom of speech, sir, that we have to look to ourselves and the rules by which we govern ourselves to make sure that there is ample opportunity to have freedom of speech, and that we do not stifle it by the rules in this very chamber.

Inasmuch as any individual citizen for the price of issuing a writ can remove a public issue from the realm of public discussion simply by its being involved in the subject matter of his action, the public's right, basic to the working of democracy to debate freely any and all public issues, stands in constant jeopardy.

Much more serious, as I say, is that the government of the day can institute the legal proceeding by which it removes from the public realm an issue which it finds politically damaging. And the present government—and I am sorry that my friend, the member for Lakeshore is not here, because he was being such a defender—the present government has, in fact, done just this on a number of occasions.

The first of these occasions was in 1961, when the then leader of the Liberal Party of Ontario, John Wintermeyer, charged that organized crime was flourishing in the province. Central in his indictment were two men who only a few weeks earlier had been acquitted of charges involving alleged bribery of a member of the Ontario Provincial Police force.

Five by-elections, you will remember, sir, five by-elections regarded as a little general election, had been announced the previous week and the charges made by Mr. Wintermeyer loomed as the biggest issue in that vote.

What did the government do? The government promptly announced that it was appealing the acquittals. The result is that the sub judice rule barred any discussion of the charges during the by-election campaign. That is, in fact, what happened, sir. That is how the government used the rule.

And what happened to that appeal? A few days after the government announced that it had changed its mind and was dropping the appeals. What conclusion can one come to, must one come to, as a result of this? The election was over and the public once again

was free to discuss the issues that were embarrassing the government.

The second occasion came shortly before the 1963 provincial general election—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that this is getting to these people, but they should listen and they should do something about it and stop abusing the right of freedom of speech. If they did something about it, it would not bother them so much when they are told about their sins.

The second occasion came shortly before the 1963 provincial general election, when the report of the Royal commission investigation into the NONG scandal was known to have been completed and its release by the government was demanded by the press and by the public alike. The hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) was on his feet on many occasions in regard to this, as were many other members of the House.

The government announced that it was laying perjury charges against the late Ralph Farris, arising out of his testimony to the Royal commission, and, therefore, would not release the report as the matter had just become sub judice, thus removing one issue from the 1963 campaign. At about this very time, a writ was being issued and a statement of claim filed in the case.

That is the second instance, I have run into the third one a little too quickly, but that is what happened in that.

The third one was this: At about this very time, a writ was being issued and a statement of claim filed in the case of McDermott versus Melcher's distillery—and the member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) has talked about that on the odd occasion—in which the former sales manager of the distillery alleged certain facts which suggested that the Ontario Conservative Party had been engaged in a shakedown of the province's liquor industry to raise funds for that election, which election was followed by the granting of a retail price increase to the distillers. Those were the allegations.

Whether or not McDermott's allegations are true, whether or not these practices were indulged in, I do not know. But almost four years later, this case still has not come to trial. The issue is still sub judice and the public and the press are still barred from discussing it. Most important of all, we are barred from discussing it or inquiring about it in this Legislature.

Most recently we have had your ruling, sir, that we could not discuss the charges or even the scope of the charges of the pending Royal commission about the man whose name we apparently are not able to use in this House, merely because the government has established an inquiry into this matter. Well, it gets to the ridiculous extreme, and it was even too much for the government when the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions a year or two ago, refused to answer a question on the ground that: "I am conducting an inquiry in my own department and it is almost as though it is sub judice and I will not answer." Now that is the extreme to which this kind of thinking leads us.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Which one was that?

Mr. Singer: There have been so many, but that is what you said and I can find it for you if you want the specific reference. You said that.

Thirty years ago when The Alberta Press Act reference was heard by the Supreme Court of Canada and the Act was held ultra vires—and you remember that Act well, sir; it was another effort of a Legislature to stifle freedom of speech—Mr. Justice Cannon said this:

> Freedom of discussion is essential to enlighten public opinion in a democratic state; it cannot be curtailed without affecting the right of the people to be informed through sources independent of the government concerning matters of public interest.

And in the same case, the chief justice—the then chief justice of Canada, Chief Justice Duff—stated that The British North America Act—

> —contemplates a Parliament working under the influence of public opinion and public discussion. There can be no controversy that such institutions derive their efficacy from the free discussion of affairs and criticisms and answers and counter-criticism, from attack upon policy and administration and defence and counter-attack.

Twenty years later, Mr. Justice Abbott, a member of that same bench, the Supreme Court of Canada, in the case of Switzman and Elbing said this:

> The right of free expression of opinion and of criticism, upon matters of public policy and public administration, and the right to discuss and debate such matters,

> whether they be social, economic or political, are essential to the working of a parliamentary democracy such as ours. Moreover, it is not necessary to prohibit the discussion of such matters, in order to protect the personal reputation or the private rights of the citizen.

In my opinion, sir, to deliberately infringe on the right of public debate and to still our voices by this ancient and misapplied rule and to still our voices deliberately, as a part of designed government planning, strikes at the very heart of democracy. I charge, sir, and seriously charge, that this is exactly what this government has systematically done over the past number of years.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, during this debate, I want to make some comments regarding the work of the Ontario water resources commission. I had expected to make these comments at the time our estimate was before the Legislature but since there was no opportunity to speak at that time, I feel that I should still put in the records information regarding the work of our commission.

Before I go into this report, I want to express appreciation of the Ontario water resources commission for the vote of confidence the Legislature expressed in our programme when on Tuesday evening, April 18, without a single question being asked, all parties in the House gave unanimous approval to our budget for the next year for over $72.5 million.

I must say that I was surprised on the next day, April 19, when the leader of the Opposition moved a vote of no confidence in the government for failing to plan for future needs and to combat pollution. It seemed to me that after giving unanimous consent to the budget the night before, it was a little ridiculous to introduce this type of motion the next day. During the debate on the hon. leader of the Opposition's motion, I endeavoured in the short time that was alloted to me to place before the House the highlights of the programme that has been carried out by the OWRC—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Do not tell me you are going to begin that list again.

Mr. Root: —by the municipalities and industry to bring pollution under control wherever pollution might exist and to provide adequate supplies of suitable water for the many needs of our people.

Near the end of my remarks, I endeavoured to point out the municipalities that were treating municipal waste and the type of treatment that had been developed in these municipalities. I started with the rivers that drain into Manitoba, came down through the various drainage basins, namely Lake Superior, Lake Huron, and Georgian Bay, Lake St. Clair, Lake Erie, and got part way through the list of municipalities that were treating waste on the Lake Ontario watershed. The great majority of municipalities I named were using the activated sludge treatment process. I was surprised to hear hon. members opposite ridiculing these works that had been built in the various municipalities in an endeavour to control pollution.

The hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) and the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer)—and I see that the member for Downsview is not in his seat—were particularly outspoken and were perhaps representing the views of their parties. I was amazed to hear them demonstrate their lack of knowledge of the subject.

Perhaps I should advise the House at this time, that Metro Toronto has provided capacity to treat 171 million gallons of municipal waste per day with the activated sludge process. Informed people know that the activated sludge process is one of the most efficient processes that has been developed to date and I would want to congratulate Metro on the part it is playing in our programme to bring pollution under control. I am sure that if the residents of Metro heard some of the comments of their elected representatives, they would want to express their displeasure in the appropriate manner.

The day following the debate, I noticed a news article in the early edition of the *Globe and Mail* dated April 20, under a two column heading "Nixon defies Premier in bid to get debate on firing of Shulman". The whole article referred to the Speaker's ruling with the exception of the final paragraph. I could not understand why the *Globe and Mail* would say the debate touched bottom when I rose to read an alphabetical list of municipalities that had lagoon and activated sludge treatment systems.

My remarks, which were delivered about two hours after the leader of the Opposition defied the Speaker, had nothing to do with Shulman. I was simply trying to put factual information before the House and I would have thought that the *Globe and Mail*, if they had wished to discuss what I had to say,

would have divorced my remarks from any comment that the leader of the Opposition might have made when he was objecting to the Speaker's ruling. I am sure that Dr. Shulman would not want to be associated with the sewage lagoon or activated sludge process and I certainly made no reference to him or his activities.

At this time, I want to report to the Legislature regarding some of the highlights of the work of the Ontario water resources commission during the past year, and since the Legislature met in the last session. 1966 was a year in which the work of the Ontario water resources commission continued to grow and expand. New programmes were launched and well established. The work of the Ontario water resources commission reaches from the international boundary line in the Great Lakes to the shores of Hudson and James Bays, the river St. Lawrence and Quebec boundary to the Manitoba boundary. Since the work of this commission covers such a wide territory, the various activities are carried out under a number of divisions and branches. Many of the details can be studied in the annual report of the commission. In the remarks that I make today, I will try to give some of the highlights of the various programmes that we are carrying out.

Hon. members are aware that the Ontario water resources commission is a service arm of government in the province. Our commission was established to assist municipalities and persons in programmes to provide adequate supplies of suitable water and to bring pollution under control, wherever pollution may exist in our water resources. This programme is carried out by a group of dedicated public servants under the direction of the commission. At the present time there are six members on the commission, with varied backgrounds. Dr. James Vance, the chairman, has had wide experience in the field of engineering and construction and business administration, and has been with the commission since it was created. Mr. W. D. Conklin, another charter member of the commission—if you would like to call him that—is a lawyer, now operating a successful business enterprise—a man of wide experience. Mr. Hugh Brown, the Deputy Provincial Treasurer, gives very valuable assistance and guidance to the commission in its financial and other policies. Mr. D. A. Moodie, reeve of Nepean township, past-warden of Carleton county, is a man who has many years of successful municipal administration and experience. Mr. Leo Venchiarutti is a prominent architect from the Toronto area, and makes a great contribution to the work of the commission. Hon. members are no doubt aware that my own background gives me experience in the rural areas and in the area of public service here in the Legislature, and in dealing with the problems of municipalities. All of the members are no doubt aware that we report to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), and that I endeavour to report from time to time to the Legislature on the work of the commission.

Mr. D. S. Caverly is our general manager. Mr. W. S. MacDonnell is commission secretary. Under Mr. Caverly and his assistant general managers, our work is carried forward through a number of divisions. On December 31 there were 548 permanent and temporary staff in connection with the main organization, with 35 casual and seasonal employees, or a total of 583. Operating the various plants that are operated by the commission under agreement with municipalities, there were some 222 full-time operators, 17 part-time operators, and 19 casual operators, for a total of 258. In other words, this small group of staff members carried out the broadly-based programme that I mentioned in my introductory remarks.

All the members, I know, are aware that there are over 900 municipalities in the province, several thousand industries, many of which treat their wastes through municipal systems, but then there are many others that provide their own treatment facilities; there are over 4,500 water-taking permits issued where people, industries or municipalities are taking over 10,000 gallons per day; hundreds of licences have been issued to drill wells—these men are required to provide records; and when we think of the amount of work that is involved in the division of sanitary engineering, industrial wastes, plant operations, laboratories, research and construction, I sometimes ask myself, how do so few people accomplish so much?

Mr. Speaker, let me give a few examples regarding the volume and value of work that is carried out by the commission. In 1966, the division of construction entered into 35 contracts valued at $11,276,293, of which $7,143,252 was for water works, and $4,153,041 was for sewage works. During 1966 some 29 contracts were completed, at a total value of over $12 million, and consist of 11 water works and 18 sewage works.

Our division of industrial wastes has greatly expanded its activities. The number of field visits was increased by 160 per cent over

1965, for a total of 1,516. Industrial surveys were increased by 28.3 per cent for a total of 525. Meetings and consultations with industries and municipalities were up 37.3 per cent for a total of 209. The number of reports issued was up 87.7 per cent for a total of 366. This increased activity of our division of industrial wastes has led to better understanding by the industries of the objectives of the water resources commission, and to industry making arrangements to bring industrial pollution under control and setting aside many millions of dollars to achieve this objective. Details of the work of this division can be found in the annual report. Perhaps I could mention a few items that indicate the magnitude of the problem. For example, we are working with the pulp and paper industry. Nine mills now have satisfactory waste treatment and control, either through access to municipal sewage treatment works or by the installation of separate treatment systems. Two mills in Toronto are negotiating for a connection to municipal sewers in 1967. Twenty-three others have submitted proposals primarily for the removal of bark and fibre solids at an estimated cost of $20 million. During the year ten applications for approval of engineering plans were received, with an estimated cost of $4 million.

In 1966, the steel industry in Ontario invested heavily in water pollution abatement measures. Over $4.6 million was allocated to commission approved works and several million dollars were allocated for treatment facilities and control measures to be installed or effected in 1967.

Dominion Foundries and Steel at Hamilton allocated some $3.7 million for waste treatment; Algoma Steel at Sault Ste. Marie, $900,000. Mr. Speaker, I give you these few examples to indicate the vast sums of money that industry is spending and will have to spend to bring industrial pollution under control in the province.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the increasing number of samples and determinations that are received and recorded at our division of laboratories will give some indication of the expansion of the various branches and divisions of the commission. For example, the number of samples received at the laboratory in 1966 was 78,652, up 16.4 per cent over 1965. The number of determinations was 369,790, up 44.1 per cent, in tests in the area of bacteriology, biology and chemistry.

Hon. members are aware that water and pollution control projects which are financed and built by the OWRC are operated by the commission's division of plant operations. By the end of 1966 there were 271 projects operating in 176 municipalities.

During the various stages of design for new projects the division works in close liaison with other divisions in reviewing the proposals submitted by consulting engineers. Operating cost estimates are provided to facilitate the development of the detailed cost analyses required for final approval by the Ontario municipal board and municipal councils. All new work proposed is reviewed in the light of past operating experience. Before a project is completed, operating procedures are reviewed in detail with municipal officials in order to establish liaison between the municipal and provincial staffs concerning the project.

Mr. Speaker, during the year 1966 the work load on the division of project development was greatly increased. This was in the main, due to the new policy of the province building and owning sewage and water systems and selling service to the municipality at a wholesale rate. In 1966 final agreements were executed for 30 municipal projects. At the end of the year there were some 109 provincially owned projects in various stages of development. I might mention with regard to provincially owned projects—that the present time we are constructing a sewage and water system under this programme at Moosonee which, as everyone knows, is the most northerly tip of the rail system in Ontario. We are also developing both water and sewage systems for the municipality of Red Lake, which is at the northerly tip of that highway in northwestern Ontario.

In 1966 some 13 regional studies for projects were under development or under construction. The first provincially owned project, the Lake Huron water supply system, is nearing the completion of the construction phase, and will go into operation during 1967.

The Lake Erie water supply system, that will provide water to a number of municipalities and industries in Elgin county, will go into operation during 1967. Hon. members are no doubt aware that these area type systems are developed to give adequate supplies of water in regions at the minimum cost, and to receive and treat large quantities of sewage from a number of municipalities at minimum cost. I might make this comment that in a pipeline system the rate for producing and delivering water is related to the volume and the length of the pipeline and the cost of constructing the entire facility. I might add at this time, in case hon. members

are not aware, that agreement has been reached between the OWRC and the five municipalities that have been carrying on negotiations for some time in Peel county with regard to an area development of a water system and a pollution control system.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it might be of interest to hon. members to know that the last report I have had from the division of project development indicates that there are now some 143 provincially owned projects of various types, in various stages of discussion, development or construction. In addition to this 143, we have the projects that we are developing under municipal agreement, I mention these facts to indicate to hon. members the tremendous load of work that has developed in recent months and to give some indication of the magnitude of the programme that the OWRC is carrying in the interests of pollution control and the development of adequate supplies of good water in all parts of the province.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps hon. members would be interested in some of the projects that we are carrying out through our division of research. I can mention research into high rate water filtration, the effect of algae on water filtration systems, research regarding pleasure boat toilet facilities. I know hon. members will no doubt be aware that regulations have been passed that are designed to bring pollution from pleasure boats under control. Our legal branch did a lot of work in connection with developing this programme. Consultations were carried out with federal authorities and other jurisdictions, and as I have just mentioned, our division of research is studying facilities that the commission may approve of in an endeavour to bring this aggravating problem under control.

Other research is carried on in the field of tertiary treatment. In other words, we are endeavouring to find better ways of delivering a higher quality effluent to our streams. This is very important, since we find that many streams in the province are overloaded with treated sewage effluent, and unless better methods of treating effluent can be found, development will have to be curtailed in certain areas if we are to have a reasonable quality of water in our rivers and streams. Studies are being carried on to see if better treatment methods can be developed to allow an increased load of sewage effluent in our streams.

We are studying supplementary aeration of waste stabilization ponds. In other words, to see if it can be more economical to increase the supply of oxygen in a pond by mechanical aeration rather than increase the size of the stabilization pond itself. Studies are being carried on with regard to nutrient removal by algae. Other studies are related to excessive algae growths in certain areas in the province. I think we are all aware that algae is nature's response to water that has been enriched by either sewage or the phosphates and nitrates that are in solution in treated sewage effluent. Other studies are being carried out with regard to the diffusion of sewage effluent. These are but a few of the research programmes that are being carried out by the commission.

Mr. Speaker, let me say something about our division of sanitary engineering. During 1966, this branch processed some 2,607 aplications, subdivision reviews and engineering reports. Some 1,842 certificates of approval were granted, with an estimated value of $152,996,000, which is an indication of the amount of works that are moving forward. There were 1,463 routine inspections carried out. River basin surveys are divided into the following water quality control programmes: (a) Water quality monitoring; (b) Water quality analysis and forecasts.

During the year 1966 four waste water assimilation studies were performed; (1) on the Holland River from Aurora (Aurora Creek) to Newmarket; (2) the Holland River from Newmarket to the confluence with the Schomberg River; (3) on Kettle Creek downstream from St. Thomas to Lake Erie. This is a very important study. With the expansion that is anticipated in the Kettle Creek watershed, that will be associated with the development of new industries in the area, it is very important to know whether there is sufficient stream flow in Kettle Creek to dilute the sewage effluent that will be coming out of the area, or whether it may be necessary in the near future to construct an effluent sewer or a waste sewer to treat and discharge and dilute the effluent in the lake, rather than carrying it downstream in Kettle Creek. These studies are very important. Another similar study is on the Credit River downstream from Orangeville. I think hon. members can realize the importance of adequate dilution of seweage effluent if our streams are to remain in a satisfactory condition.

Under this division, Great Lakes surveys are carried out. These surveys are coordinated with Canadian federal agencies that are involved in the international joint commission studies, including The Department of National Health and Welfare, The Department of Energy and Resources Management, and

The Department of Mines. During 1966, four vessels were used in the survey, and they were supported by land based laboratories at Toronto and London.

The division of water resources has found its programme expanding as was the work of all other divisions in 1966. For example, some 409 licences were issued to drill or bore wells. Records were received for some 8,648 new wells during the year. These records are very important since they provide the branch with information regarding the areas where suitable water can be found, and at what depths. The records that have been received and are available are well over one hundred thousand to date. This branch has inspectors visiting the various contractors to check the location of wells, and to check for sanitary construction. One hundred and ten observation wells were in operation checking well water levels on a regular basis. Twenty new observation wells were installed in 1966. At the end of 1966, the branch was maintaining or supporting a total of 88 permanent stream flow gauging stations.

The division of water resources is carrying out Ontario participation in the international hydrologic decade survey that is under way. This division also carries out river basin studies in various parts of the province.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps at this time I should refer to the northern Ontario water resources studies. This programme is now well established, with preliminary planning coordinated with federal agencies. This plan calls for the investigation of the major river basins in northern Ontario that drain into Hudson and James Bays. The investigations were under way in 1966. Staff members, assisted by summer students and local casual help, spent a field season of three months in the area. The work consisted of reconnaissance investigation of the area; an investigation of 32 sites for suitability as hydrometric stations. Other phases of the work were a more detailed investigation of geology, vegetation, characteristics of rivers and water quality; stream flow gauging, and the establishment of bench marks at nine sites. A study of the Attawapiskat River basin was done under contract by consulting engineers. These studies will provide much needed information regarding the northern part of the province — information that will serve us well as we develop future policies regarding our water resources and the development of the northwestern part of the province.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might interject this comment. I had the privilege of accompanying staff members on one of their survey trips into the north last summer, a trip that took us on to the Albany and Attawapiskat rivers. We sometimes think of this part of Ontario as being old Ontario, but it was interesting to visit Hudson's Bay posts that were established as early as 1670, nearly three hundred years ago, and to see the timber growth in the area, and to get a better appreciation of the vast space that lies within the boundaries of Ontario and the potential for future development.

The division of water resources is the branch that deals with our permit system, which was brought into effect in 1961. Hon. members are aware that these permits are issued when over 10,000 gallons of water per day is used for commercial purposes, industrial purposes, irrigation, municipal and recreational purposes.

At the end of 1966 there were some 4,555 permits issued that made available to the holders some 3.9 billion gallons of water per day. With this amount of water involved, it is necessary to have inspectors checking to see that abuses do not occur, making it impossible for other people who have claims for water to secure their fair share.

Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks I hope I have given to hon. members some grasp of the magnitude of the programme that is being carried by the limited staff of the Ontario water resources commission. A few days ago, I listened to the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) make a comment that we were building an empire. Mr. Speaker, we are not building an empire—we are building for the future development of Ontario, the health and prosperity of our people. I suggest that, although we have water in abundance in certain parts of the province, with the rapid expansion of population and industry and increased use of water in connection with increased agricultural production, careful studies must be made, and proper controls established if Ontario is to continue to move forward as it has moved forward in recent years. Let me say that on the water resources commission we have appreciated the cooperation we are receiving from municipalities, conservation authorities, industry, and other branches of government.

We have appreciated the cooperation we receive from the various news outlets, who have been of great assistance in making people aware of the challenges that face Ontario if we are to provide our people with adequate quantities of suitable water, and to bring pollution under control wherever pollu-

tion may exist. Let me make one qualifying statement, Mr. Speaker. One of the problems that confronts us, is the problem that is created when ill informed people in their desire to be helpful, make statements that are not always related to fact, and since news outlets report these statements, it creates confusion in the minds of people. I realize that these unfounded statements draw attention to problems, but they do sometimes slow down programmes and take much staff time explaining what are really the true facts.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the best examples I can give of the type of thing I am talking about was the speech of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) that was delivered in this House on February 14. At that time the hon. member read into the records of *Hansard* statements made by ill-informed people, and reported in the press. You will find the matter that I am referring to on page 492 of *Hansard*.

The hon. member, I know, was building his remarks around the quality of water in Lake Erie and certain studies that we had carried out with regard to a possible pipeline from Lake Erie into the Brantford area, and perhaps ultimately further north into the Kitchener-Waterloo area. If one were to believe the quotes from the press and from other men that the hon. member read into the records of this Parliament, one would have very grave doubts about the possibility of ever using water from Lake Erie. Let me flatly say that the statements that were read were very misleading. At the end of the hon. member's address, to give him an opportunity to not misinform the House, I asked for permission to ask a question, and the permission was not granted.

Mr. Speaker, the question I wanted to ask the hon. member for Brantford was, was he aware that on September 14, 1964, the Brantford public utilities commission addressed a letter to the secretary of the Ontario water resources commission in which he stated, and I quote:

> During the discussion that took place at the commission meeting, the possibility of a source of water from the Great Lakes was suggested, and I was instructed by our commission to ask the Ontario water resources commission whether they were prepared to make a proposal of supplying Brantford with water from some other source, to be integrated perhaps into the southwestern Ontario network system. This, of course, developed from the plans which are now being made for a pipeline from Lake Huron to the city of London. The commission has therefore asked our consulting engineers to delay any further action on this matter until the Ontario water resources commission has had an opportunity to examine the possibility of supplying the city of Brantford a bulk water supply from its water works systems. The commissioners have also asked that arrangements be made for a meeting with representatives of the commission to discuss this matter at an early date. We respectfully request your consideration of this very important matter. Your very truly,
>
> *(Signed)*
>
> N. A. GRANDFIELD,
>
> *General Manager and Secretary*
>
> Brantford P.U.C.

That letter was dated September 14, 1964, and was acknowledged by our general manager, Mr. Caverly, on September 18, 1964, advising that Dr. Vance, chairman of the Ontario water resources commission, had arranged for a meeting on Thursday, October 1, at 11 o'clock, in the commission offices.

The other question that I wanted to ask the hon. member for Brantford: was he aware that in the brief that was presented by the Brantford public utilities to the Ontario water resources commission dated December 15, 1964, they said, and I quote:

> During its history Brantford, although benefiting from the growth and business activity of the watershed, has suffered from the unfavourable effects of such growth on the quality of its water source. As an example, chemical treatment costs for water supply have risen from .85 cents per thousand gallons in 1945, to 4.6 cents per thousand gallons in 1963, an increase of over 400 per cent or 25 per cent per year, despite the fact that most municipal and industrial waste discharges to the river are now receiving complete treatment. Our 1964 chemical costs will exceed our 1963 costs by another 60 per cent.

The brief went on to say:

> The impoundments at the river have effectively reduced flooding and maintained reasonable dilution of flows during dry summer periods, but they had not assisted appreciably our low winter water flows when ice covers compound our problems. They have also created some new problems because of the excessive growth of algae and other microorganisms in our warm shallow waters. With a deteriorated river

source and a public demanding a high quality water supply, our problem is pressing and serious and therefore our presentation to you today. To factually demonstrate our present position let me list the following:

1. The Grand River can supply Brantford with sufficient quantities of water within the foreseeable future;

2. Investigations into the practicability of achieving similar quantities from underground sources, but with improved quality, recently carried out by my commission, indicate that our water requirements cannot be met in this manner.

3. Water quality is continuing to deteriorate with upstream industrial development which, despite the exotic treatment methods that my commission employs, indicates that is almost beyond our capabilities to produce a water which will consistently satisfy our users.

4. Our current production of water to serve approximately 56,000 persons in Brantford and Brantford township averages 7 million gallons per 24 hours throughout the year, with maximum daily requirements reaching 11 million gallons per day. The cost of producing, and distributing this water last year was 34 cents per thousand gallons.

5. During 1964 our water treatment costs alone were 18 cents per thousand gallons including both capital and operating costs. If our historical rate of increase in treatment costs is any yardstick to gauge future water treatment costs, this figure could rise to 25 or 30 cents per thousand gallons in the next decade.

6. Since the maximum day figures represent the capacity of our present treatment facilities, we are currently faced with the extension of our purification plant, to produce a rated capacity of 15 million gallons per day, which we hope will satisfy our requirements in quantity until 1980. This extension, however, represents an estimated construction cost of $650,000 and a further increase in our production costs.

7. It is difficult to accurately forecast water requirements very far in advance, but one might suggest that within 25 years our area requirements may be of the order of 15 million gallons per day.

The foregoing is our current position which represents to my commission a major problem—increased expenditure on an already expensive water to provide adequate quantities of safe, but not what could be described as high quality water. We do not believe that this problem should rest entirely with our city and commission. Surely its solution must also be the responsibility of other regulating boards and commissions established by senior governmental authority for this purpose. Gentlemen, to you, as custodians of the water resources of this province, my commission respectfully direct the following questions.

1. Can we hope for any improvement in the biological and chemical quality of the water in the Grand River at Brantford either through tertiary sewage treatment or other river purification?

If we cannot, should the city of Brantford be solely responsible for the increasing costs of treating Grand River water containing effluents from the upstream population?

2. Will the Ontario water resources commission consider the supply of a better quality of water to the city of Brantford in the quantities previously stated?

3. If such a supply could be made available, what do you estimate would be the price and terms of sale of such water?

4. When is the earliest date that a suitable adequate supply could be made available?

5. Assuming that a supply could be made available, would our present treatment plant be usable for water treatment?

6. Assuming that a water supply could be made available in the foreseeable future, could the expanded Brantford treatment plant be incorporated as part of the overall water supply facilities?

We gratefully acknowledge your presence here today, gentlemen, to listen to our water supply difficulties—a matter which is of grave concern to my commission and of serious consequence to our city. We respectfully request your consideration of our problem and answers to these important questions that face the authorities responsible for the future course of Brantford's water supply.

All of which we respectfully submit to you.

(Signed)

N. A. GRANDFIELD,

General Manager and Secretary

Brantford P.U.C.

Mr. Speaker, I have read this request from Brantford into the records at this time, since

I was not permitted to ask a question of the hon. member for Brantford the day he made his speech suggesting that we were carrying coals to Newcastle when we suggested another source of water for Brantford. I had hoped that I could ask it on that day, and at the same time, whether he was aware of these representations we had received from Brantford—and knowing him to be an honourable member, I am sure that he would have said that he was not aware of all the implications of these representations. I regret that the hon. member is not in the House today. I had hoped he would be here when I read it into the record but it will be in *Hansard*.

I merely bring this to the attention of the Legislature to point out the problems that arise when misleading statements are made and reported in the press. The Ontario water resources commission was asked by Brantford to make a study and make a report. We did an area study. We made a report, and to date Brantford apparently is not prepared to go along with pipeline construction. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we are also making studies further north in the Kitchener-Waterloo area regarding the possibility of either reservoir water to supplement the existing ground water, or the necessity of pipeline water going into the area to supplement existing supplies of water. These studies are not completed, so I cannot make any reports at the present time.

Let me say something about Lake Erie. Lake Erie is a suitable source of potable water. Certainly it will require treatment; we all know that the quality of water is changing to some degree in Lake Erie as it is in all waters that are receiving either sewage or treated sewage effluent; and I am sure that hon. Opposition members who listened to the member for Brantford make his speech and sat there with rather pained smiles on their faces did not agree with him in some of the statements that he made about the quality of Lake Erie water. I am sure the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson), who comes from that fine town of Leamington, where the main industry makes 57 products with a base of Lake Erie water, does not believe the statements that were read in *Hansard* by the member for Brantford, that Lake Erie has now become a dead lake—that the water is unfit for drinking, unfit to support life, unfit for industry, and unfit for any purpose—as the member quoted from a speech by David Hahn, the Liberal MP for Toronto-Broadview. I do not think there is anything wrong with the water that is used by that great industry in Leamington, water that is used to serve many parts of Essex South, and I am sure that the hon. member for Essex South agrees with me and disagrees with the hon. member for Brantford who read into the record statements that could cause great concern to people who were using these products or using water from Lake Erie.

I am sure that the hon. member for Kent East (Mr. Spence) does not agree that the fish are dying in Lake Erie because of pollution. We know that there are fish kills in many parts of the province from various causes. In the annual report of The Department of Lands and Forests for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1966 we are told that two-thirds of the landings and one-half of the value of the commercial fishery were reported from Lake Erie, where catch and value increased nearly 40 per cent over 1964. That is, two-thirds of all the commercial fish in the province came out of Lake Erie.

The *Globe and Mail* of March 15, 1967, and they were reporting Lands and Forests, stated that more than 70 per cent of the province's total production of commercial fish came from Lake Erie, where 41,424,000 pounds were netted for a value of $3,102,000. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to put these facts into the record, since some people might be confused by irresponsible statements that are made and later quoted in the press. I am sure that the hon. member for Kent East, who has from time to time spoken about problems associated with the fishing industry, did not agree with the hon. member for Brantford when he tried to suggest that the fish were dying in Lake Erie.

In Ontario we are carrying out a programme of pollution control in all the areas that feed water into our Great Lakes system. If there is any member in this House that has failed in his responsibility more than any other with regard to pollution control, probably it is the member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume), who for years was the mayor of the great city of Windsor. During his regime no programme was developed to bring pollution control into effect. It was simply a programme of pouring raw sewage into the Detroit River to be carried down into Lake Erie.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor Walkerville): What was the water resources commission doing?

Mr. Root: I want to pay tribute to the present mayor and council of Windsor.

Mr. Newman: Well, there you are. There was nothing.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, I regret the members that I have named from Brantford, Essex South, Essex North and Kent East are not in the House. I hoped they would be here when I was making this comment, so they could speak for themselves. I would remind the hon. member who has just spoken, from Windsor-Walkerville, of the meeting he and the member for Essex North had with me a little over a year ago. You wanted me to pull the pressure off Windsor.

Mr. Newman: I never met with you at any time.

Mr. Root: I want to say this, I want to commend the present mayor and council of Windsor who have embarked the city on a great and expensive programme to pick up the backlogs of works that are needed to bring pollution under control in the Windsor area.

I realize that this is a very costly programme. We have gone along with Windsor on a staged programme but pollution has to be brought under control in Windsor as well as in other parts of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that the waters of Lake Erie, with reasonable treatment are a good source of potable water and will remain a good source of potable water if we continue to have the cooperation we are receiving from the municipalities and industry in our pollution control programme.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members would like to have the facts regarding the ability of our municipalities and industry in Ontario to treat municipal wastes, industrial wastes and water supplies. I have asked our staff to prepare information regarding what has been accomplished to date. I have asked our staff to break this down into the various drainage basins in the province, the rivers that flow into Manitoba, into Lake Superior, Lake Huron and Georgian Bay, Lake St. Clair, Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, the St. Lawrence River, Hudson and James Bays, and the Ottawa River. Let me put into the record the capacity that has been built in these areas to provide adequate supplies of good water, and to bring pollution under control.

In river systems draining into Manitoba we can treat 9.35 million gallons of water a day. We can treat 2.75 million gallons of municipal wastewater; 41 million gallons of industrial wastewater. Of these works the commission has financed $1,957,000.

Draining into Lake Superior we can treat 95 million gallons of water per day; 11 million gallons of municipal wastewater; 151 million gallons of industrial wastewater—and the commission has financed $14,275,000.

In Lake Huron and Georgian Bay we can treat 120 million gallons of water per day; 48 million gallons of municipal wastewater; 164 million gallons of industrial wastewater; and the commission has financed $23,900,000 of these works.

Draining into Lake St. Clair we can treat 34 million gallons of water; 48 million gallons of municipal wastewater; 383 million gallons of industrial wastewater; and the commission has financed $11,865,000 of these works.

On the Lake Erie watershed, we can treat 148 million gallons of water per day; 65 million gallons of municipal waste; 55 million gallons of industrial waste; and the commission has financed $26,924,000 of these works.

On the Lake Ontario watershed we can treat 652 million gallons of water per day; 399 million gallons of municipal wastewater; 693 million gallons of industrial wastewater; and the commission has financed $29,431,000 worth of these works.

On the St. Lawrence River watershed we can treat 28.75 million gallons of water per day; 15.5 million gallons of municipal wastewater; 14.5 million gallons of industrial wastewater; and the commission has financed $5,570,000 worth of these works.

On the Ottawa River we can treat 118 million gallons of water per day; 55 million gallons of municipal wastewater; 21 million gallons of industrial wastewater; and the commission has financed $6,109,000 worth of works.

On the Hudson and James Bay watershed we can treat 28 million gallons of water per day; 4 million gallons of municipal waste; 14.5 million gallons of industrial wastewater; and the commission has financed $631,000 worth of these works.

Perhaps I should remind hon. members that many of the municipal systems are also accepting industrial wastes.

The figures I have given add up to a total capacity in Ontario today where we have ability to treat 1.208 billion gallons of water every day; 649 million gallons of municipal wastes; 1.538 billion gallons of industrial wastes; and the commission has financed $120,662,000 worth of these works. In other words, we can treat a total of 2,187,550,000 gallons of municipal and industrial wastes every day in the province; and 1,208,250,000 gallons of water, for a grand total of

3,395,700,000 gallons of water and waste can be treated by the present facilities that have been constructed in the province. All of this has been done without provincial subsidy, and I would suggest that Ontario can be proud of its achievement to date.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to put these figures in *Hansard* so that hon. members will know that Ontario has a tremendous programme under way to protect its water supplies, to provide adequate quantities of suitable water for our people, to bring pollution under control wherever it may exist.

The hon. member for Sudbury, in one of his recent speeches, said we were trying to build an empire. Mr. Speaker, if the protection of the health of our people is empire building, then perhaps that is what we are doing. I say we are trying to play our part in making Ontario the most attractive jurisdiction in the world in which to establish a home, a business or an industry. Thank you.

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 23rd order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

(Continued)

On vote 2002:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, there was some slight confusion last night as to whether vote 2001 has been completed. The Minister did not answer one part of my inquiry relating to the grants to the societies and perhaps, without getting into a procedural hassle, with the indulgence of the chair, the Minister might reply to my questions about the grants to the societies under vote 2001.

Mr. Chairman: I might say to the member, there does not appear to be any doubt about the completion of the vote. It has been properly initialled here in the book, in the record before me.

Mr. Renwick: Well Mr. Chairman, there is a doubt because whether the vote was initialled or not, the Chairman who was then in the chair did not state, as is usually the custom, that the vote had been carried.

Again, I do not want to get into a procedural hassle. I had placed the questions with the Minister. He recognized that I had placed the questions. Two or three other members intervened and I thought at some point he would come back and reply.

Mr. Chairman: May I say to the member for Riverdale that the Clerk informs me the question was placed, but under the circumstances we want to give you all the information that is available. If the Minister does not mind answering a question at this time, as long as we do not re-enter and re-open the vote.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, quite frankly I thought I had answered that question. Which question specifically does the hon. member feel I did not answer?

Mr. Renwick: I had asked under the item related to grants, which was item 9 of vote 2001, I had asked three parts of that question. Had other societies made applications for grants and been turned down? How was the amount arrived at which was granted to each of the present grantees set out in the item? What is the method by which the department selects the societies which are eligible for grants?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My recollection is, Mr. Chairman, that I had answered that. I may be wrong.

Mr. Chairman: With the concurrence of the House, the Minister will answer the question as long as we do not open the vote.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My recollection is that I had answered it and as I say, I may be wrong. But as to whether there are any others asking for grants, I cannot recall it, and my officials here cannot recall any such organization. If there has been such an organization, I will get the information and provide it at a later date for the hon. member.

The method of arriving at this is by discussion with the organization, and as far as we know everybody is fairly happy with the amounts they are being given today.

Now, does that deal with all those questions?

Mr. Renwick: Yes. Specifically, did any of the societies ask for a larger amount than was, in fact, allocated last year, or for which provision is made this year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told that the centre of criminology asked for larger grants. And while two of the others did not ask for

larger grants, they have a general request of us that if there is any money left in the vote at the end of the year we might give them consideration. That was done in the instance of the Elizabeth Fry society, the John Howard society and the Salvation Army.

Aside from that we did not accede to the request of the centre of criminology because there is a matter of general policy involved here. In the first place, I am not too sure that having merely started this organization with a grant from my department that this is the way it should continue to be done, particularly when, as the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) mentioned last night, he has given them $15,000 for, I think, a specific project. And they are getting moneys from other sources. So the matter of the centre of criminology is being given a special review.

Mr. Renwick: Just one final comment, Mr. Chairman, on those grants, are the allocations made for the general operating expenses of those societies, or do they furnish specific projects in which they are interested as the basis on which grants are made?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, these are just given to them for their general operations.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, on vote 2002, the amount that is listed for the total for parole and rehabilitation services is $930,000, which is three per cent approximately of the total budget. This, of course, is an extremely important part of the whole service, and I wonder if the Minister will give us some details as to staff, case load and success in connection with this service?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that the number of rehabilitation officers amounts to 76, with a total complement of 112, including other people involved in the work. The average case load is 35 to 40, depending upon the area in which they are working.

Mr. Young: Then Mr. Chairman, are volunteers used to any great extent in this process?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the volunteers are those, of course, who are working with the aftercare agencies. We work very closely with the aftercare agencies.

Mr. Young: But there are no volunteers in direct contact with the Minister's organization, that is, there are no volunteer people who are closely connected with the Minister's officers and who may be paid a small sum for their work by the department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that we also use private individuals who are volunteers in particular communities.

Mr. Young: And do they receive any remuneration at all?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, they are volunteers.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister outline briefly the position of a person from the time he is released until such time as aftercare services are provided in the system of re-establishing the person, what assistance is provided for him?

Specifically, questions such as: what is the number of dollars or the maximum number of dollars a person on being released would have available to him in an endeavour to re-establish himself? What is the source of the number of dollars? Is it from earnings which he has had or moneys which have been set aside for him? What type of clothing, for example, is made available to a person when he leaves one of the institutions? Is he provided with new clothing or is he provided simply with the return of his previous clothing?

I notice the Minister referred to the question of releasing people on week days rather than on weekend periods, or one of the members did. What steps are taken to provide him with some kind of readjustment facility on his re-entry into civilian life, and what are the relationships which are established with the various aftercare facilities for the placement of such a person?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that the rehabilitation officer works with the inmate long before he is released. First, of course, to establish whether he can benefit from his services, and in what manner he can benefit from his services.

As far as the amount of money involved is concerned, we have no policy in this respect. He will be given as much assistance financially as it is deemed he can benefit from. Now, of course, this is within reason. He will be provided with whatever clothing it is deemed will be of benefit to him. The hon. member will also appreciate, I am sure, that there are many releasees who would abuse any kind of help they would get, and it is the duty of the rehabilitation officer to be able to choose those who by their histories and by their actions and by their apparent motivation are those who would benefit from some kind of assistance.

Perhaps it might be advisable to read a typical case which the head of the rehabilitation services has just handed to me. I will not read the man's name, of course:

> The above-mentioned was released from OTC, Brampton, on parole on February 9, 1966. This man had no prospects for employment or living accommodation. Board and lodging was obtained for him at $18 a week. His clothing had to be obtained for him from Kapuskasing. Pocket money for toiletries, car fare and smokes, and so on, was requested by him. He was released from the institution with $17 gratuities. Following are the expenditures on his behalf:
>
> February 9, board and lodging $18; February 14, pocket money $10; February 16, board and lodging $18; February 23, board and lodging $20; February 24, pocket money $10; February 28, board and loging and pocket money $20; March 3, pocket money $10; March 6, pocket money and car tickets $5; March 9, board and lodging and pocket money $20.

In this case, a total of $131 was given to this man in assistance in the one month after his release. On March 8, the day before he was given his last amount, this man started work. The company where he is working withholds two weeks' salary, so our subject will receive one day's pay on March 18. Then on March 25 he will be self-supporting.

This is a typical case of the kind of help that is given to the releasees.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, an inmate was released from Guelph three or four months ago who was from Owen Sound, and he was getting 6 cents a day for a 12-hour work day. When he arrived home he had $10 to start life with. You say you do not have a policy insofar as giving them a stake to start life with again. But in other areas of penology in America, is there no fair way to pay people on a daily rate that they will start with $400, $500 or $1,000 after four or five years in jail? Is this a measly policy of yours, or is this a case across the board?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the hon. member was not here last night when we did go into this. In the first place, we rarely have any one who is in one of our institutions for four or five years. The average term probably works out to nine months. This is about the average.

I said last night that the maximum of $20 —or the 6 cents a day, as the hon. member put it—bears no relationship to any reality or facts or any real policy. It happens to have been in the regulations for years. To all intents and purposes, as far as we are concerned, it has no meaning, because we carry out the policy as I have just outlined here, and in reviewing the regulations which we are now doing—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member would just give me a chance! In reviewing the regulations, we are bringing in a completely new set of regulations. There will be nothing in them about this kind of an allowance unless, by that time, we have established a policy of pay for work and pay for keep, which we have not done at the present time.

The hon. member said this man worked 12 hours a day. Well, no one works 12 hours a day in our institutions – anything but. I would imagine that most of the people going out of our institutions are getting very little rehabilitation assistance because most of them do not want it They want nothing to do with the people who have kept them incarcerated, and many of them who would want it we know from experience, would just take the money and go to the nearest beer parlour and spend it there.

We have this from their records. If a man goes in and out of an institution, for example, is constantly coming in, we know from the experience of the rehabilitation officers who tried to help him before that there is no use giving him any money in his pocket because he will use it for alcohol or drugs, or something of that nature. He may even have sold tools which had been provided for him in the past. There is no use giving this kind of person any money at all, except some money in his pocket to get home.

Perhaps if I would read this, it would help outline the policy:

> Inmates in our institutions may request an interview with a rehabilitation officer—

Does the hon. member want this information? There is no use wasting time if he is not going to listen to it.

> Inmates in our institutions may request an interview with a rehabilitation officer at any time during their sentence and are encouraged to do so. In addition, an automatic interview is scheduled for each inmate prior to release, in order that he may be acquainted with the help that is available to him, both from our services and the community agencies.

If the inmate is willing to cooperate in the rehabilitation plan, the same assistance is available to him as to an inmate released on parole, that is, employment, room and board, clothing, and so on. He receives a gratuity of $2 per month served to a maximum of $20. However, additional financial assistance is available when warranted, depending on the merits of the case concerned. There is no limit as to the amount which may be granted so far as we feel that this is doing him some good.

Our regulations state that:

Transportation will be paid to the place of conviction or equal distance within the province. In cases that are assessed as deserving, transportation may be paid to his home or place of employment, anywhere in Canada.

The rehabilitation officer would naturally investigate the circumstances surrounding the request prior to requesting authority from the main office.

Mr. Sargent: I thank the Minister, but I asked you if in other areas of America there are policies where they are paid a larger sum, something like $2 a day I think, in some parts of the United States.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are places in the United States and all over the world where there are programmes where they are producing, for example, products which are sold. One on this continent which comes to mind is the programme at Leavenworth penitentiary in the United States where they have long termers. They have a shoe plant there. If I recall correctly, they manufacture something like 35,000 or 60,000 pairs of shoes a month for the military services of the United States, and they get paid a fair wage for this sort of work. It is really run on a mass production scheme; they are working at a high rate—

Mr. Sargent: Why is that not tried here?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will let me finish; if he had been here last night, he would have heard me explain.

Last year, as a matter of fact, when I announced the appointment of the trades and industry advisory committee, I said that this was the purpose of this committee, that they were to go into all that and they are doing it now. At the present time, they are studying apprenticeship, vocational training and the industries in our institutions, with a view to developing a comprehensive plan that they can recommend to the government. Possibly so that we will be able to pay them for their work and they will be able to pay for their keep and perhaps help keep their family and perhaps even—at its most ideal—help compensate the victims of their crimes.

Mr. Sargent: One more point, Mr. Chairman. The parole people probably know the psychology of paying out $10 at a time to a person coming back into society, but I think that that is the way you train an animal. You keep them hungry all the time. I suggest that the psychologists are entirely wrong. Most people do not head for the liquor store or get into drugs as soon as they are released. I think the Minister is taking a very narrow view of the whole thing.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I was not going to rise, but I thought I would assist the House and the hon. member who has just sat down, by giving them a summary of what goes on in Canada with reference to discharges.

As I pointed out last night, in the federal prisons they are graded 1, 2 and 3, and they earn from 25 cents to 55 cents per day. As far as the other provinces are concerned, the rates of pay in Alberta for inmates, including forestry camps, is $1 a month, depending on performance, with a maximum of $20 payable on discharge. In the camps, each inmate is paid 50 cents a day for a six-day week and if called out to fight forest fires, is paid the usual firefighting rate pay to civilians. In all institutions, including the camps, free tobacco is issued twice a week.

In British Columbia, the inmates may be paid at any step of the scale, 10 cents, 20 cents, 30 cents, 50 cents or 80 cents per day. Top pay is equated with skill and may only be earned by those inmates employed in production shops, such as press operators in the licence plate shop of Oakalla prison farm. The pay scale in the camps is 20 cents, 30 cents, 50 cents, 80 cents or $1 per day.

At Newhaven institution, inmates are paid: juniors, $1.10 per week; confirmed intermediates, $1.40; confirmed seniors, $1.75, and pre-release, $2.10 per week. If they become foremen, they get an additional 5 cents per day.

In Manitoba, inmates are paid 75 cents per day for a six-day week, and 50 cents of this amount is withheld and paid to the prisoner on discharge.

In New Brunswick, they are paid $6 per month and no other remuneration is paid.

In Newfoundland, there is no remuneration, as is the case in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Quebec.

In Saskatchewan, each inmate receives 10 cents per day, with the short termers receiving $1 for the full period. Inmates of the camps receive 65 cents per day. Women also receive 65 cents per day.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is just as well to add to that that there is no other province in Canada which has the extensive rehabilitation service which we provide in this province and that, of course, bears some relationship as to why they give them a little more in some other provinces. Many of them allow this to be put in the hands exclusively of private agencies.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, at certain times of the year in the county of Essex, it is quite imperative that we get additional help to remove crops, especially during the tomato picking season. Has the Minister considered taking select individuals from some of his institutions, bringing them down there to help to overcome the labour shortage for that short period of time, enabling the individual to earn a little money, allowing him to keep some of the funds he makes by helping the agricultural crops in the county, and at the same time not only assisting himself financially, but assisting the community with its agricultural difficulties?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is being considered by the trades and industry advisory committee. There is farm representation on this committee for precisely the consideration of that purpose. It is not as simple as it sounds. When you have inmates in an institution you cannot have some of them being given the opportunity to earn some money by employment without concerning yourself with the morale of the others who may not be suitable for that type of work. It is a very complicated one. I know it is not one which cannot be overcome because I have seen it in operation in various degrees in various parts of the world, but this is one of the aspects being considered by that committee.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that you try a pilot project this year so that we would know in the future whether this is workable or not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is this, if the hon. member is prepared to back up this department if we go out into private industry, or even out into farms, and send some people out there and compete with the people on the outside at this stage without concerning ourselves with the implications, we will give it perhaps quicker consideration than he may think we are doing now. It is not that simple. Some of our own inmates were being taught a trade in the Fort William training centre, and we had the union down on our heads. There is a great problem in every jurisdiction in the world in this area. We have to get the cooperation of labour, of manufacturers, and of farmers before we embark on anything like that. There are so many implications it would be foolhardy to do it without a well-organized and well-thought-out programme with the cooperation of those other elements I have spoken of. Those elements are represented on the trades and industry advisory committee.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in the agricultural field there would not be the same difficulty that you would find in the skilled trades or in the other types of labour market. I do not suggest to the Minister that he go in there and compete against private industry or anything of that sort. There are certain times in the year when they are crying for help on the farm. This is the time—when they plead with labour to come to the farm to help pick up the crops—that the Minister could consider a small project to see if this is feasible. If it is not feasible, our discussion ends. If it is feasible, it could be a good rehabilitation project.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, backing up my colleague from Windsor-Walkerville; we had a meeting last week in the Georgian Bay fruit area and we are spending $250 per person to fly in, by charter from the Caribbean, Jamaicans from Trinidad, for the apple crop. I agree with the member for Windsor-Walkerville that all this great manpower we have sitting idle could be helping out different seasonal projects, like apple picking and tomatoes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I agree this is what we should work towards.

Mr. Sargent: Let us hope it is not in the same programme as building your jails. You have not built a jail for the last four years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) brought this

to my attention, and as a result of that we made sure there was representation of the farming community on this committee. I am sorry, I would like to be able to say we will try it this summer immediately, in a hurry, without giving it as much consideration as is needed. There are so many implications involved in this when you are dealing with people in correctional institutions. You have to set up a classification system to make sure that those who are going out to work are not going to cause a lot of damage and that sort of thing. I am sure this is going to come in the very near future but it is going to be well thought out and well organized before it is done.

As a matter of fact, we are doing this to some extent with some of the youngsters from the training schools. There is also a problem to make sure they are not being exploited by some of the people for whom they are doing work. This is why it has to be done, as I say, on a well thought-out basis.

Mr. Newman: I do not think it would be that complicated to take over some facility in a community adjacent to the farming area. You have a group home, so to speak, where the individuals go out and work all day and report back to the home. It can be done. I do not think it is that complicated at all. The only thing is, why delay a year when you can experiment this year? Why put off? Do it now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will discuss that with the committee.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the Minister, in his opening remarks, referred to the representations that have been made to the federal government on the equalization of the remission. I think, just from ignorance, I would like to have a little assistance on the sheet which he distributed at that time. Are all the items of remission excluding the statutory remission period in a penitentiary which of course is a statutory one, but are the other two items—that is the earned remission for a person serving a term in a penitentiary and the earned remission in a reformatory? Are they statutory requirements or does this Minister have any control over these?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Those are subject to good behaviour and that sort of thing.

Mr. Renwick: Well, perhaps I could point my question a little more sharply.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a maximum by statute. They can earn this remission by their conduct in the institution up to this maximum.

Mr. Renwick: What I wanted to get at is whether or not the good conduct remission in reformatories is a matter totally beyond the control of this Minister without federal co-operation in amending the statutes or regulations in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is yes.

Mr. Ben: I think the Minister will agree that the fly in the ointment here is not so much the remission earned through good behaviour, but the statutory remission of six months provided for penitentiary terms which is not provided for reformatory terms, that they automatically get an abatement of six months in their sentence whether they are good or not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Automatic—well, more or less—25 per cent.

Mr. Ben: Twenty-five per cent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It could be a five-year term and it would be 25 per cent of that.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just to pursue a couple more questions on this question of parole. I assume that by now those who are responsible for the paroling in the province would have some views on the wisdom of maintaining as an adjunct to the sentencing process the definite and the indefinite term.

To put my question perhaps a little more clearly, if a man is sentenced to say six months definite and nine months indefinite and goes to one of the Minister's institutions, that is one of the possible variations which may determine how long he stays in the institution. If he is sentenced simply to a definite term of so many months, then he has a remission operating for him in terms of the good conduct remission referred to in this statement.

Of the variables in that situation, what is the position of a person who is sentenced to one of the Minister's institutions, is he in some way kept on the hook as to what extent he is going to have to serve that indefinite portion of his sentence? Is this some form of an additional continuing threat to him so that he does not know specifically what his position is in the system? What view does the parole board have as to the wisdom of perpetuating the indefinite sentencing portion of the sentencing procedure?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, actually the indefinite sentence is the only portion of the sentence with which our parole board can deal, and presumably, and I am sure, this is the reason why the magistrate has given this sentence. He has decided that if he gives somebody a term of six months definite and six months indefinite, he has in effect said, you will serve 12 months, unless by your behaviour the correctional authorities feel that you can be paroled for that last portion of six months.

This is entirely aside from the good conduct remission that he may earn, because he is entitled to that anyway.

Now, I should also point out to make it clear to the hon. members, that portion of the sentence which is a definite sentence, can be dealt with by the national parole board. Does that answer the hon. member's question?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I have some remarks I want to make about Burwash, touching on what the Minister said last night and certain other points, and I do not know whether this is the appropriate vote. I feel that it might not be. I do not want to get caught, though.

Mr. Chairman: I think we could deal with it under institutions, on the next vote.

Mr. Singer: Under institutions generally or the Burwash later? I just wanted to say that I have several points that I want to make.

Mr. Chairman: You have my guarantee.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on the question of the number of dollars made available at the time a person leaves one of the institutions—and I appreciate the example which the Minister gave a few minutes ago—could the Minister give us some indication on a comparative basis, as to the relative position of a person leaving the Kingston penitentiary as distinct from leaving one of the institutions under the Minister's aegis, rather than what rehabilitation gratuities he may receive at some time as to more in the nature of what his entitlement is at the time he leaves the institution? Is the remuneration or the amount of money, for example, the person who had the two-year term in the penitentiary, is the remuneration likely to be more than when a person leaves one of your institutions? What is the comparative basis by which a person can accumulate some funds while he is in one or other of the institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It bears no comparison really and it is really academic as to how much he gets from the federal as against ours, as I pointed out earlier. He would, because of having served a longer term, in most instances, in the federal penitentiary, and because they give him a higher allowance, he would naturally be getting a larger amount guaranteed him when he gets out of the institution.

But as I tried to point out earlier, this is really academic. He gets as much assistance as he requires—as is indicated—from our services. I should also point out, which may have some bearing also on the amount of money, that despite the additional money he gets from the federal system, they do not have their own aftercare service as we do. We are in a special position in this regard. They depend on the private agencies exclusively for aftercare services.

So I would say there is no comparison between relative positions of one coming out of the penitentiary and one coming out of reformatory. All I can tell you is that insofar as it is humanly possible to conceive just how much assistance a person should get, and how much good it will do him, we give him all the help he needs. How much the federal government does for him only has to do with the amount of money that he gets, which is slightly more than he gets in our institutions.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the Minister through you, one or two questions.

With regard to the rehabilitation area, Mr. Chairman, do we take it that there is usually, or you try to establish a rehabilitation officer in each institution?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is at least one rehabilitation officer in each institution.

Mr. Freeman: Further to that question, Mr. Chairman, does the rehabilitation officer then in the institution do any other work in the area as a custodial officer or as a teacher?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, that is his work, exclusively.

Mr. Freeman: Full time on rehabilitation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Freeman: The other area that I was interested in was, does your department have any figures on the IQ generally on the yearly operation of the inmates of the various institutions, under the Minister's care?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We take the IQ. There is a test, generally, of each inmate in the reformatory, but I am advised that generally speaking—you will find this on page 81 of the annual report if the hon. member has it in front of him—it gives the inmates educational status and so on. I am advised that the general IQ of the inmates across the system turned out to be a meaningless figure and therefore it was dropped from the report.

Mr. Freeman: I would have been interested, Mr. Chairman, to see if there was a breakdown of the ratio of higher IQ people as compared to the medium or lower IQ types. I would have thought the department over the years, would have established some method of approaching this in a fairly scientific manner so that rehabilitation efforts could be directed particularly to reach the IQ of the people who needed the rehabilitation.

There is no point in trying to rehabilitate a person, in my opinion, with an unusually high IQ. I am sure that in the various institutions there are many people with very high intelligence quotients. But there is no point in trying to rehabilitate a person with a very high intelligence quotient into an area of work requiring the mentality and skills of someone in a medium IQ or a low IQ. This is one of the things that I think must be very frustrating to a lot of people.

I am sure we all know, throughout our lives, people who have gone to work, day after day, to a job they disliked, or perhaps intensely hated, but they did it out of duty to their family or the fact they had to maintain themselves. Many people have felt sorry for people in those circumstances. I would think that the recidivist situation could be definitely augmented by placing people in work that they dislike or did not want to do. This is particularly true, I would take it, under your parole system. Under this system, as I understand it, if a person is serving a definite and an indefinite sentence, and that person is released on parole by your parole board at the end of the definite sentence that person must have an assured job to go to before he can leave the institution, and be under the parole officer in the locality in which he is going to be employed. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, that is not quite correct. If the hon. member will recall, the example I gave was the man who did not have a job waiting for him. Our people worked with him until he was able to get a job while he was on parole.

Mr. Freeman: Is that unusual?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, a man is entitled to parole if he looks as though he has benefitted from his time and it appears that he may be able to do better in the community. Our people work with him. As far as the IQ is concerned, I thought the hon. member was asking about a rundown of the average IQ across the system. I did say that the IQ of the individual is in his file; of course, the rehabilitation officer takes this into consideration when he is attempting to help him, so he will know whether he is dealing with a man of of high IQ or low IQ.

Mr. Freeman: That was what I was getting at, Mr. Chairman. Are each of the people who are in institutions subjected to an IQ test? Or is it taken on an average; do you take one out of ten, or one of 20, or something of that kind?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: With some exceptions, where apparently it has been deemed unnecessary because of the history and so on, everyone has an IQ test.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the hon. Minister if OSR cards from the school system are handed over to the department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Newman: They are?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Newman: Is the information on them, kept strictly confidential?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All our files are strictly confidential.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on this particular vote, has the Minister any statistical information or any information which would indicate whether, under the rehabilitation and placement service that his department provides, they are able to place any given number of people in trades for which they have received training in his institution? To put it directly, is the training and trade training programme in any of his institutions, in fact, producing persons who have qualifications who then find employment in those trades and does the Minister have any specific statistics or information to confirm that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have some statistics that are at the head office, but I do not know that they would be very meaningful because some of these people disappear after they have had some employment. We do not

follow them through after our responsibility has been attended to insofar as the sentence, the parole supervision and helping him with employment because, for obvious reasons, the man wants to be left alone. He should be, and therefore whether he has at some stage or other after that fallen back is a difficult thing to establish. We do know that a great number of them who are established in positions are able to keep them.

Now, if it is a question of statistics I should advise the hon. member that there is one thing that is lacking across this whole country and that is a system of proper figures, even on recidivism itself. There is a system which is now being hopefully organized by the federal government, and again, if the hon. members do not mind my complimenting my department, we started this ourselves and we are all ready for it with a punch card system and everything else. Just as soon as the federal government is ready we will have this. Until such time as this system is organized—and there is no reason why it should not be today, with computers and that sort of thing—until this is done all talks of rates of recidivism and so on are really guesswork.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, last year I brought up the results of a survey that was taken, I believe, in the St. Vincent de Paul prison in Quebec, I think I pointed out to the Minister that only eight per cent of the people who had taken any kind of a trade course stuck to it after their discharge. Could it be that the Minister does not have figures because they would be as appalling as the ones from Quebec? After all, let us face it, you have got a very good man there in the person of Mr. Grygier, who could immediately start one of those researches, or perhaps would have been on one of those researches and have finished it if the Minister was truly interested in finding out what the effect of all this programme was.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It seems to me fairly obvious, Mr. Chairman. A man moves to another province, or he follows the work that he has learned in the institution. He takes his apprenticeship, he follows it through later on, and then he gets a job, and this may be a year and a half after he started his apprenticeship in the institution. How would you follow that man through when you have no legal right to knock on his door? He does not want to be bothered. He does not want to start answering questions. Suppose he moves to another province? This is the sort of thing. It is very difficult to get these kind of figures.

Mr. Ben: Well, just to put the Opposition back in their seats and to show how clever the Minister is, why does the Minister not give us the figures indicating the number of people who continue their apprenticeship after they leave prison? Even that would help. How many people continued their apprenticeship outside the prison?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We could get that information, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in the Don jail I asked the governor if there was any bugging of the cells. I am wondering whether in the area of parole and rehabilitation you use electronic apparatus for bugging the cells in the jails across—

Mr. Chairman: We have finished the head office, we are on parole now under our regular—

Mr. Sargent: I was wondering how I could get it in there.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on vote 2002?

Vote 2002 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the committee of supply rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will continue with the estimates of this department, and the order of estimates of departments will be Reform Institutions, Public Works and then The Department of Municipal Affairs. I think the members should be ready for bills at any time. And I would like to make reference to the normal night sitting scheduled for Tuesday night. The House will not sit on Tuesday night but it will sit on Wednesday night.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 89

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 8, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 8, 1967

Territorial Division Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 3115

Department of Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 3115

Assessment Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 3115

Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 3115

Question to Mr. Dymond re drug purchases for Ontario hospitals, Mr. Bryden 3115

Question to Mr. Dymond re home care programme, Mr. S. Lewis 3115

Question to Mr. Dymond re Miss Mary Hackney, Mr. S. Lewis 3116

Questions to Mr. Dymond re air pollution, Mr. Renwick 3116

Question to Mr. Gomme re Highway 43, Mr. Newman 3117

Third Readings 3117

Ontario Municipal Board Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading 3117

Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading 3117

Municipal and school tax credits for the assistance of elderly persons, bill to provide for, Mr. Spooner, second reading 3117

Agricultural Development Finance Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 3135

Public Service Superannuation Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 3135

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman, continued 3135

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, on second reading, Mr. Ewen, Mr. Young, Mr. Singer, Mr. White, Mr. Morningstar 3143

Recess, 6 o'clock 3152

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today, we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, St. Benedict's separate school, Etobicoke and in the west gallery, eastern high school of commerce, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE TERRITORIAL DIVISION ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Territorial Division Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, the amendments are to bring the Act up to date with recent changes in corporate status of municipalities by reason by amalgamations, dissolutions and annexations and to make certain corrections in the boundaries between the districts of Algoma and Nipissing, and Sudbury and Timiskaming.

THE DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to make a correction with respect to the registration of a declaration as to certain notices having been issued by municipal treasurers.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, The Municipal Act amendments deal with quite a number of various pieces of legislation and I think it would be advisable if we were to leave the matter of examining some—there must be about 25 pages of various amendments. I think we will deal with it either in House in committee or before the municipal law committee.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): No "sleepers" in it, are there?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not think there are any secrets in it.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, some hon. members asked me certain questions during my estimates which I undertook to answer when I had the material.

The hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) asked: "If, sometime during the course of these estimates, the Minister could provide a rough estimate of the current savings from our drug purchasing programme, I would be very happy to have it."

The most recent survey we have is for 1965-66 when we spent $1,840,000 on drugs for the Ontario hospitals. Of this total, $400,000 were purchased by generic name on tender. These were tested for quality, appearance, and so on. If they met the standard, they were purchased, if they did not, they were rejected. We realized a saving of 25 per cent on those purchases.

It is believed that as we expand this programme—and we are in the process of doing this by providing more space, both lab and warehousing space—we will realize even greater savings.

The hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) asked: "Does the Minister have any estimate of the number of days of hospital care saved by virtue of the home care programme in various communities?"

Statistics available for the period April 1, 1966 to March 31, 1967, indicated that our home care programme served 8,499 patients with an estimated saving of 89,966 hospital bed days. The hospital bed days saved are only estimates because referring physicians are reluctant to commit an exact figure of days saved when the clinical picture has so many variations.

The same hon. member read a letter from one, Miss Mary Hackney, chief psychologist, sick children's hospital, and, I am given to understand, posed this question.

This may not be in his exact words:

> Why could this woman, in this particular case, not have received bursary training for the Ontario Department of Health? Why was she unable to get the support she wanted to further her training in Toronto where her services are so badly needed?

I am advised by my division executive that Mr. R. G. Berry, advising psychologist in the mental health division, investigated this situation and reported that at no time had this matter been discussed with him or had the division received a request for assistance.

Mr. Berry advises that their investigation indicated that this matter would appear to be an internal problem relating to the sick children's hospital's own administration.

The hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) asked some questions re air pollution.

Question 1: "What steps were taken by the Minister to record the amount of air pollution in the years 1960 to 1967 in the Port Maitland area?"

Records of air pollution measurements have been kept of fluoride and sulphur dioxide in the Port Maitland area during the period under question. Fluorides were measured by the use of lime candles which gives a relative index of contamination. Automatic sampling equipment has not been available for this pollutant.

The Ontario research foundation has developed such instrumentation for us after three years of work, and it will be installed in the field, by July of this year.

Sulphur dioxide was also measured by lead peroxide candles and automatic instrumentation.

Question 2: If records were kept by air pollution in this period in this area, what were the figures obtained for all kinds of air pollution; but in particular, what were the maximum recorded figures in parts per million for fluoride pollution?

The maximum levels of fluoride pollution varied from 4,500 micrograms for 30 days close to the industrial operation, to five micrograms for 30 days four miles away.

3: "What were the maximum figures for the fluoride pollution in parts per million of samples taken from soil, vegetable and livestock in the period from 1960 to the present?"

Fluoride measurements were not made of soil since we have been advised that vegetation does not normally absorb fluorides from soil.

The maximum fluoride content of vegetation was 229 parts per million, of hay 93 parts per million, and in livestock urine 75 parts per million.

4. "What is the total number of livestock that we have had (a) destroyed because of sickness; (b) declared unfit for human consumption in the period and place stated; and (c) what percentage increases do these figures represent over the average figures for these categories in this area?"

In 1965, some 207 livestock were judged to have fluorosis. The figures for 1966 have not been completed as yet. To the best of our knowledge, all cattle with fluorosis have been disposed of. We have no record of cattle being destroyed for other reasons.

Percentage increases in these categories are not available since average conditions are not available.

5. "How many certified cases of fluorosis have been recorded in this area and period?"

We do not know how many livestock were declared unfit for human consumption. Fluoride accumulates in the bones of livestock, it is not transmitted to the flesh or milk.

6. "In the years in which arbitrators have been appointed to mediate between industry and agriculture in this area, what sums per annum have been arrived at as representing pollution damage and how much has been paid in compensation?"

Arbitration started in 1965 when fluorosis in livestock became apparent. The total amount of the awards for 1965 was $95,729.10. To our knowledge, all but four claims have been paid and these are under negotiation between the company and the claimants. The 1966 awards have not been finalized as yet but should be within the next month.

What steps by means of warning, prohibition and fines have been taken to prevent and/or alleviate pollution in the Port Maitland area?

The township of Sherbrooke has an air pollution by-law and this matter is within their jurisdiction from October, 1965.

To our knowledge, no fines have been imposed. The company was advised of the potential problem prior to 1965 even though it could not be documented for court proceedings. The company installed additional air pollution control equipment in May, 1965, and early 1966 to reduce fluoride emissions.

This equipment did not reach full operating capacity until the growing season had started. Arrangements are being made now to have all equipment tested within the next three weeks to ensure that emissions are at the minimum.

The new legislation will permit a much more rigid control of this operation.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways. Would the Minister advise the House what construction is being carried out, or planned on, or near Highway 43, between Alexandria and Glen Robertson?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, Highway 43 terminates at Alexandria. The road between Glen Robertson and there is a county responsibility.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). He is not in his seat but perhaps I can put it on the record.

Will the Prime Minister consider setting up an eviction and rent review board to which appeals can be made for review of cases of evictions and rent increases?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) which I shall put on the record for his consideration when he returns.

In view of the Canada Cement Company's decision to close down operations in Port Colborne, has the Ontario housing corporation approached this firm to purchase a number of company-owned houses now vacant so that they can be placed on the market for rental or sale to ease the housing shortage?

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, there is a question I placed before the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs on April 17. I wonder if he yet has the answer for that?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not remember what the question was, Mr. Speaker. What did it relate to?

Mr. Young: Did the township of Sandwich West sell parcels of land to—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, I have not the information on that yet.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 71, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Bill 73, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962.

Bill 74, An Act to amend The Niagara Parks Act.

Bill 76, The Pesticides Act, 1967.

Bill 77, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Bill 78, An Act to amend The Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1964.

Bill 79, An Act to amend The Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1966.

Bill 84, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Bill 85, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Bill 87, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Bill 94, An Act to amend The Tile Drainage Act.

Bill Pr18, An Act to incorporate Peterborough Racing Association Limited.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 103, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PLANNING ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill 104, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TAX ASSISTANCE FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill 105, An Act to provide for municipal

and school tax credits for the assistance of elderly persons.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the matter covered in principle by the law that is now before us, has had considerable discussion already in the province and in this Legislature.

We, in the Opposition, and groups from all parts of Ontario have put to the government, in the strongest possible terms, the need for far reaching reforms in the tax situation at the municipal level, particularly as it applies to older citizens—and this is the group we are dealing with in the principle of this bill.

We should not forget however, in setting up machinery to provide some relief for older citizens in the payment of municipal taxation, that there are other groups which are in as serious a need as this particular special group is. I refer to citizens in the agricultural communities, who have been burdened by increasing taxation at the municipal level, unrelated to their ability to earn profit from their own commitments at the local level and their operations as farmers.

I would also like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the special difficulties associated with young couples who are taking on the responsibilities of married life, raising a family and looking forward to the ownership of their own home, which is becoming increasingly difficult as we see—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Are you voting against the bill?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I can have your attention, sir—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. member for London South should concentrate on building courthouses—

Mr. Nixon: —you will see, and I know even the member for London South who does not see very much, would agree with me in this particular instance, that young married couples are subjected to tremendous pressures when they try to take on the responsibility for home ownership because the tax system in this province is definitely out of kilter and the need for reform is obvious.

The hon. Minister himself, and the Provincial Treasurer, who is now trying to support him, have admitted freely that this particular legislation is simply stop-gap legislation.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): It will not be.

Mr. Nixon: It is entered into without the advice that the government feels in most matters is needed from their professional committees—committees that go on sitting and sitting and not reporting and not making their advice available. But we agree wholeheartedly that even this step—designed to provide the assistance to the older citizens in this province—is of some limited use.

It is, however, far from satisfactory, even when you compare it with the special legislation that the Minister himself and those people who are presently interjecting in the debate supported. Legislation that was enacted on behalf of the city of Hamilton, and at least two other municipalities, that permitted them, on their own initiative, to provide the relief at the local level for older citizens. This relief would then be distributed over the rest of the taxpayers.

I would say, sir, that we have very serious misgivings on what the government has tacked on to this particular plan—they themselves admit it is a stop-gap and a patchwork designed to tide over the older citiezns until some better reform measures can be enacted.

The serious difficulty, of course, is obvious These older citizens are not going to be willing nor are they going to be pleased to have a lien put on their property—a mortgage against their estate. A bill which will be collected after their death and which will, of course, reduce the value of what they are handing on to the next generation.

This is by no means a new plan. There are many citizens in the province who were exposed to this sort of legislation at the federal and provincial level years ago. It was then the custom, whenever assistance was extended to those in need, that a mortgage or lien was registered against their particular estate. If you talk to some of these citizens who experienced this sort of legislation in years gone by, Mr. Speaker, you will know that they did not accept this responsibility lightly. It was only because they were forced, by severe personal circumstances, to ask for special relief in those bad times, that they subjected themselves to a lien against their property on the part of the state itself.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this particular aspect of the plan is not palatable to those citizens who are looking for the relief that they deserve, having paid their taxes over many years and having supported a growing and expensive school system through their taxpaying responsibility.

It is with this in mind, sir, that I would tell you that we have this serious reservation in supporting the principle of the bill. The principle, as you know, deals with the assistance that is being extended—all of us have called for this in the weeks gone by—for the older citizens who simply cannot cope with the costs of education and other municipal services that have gone up year by year. The costs have increased because the government of the province of Ontario has not provided the leadership for taxation reform at this level. They have now assumed very serious proportions, involving the cutting back of the requirements in education in a good many of our municipalities, whether they are big cities or small rural areas. This is stop-gap legislation that will meet only the most severe needs of those of our older citizens who are prepared to ask for relief and it will have the relief that is granted to them registered as a lien against their property.

There is no consideration of the expensive administration of this legislation. It is difficult to judge from the information available and without the regulations that will accompany it. Perhaps the Provincial Treasurer, in taking part in the discussions this afternoon, would be able to indicate to what extent the public treasury will be involved in the administration of really a regressive piece of legislation. It is a piece of legislation based on a principle that was cast out by this government, the government of Ontario, and the government of Canada many years ago, when it was found to be unacceptable to the older citizens of this province and this country.

The government has been very proud of the idea that taxation at the local level will not be increased in order to maintain this new type of legislation. This is a point in its favour. But the principle is the consideration of the special needs of our older citizens, those 65 years and up. Surely it is in this connection that we should accede to their needs and see that wide-reaching reforms are made available to give assistance in the costs of the municipal responsibilities, both for education and in other areas that are so desperately needed.

The member for London South is concerned about how we are going to vote on this bill. Naturally we are going to support it in principle.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How about that?

Mr. Singer: All you give away is crumbs.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, as you know, the principle deals with the special needs of the older citizens who have not been granted the assistance they should have had by this government in years gone by. We say as well, that this particular bill is insufficient. It is drawn on lines that are retrogressive It does not meet the needs for financing at the municipal level that we see in the responsibilities in the future.

So, with these remarks, we would listen very carefully to the justification of the statute by the Provincial Treasurer himself, because I know he is anxious to take part in these affairs. When we look at the response and comments from thoughtful people across the province, we can see that, although they are glad of another means whereby they can provide relief in the old sense of the word to the citizens who are in desperate need, it by no means fills the bill for the far-reaching requirements established by the municipalities in these days.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, on first reading of the bill the Minister, in his explanatory statement, said that this was an interim measure designed to deal with an emergency situation pending a more comprehensive and adequate solution. This is not a direct quotation of what he said, but I think it fairly summarizes his statement.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared in this group to support the principle of the bill, although as I will indicate in a moment, there is one matter of detail which we positively do not support and which we will oppose in committee. We support the principle on the basis indicated as an interim measure. Indeed, we could hardly do otherwise, since we have been advocating this very thing ourselves for some time. As a matter of fact, my hon. friend, the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Davison), on at least two occasions introduced bills in this House to change the general municipal legislation to authorize municipalities to grant tax relief to senior citizens.

That bill, as the Minister himself has indicated, was undesirable in one sense, that it threw the burden on other municipal taxpayers. We were well aware of the limitation of the bill at the time, but, of course, a private member cannot introduce legislation to impose a charge on the provincial Treasury. So, we brought that bill forward both last year and this year—possibly also the year before, I am not quite sure—to at least get before the House the principle that, pending more adequate reform of our tax structure,

relief should be granted to senior citizens as far as property taxes are concerned.

Our basic position, when we were not inhibited by the inability of private members to move resolutions imposing charges on the Treasury, was set forth in my remarks on the Budget this year and, I think, in previous years. I will only go back as far as this year. On behalf of our party, I stated our position with regard to the matter of the distribution of responsibilities among levels of government and, what is intimately related to that, the distribution of tax burdens.

We took the position, as I think is well known—and we continue to take it and have taken it for some substantial time—that there should be a major reallocation of responsibilities as between the province and the municipalities. We specifically suggested that the province should immediately take over the cost of the administration of justice and what remains in municipal hands of the administration of welfare costs. In addition, we proposed a phased programme for taking over the bulk of the burden of educational costs. We believe that that should be started immediately but of course, in a deal as complicated as this—allowing for the fact that under the present government we are already well into another fiscal year—we recognize that a start in the programme could not be undertaken until the next fiscal year.

We therefore proposed—and I was chosen as the party spokesman to do so—that in the interim the government should permit municipalities to relieve pensioners of their municipal taxes up to a limit of $150 per pensioner and that the provincial government should reimburse the municipalities for the revenue lost as a result. This was the principle we set forth as an interim measure that we thought would be effective for a year or two, while more fundamental reforms were undertaken. We still favour it.

We are happy indeed to see that the government has accepted this idea of immediate interim relief for the pensioners. We regret, however, Mr. Speaker, that the government has shown its same niggling Scrooge attitude towards the old age pensioners by putting into the bill the provision that they will take a lien on the pensioner's house. We object absolutely and fundamentally to that provision of the bill.

We have considered the matter in some detail and have decided that this is not sufficient grounds for opposing the bill on second reading, because the objectionable clause can be severed from the bill. If it is severed, then in our opinion, the bill is satisfactory as an interim measure. In fact, it would implement precisely the principle that I was asked by my party to set before the House in the Budget debate.

The bill, with that provision severed, would then provide that municipalities could relieve the senior citizens of a portion of their taxes and could receive compensation from the provincial government as a result. So, we are prepared to go along with the bill in its second reading, Mr. Speaker, but I will give notice now that we will oppose, and try to have deleted, that portion of the bill that relates to placing a lien on pensioners' homes.

With regard to that one provision, if, now that I am on my feet, I may make reference to it, I would like to hear from the Minister an explanation of why his department or the government consider it necessary, if they indeed regard this as an interim measure, as they say they do. We object to the idea of the lien on the pensioner's home under any circumstances. Even if this were to be a permanent measure, Mr. Speaker, we would object to that principle. It was tried many years ago with regard to old age pensions. It caused great discontent and heartache among pensioners and the government never did realize enough from it to make it worth all the trouble. We object to it fundamentally, even as a permanent measure.

If, as the Minister says, this bill is to be only an interim measure, what is the point in sticking a lien on a pensioner's home for tax abatement of a year or two? I hope the government does not envisage that we will go through a period of more than a year or two before we have more fundamental tax reforms in the province. Or is the fact that this lien provision is included in the bill an indication of an attitude on the part of the government that it will probably be several years before it gets around to any fundamental tax reforms and any fundamental reallocation of responsibilities?

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is only on the basis of that assumption that there is any sense in the lien provision at all.

I hope it is not true, but having observed this government in action over the years, I have no doubt that if they should, by some curious tragedy of fate, be returned to office, it will be many years before there is any fundamental reform—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: When?

Mr. Bryden: —of the tax structure in this province.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is a matter of question.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): It is a question for you fellows too, this when!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not at all.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Provincial Treasurer says it is a matter of when. If I can interpret him correctly, I judge that he has now come to the position that this group has been advocating for years, namely that major tax reform is necessary.

The only question at issue between us now is when is the appropriate time to do it. Mr. Speaker, my answer on that is that it should have been done about three years ago, or maybe four or five years ago. The government sat smugly there, allowing the tax structure to become progressively more regressive, if I may put it that way—and that is an accurate way of putting it.

They permitted an increasingly regressivity in the tax structure and increasingly heavy burdens to be imposed on municipal taxpayers, which means mainly the small homeowner.

They have sat there for years and did nothing about it. Now they are engaged in a game that one could describe as waiting for Lancelot. They are going to wait until Lancelot comes forward and gives them a magic formula, that is what they are waiting for. They are waiting for the magic formula from Lancelot, says the Provincial Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: A responsible way.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Irresponsible way—just procrastination.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Responsible way.

Mr. Bryden: The Provincial Treasurer's definition of responsibility is to permit gross injustice to become even worse, while he waits to get a magic formula from Lancelot. I am not suggesting at all that the Smith committee's report will not be a most useful document in the life of this province. I am sure it will.

I know nothing about its contents at the moment but I am sure that with the quality of the people who have been working on this report, it will be a good report. But I say to the government, Mr. Speaker, that they should be prepared to take some responsibility on their own.

They have neglected this problem for lo, these many years. I say that they should not neglect it any longer and they should not make Lancelot Smith, and all the problems he has—and this is an extremely difficult task he has undertaken—as their excuse for doing nothing for another period of time.

I do not know when the Smith report will be available, but let us assume it comes down sometime this summer—

Mr. Speaker: I do not like to interrupt the member, but I think perhaps he should confine his remarks to the bill and not get on to the Smith report. It is a matter of anticipation and this bill is now before the House.

Mr. Bryden: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was the Provincial Treasurer who got me onto that line. I had intended just to make a passing reference to it, but at any rate—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will take the blame.

Mr. Bryden: At any rate, I say to the Provincial Treasurer that it is not a good enough excuse for deferring major reform in the tax structure in the province. I hope that the government truly looks upon this as an interim measure as they have said they will. We will certainly go along with it on that basis, but we see no reason why it should not be possible to bring this interim measure to an end by the end of this fiscal year.

If the government would, without waiting for Lancelot, accept the programme that I was authorized to propose on behalf of our party in the Budget debate—of taking over all the costs of administration of justice and all of the cost of welfare that now falls on municipalities and proceeding immediately with taking over the cost of education—if it would initiate such a programme, starting next year, then this particular measure would become less urgent.

I do not see why the government cannot do that. They cannot do it because they will not, but we do not need Lancelot Smith or anyone else to tell us that, at least, it is necessary.

It is true that the government would have to find substitute revenues for undertaking those responsibilities. We have already put ourselves on record a number of times as indicating the areas from which we think other revenues can be obtained. I suggest to the government—as a matter of fact the Provincial Treasurer said earlier that he was now studying some of the proposals we had made—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is true.

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest that he expedite his studies so that he could do some of these things, effective next year.

Then the need for the lien provision in this bill, if there is any sort of a need at all, disappears. We can foresee that the emergency which this bill is designed to meet will be overcome in a relatively short period of time, so that the legislation will no longer be necessary and can be dropped from the statute books.

I suggest that we get on with the real job. If we do that, we do not need the lien provision in the bill. We can, however, continue with the bill as an interim measure without the lien provision contained in it.

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I listened very intently to what my hon. friend from Woodbine had to say, and he did repeat himself three times. I will try not to do that in my very brief remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: You need to repeat it a third time. Slow learners over there.

Mr. Harris: Let me say, sir, that some two years ago, in the Budget debate and last year, the Minister of Municipal Affairs will recall that during his estimates I spoke about a scheme very similar to that which we are having second reading on today.

Mr. MacDonald: Second thoughts you mean.

Mr. Harris: Also my hon. friends opposite will remember that in the Budget debate this year, and in a private bill I made exactly the same suggestion.

What we are really doing is easing the burden on our senior citizens who must have relief. Therefore, this bill does just that and it provides relief for those people who need it. In my estimation it is a good piece of legislation, which I might say is long overdue and I am sure that everybody in the House will vote for it.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I think it was back in 1931 that, under another group of people of the same type as we have now in power—

Mr. MacDonald: The member was one of them at that time.

Mr. Reaume: No, I was not. They passed an Act for the purpose of helping the home-owners at that time who were having a hard time paying taxes. It was rather a popular Act at that moment but there was not any clause in the Act whereby the government of that day was taking back any liens at all on people's property.

Mr. Henry, who was Prime Minister of Ontario at the time, in explaining the Act, said it was for the very sole purpose of, "helping people who unfortunately could not help themselves"—and those were his exact words. That Act went on and I think it did a lot of good.

This business of handing out money with one hand under the auspices of disguise of helping old people, and then taking it back with the other hand, is just typical of the hodge-podge sort of work that this government has been doing over a long period of time.

There are many thousands of old people, who do not own homes, people who are paying high rents in every area of the province. Practically every day, older people are being put out of their homes because they cannot pay these high rents.

I say this, it is pretty near time that we started giving thought that if we are going to help the elderly people out in taxes—and I am for it—then has not the hour arrived when we ought to start thinking about helping those, too, who are being gouged in rents?

Is it any easier for an old person, or any harder, to get by on the east side of the road than it is on the opposite side?

This government has had ample opportunity over a long period of time of augmenting, in their own way if they would, the old age pensions that are being paid by the people up in Ottawa. This is your way of augmenting—augmenting it by taking back a lien on property that those people, over a long period of time, have worked hard in order that they might own.

If that property is ever sold, the first people who step in and grab your last pound and ounce of flesh is the government of the province, the very people who have said that they are the ones who are helping them.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the problem of helping the old people is one of grave importance. I say that we should not be helping them with one hand and injuring them, or their estates, with the other.

Because they were people who were thrifty, who worked hard for years and years and finally owned their own homes, we will help them, but if anything happens, if the home is sold, or after they die, you take what you have coming back again.

I just want to ask this question, is it not as reasonable and fair and equitable that we

should help the old people who are now paying these high rents and cannot pay them, as it is that we ought to help the man who owns his own home?

Indeed, our party will do everything that we can do in order that we may help the elderly. We are for the principle of the bill but we are not for the part that takes a lien back on a man's property.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how often we are going to watch the performance from the other side of the House, especially when a couple of them, the chief government Whip and the hon. Provincial Treasurer, started to jeer—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member should stay with the bill.

Mr. Ben: I am speaking on the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I know, but you cannot lecture the members.

Mr. Ben: All right. They started to jeer when the hon. leader of the Opposition indicated we are going to support this bill in principle and, like sheep following the proverbial Judas, all the other Tories started to jeer also. Mr. Speaker, surely this government does not expect us to deny the starving a half a loaf of bread because we cannot persuade that parsimonious group over there to give them a whole loaf? What idiocy, I have never seen the like of it.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Beaches himself stated this is long overdue. He ought to know because he is a member of that government, the Tory government, and what is a Tory government? A government that never believes in doing a thing the first time.

We had to have, I think it was three private members' bills from the municipalities offering tax relief to their citizens, before this government would take action. As I say, a Tory does not believe in doing anything the first time.

Some people here are talking about interim measures. What in heaven's name could this be except an interim measure? In the area of Metropolitan Toronto, they continually use, for example, with reference to the increase in taxes, a home that is assessed at $5,000, against which the taxes would be $450, so let us use that as an example.

The taxes have been going up at least 10 per cent in the Metropolitan area annually. So at the end of the first year they are going to go up $45, at the end of the second another $49.50, and at the end of the third $54.45.

So at the end of the third year, the poor taxpayer is going to be right where he started, because his taxes are going to be $598.95—just one dollar and a nickel out from where he is today. How can you call this anything but temporary? It is temporary by virtue of the mathematics involved.

When this government will take action to make it permanent, only the Maker above knows. According to their technique, it is going to 22.5 years. So what is going to happen to them in the interval? And then why stop at 65?

At least, at 65, under the present pension scheme, there will be many people who will be receiving old age assistance next year, but how about the ones who are 64, 63, 62, 61 and living on fixed incomes?

How about the widows at 48 and 49 who have not a job, or cannot find anything to do? What about tax relief for them? Nobody has brought in a private member's bill like that yet. So the Tories will not do anything about it, because, as I say, they do not believe in doing anything the first time.

Do not put on such sanctimonious attitudes. We are supporting this bill because we believe that if you are not going to give them the loaf they deserve, we are not going to prevent them from getting the half loaf.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I would—

Mr. Reaume: Now we get the words of wisdom.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, they will not be as wise as the hon. member's.

Mr. Reaume: They ought to be, coming from the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I learn a lot more because I am here—a lot more than the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is like the government, he is a slow learner.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, of course everyone is skirting around the real point in this bill, and this is that the vast majority of people affected by this—those to whom we are going to give this relief—are going to be their children to whom they will be leaving their property.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the board of a home for the aged for many years. I was a member of the boards of a couple of homes for the aged for a number of years, and we all know, perfectly well, that there are people in those homes who have families who refuse to help in their keep.

The same principle applies here, Mr. Speaker. There is no intention of this government to enact any legislation at the expense of other taxpayers, to help children who will not help their own parents.

Mr. Reaume: If they can.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that two parents can keep 10 children, but somehow or other, 10 children have difficulty keeping two parents.

Mr. Reaume: He has a point, all right, but it is a bad point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, we will give all the help we can to those who have—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —worked all of their lives to live in their own homes. We will do all we can to keep them there. But those children who refuse to help them certainly should not—

Mr. Reaume: Because they cannot help them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —inherit thousands of dollars, without paying back what the other taxpayers have paid to help these old people.

Mr. Speaker: Order: I am going to ask that there be fewer interjections. I have asked the members two or three times to let the member who is speaking, make his speech. You shall have your opportunity afterwards.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: If the member is finished speaking, I would like to complete what I have to say.

Mr. Reaume: Go right ahead sir.

Mr. Speaker: I ask the members again to give the person who has the floor the opportunity to speak.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, after the intervention of the Minister of Reform Institutions, and I think it is rather appropriate that the Minister of Reform Institutions should have intervened with that outburst of Victorian paternalism, I have a few words I would like to say.

Mr. Speaker, one of the unfortunate things about this lien clause that the government is going to put on, is that many older citizens who desperately need this help are simply not going to seek it because—you may say it is a bit irrational—but they have built an equity in a home down through the years, and they do not want to mar that equity on their home by accumulating liens.

The net effect of what the government is doing is that many older citizens who require this assistance desperately are simply not going to take it because of the indignity that the government has imposed upon them.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if one analyzes the basic philosophy which was so magnificently, if somewhat unwittingly, expounded by the Minister of Reform Institutions, he poses as the man who is going to chastise the younger generation. They are all wrong. They do not appreciate their parents.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is your interpretation.

Mr. MacDonald: I am interpreting what the hon. Minister said—and, therefore, because they are all wrong, he is not going to pass legislation which would make it possible for these older folk to pass on a piece of property to their children without liens.

He is going to punish them for their neglect of their parents. He is going to put a lien on it so that when the bequest comes to them, it is going to be minus a little amount, authorized by this interim piece of legislation that presumably is going to go on for only two or three years.

Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult to conceive of a piece of legislation that so magnificently illustrates the Scrooge-like niggling attitude, as well the Tory Victorian attitude of this government.

There is not much more need be said, Mr. Speaker. The content of the bill speaks for itself. The observations of the government speak even more eloquently for themselves. We are going to oppose it, the lien section, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the support of the Liberals in opposition to this, because when the East York bill was before the standing committee of the House, there was not a voice raised in the Liberals against the lien principle.

They too, like the government, are slow learners, but they learn and we welcome their support to fight this lien clause when it comes before the House—

Mr. White: The member for Woodbine said he was voting for the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: What do you mean?

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, how can one oppose any principle that gives some type of assistance to the senior citizens? It is silly for the members opposite to come along and say that we are against this. Mr. Speaker, all we are doing is putting a rope around the neck of the senior citizen when it comes to him selling his property later on, or when it comes to the children acquiring the property.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to simply read to you some of the comments of mayors of municipalities concerning this legislation. Waterloo's mayor—

Mr. White: I hope you will tell us their political affiliation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: It does not matter whether they are Liberals or Tories. These are men that can see the future. They are clear thinking individuals. They realize that this is a death bed repentance. Were it not for an election coming up this year, this would have been held off until the Smith report came down. You are doing this now simply because you had plans for holding a June election and you chickened out, and now you are going—

An hon. member: Chicken is a good way to describe it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member return to the principle of the bill?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That is the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Waterloo, Arthur Polechmy, attacks the legislation "which just transfers taxes to the next generation". That is all we are doing here.

Mr. White: Is he a Liberal candidate?

An hon. member: Tory!

Mr. Newman: Why not use that same principle on welfare payments then—transfer it to the next generation? Why not do it with old age security, transfer it to the next generation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do.

Mr. Newman: The federal authorities make sure you get your old age security payment once you reach the age, and that is all. There is no lien against you. All you are doing is providing a lien against an individual's property: "Beside the accumulated tax, a subsequent property owner would have to pay at least $100 in legal fees to register and trace the tax liens," he said. This is from a lawyer.

Mr. Reaume: By the Crown.

Mr. Newman: This could cause an increase in the down payment when such home came on the market, putting them farther out of the reach of the prospective owners.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): It is awful; irresponsible.

Mr. Newman: Mayor Alfred Judd from Simcoe had these comments when questioned.

An hon. member: Is he a Liberal candidate?

Mr. Newman: He said "the true effectiveness of the law." He said it could have the effect of tying up property to such an extent it might become a handicap.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: Here are the comments from another individual from a smaller community, alderman Clifford Waugh from Owen Sound. He thought the provincial government was "just passing the buck."

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Not passing the buck.

Mr. Reaume: Passing the buck and then grabbing it back again, eh?

Mr. Newman: What you are doing is, for the time being, providing a $12.50 supplementary assistance to the individual but at the same time you have your hand in his pocket to take that back from him once he passes away.

Mr. Reaume: Robbers. One buck in, one buck out.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, this legislation is as a result of a far-sighted mayor from the city of Hamilton. If it were not for Mayor Copps of Hamilton, this government would never have introduced this.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): The next leader of the Ontario Liberals.

Mr. Newman: Mayor Copps came along and was more far-sighted than these people, because he was willing to grant them the $150 relief from their property taxes.

This, as I have said earlier, is strictly a death bed repentance and were it not for the other municipalities that have asked for legislation to give tax relief to their senior citizens, and the fact that an election is in the offing, this government would never have acted. It took three years for them to even act on Mayor Copps' suggestions.

Mr. Reaume: They are cruel men.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the answer to this is a complete revision of the tax burden on the municipalities. The resolution passed by my own community, and endorsed by communities across the length and breadth of Ontario, asks for the province to pay 80 per cent of the share of the cost of education.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think you are generalizing too much.

Mr. Singer: It is the same thing.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, they are going to take 80 per cent.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Read another newspaper article.

Mr. Newman: At least I can read. Why do you not read?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

An hon. member: This has got to come up. It is all part of his speech.

Mr. Newman: This is all part of the tax relief, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Stick to the principle of the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Disorderly political retreat going from bad to worse.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if 80 per cent of the cost of education were to be assumed by this government, there would be no need for this type of legislation at all.

Mr. Speaker: I have asked the member to get back to the principle of this bill.

Mr. Newman: The principle is tax relief to the senior citizens, Mr. Speaker, and this is what we are talking about, tax relief and assistance to the senior citizens. This can be given to him by taking 80 per cent of the cost of education off the property tax payer.

Education 80 per cent, welfare 80 per cent, hospitals 80 per cent, administration of justice 80 per cent, and connecting road links. Were these various departments or responsibilities assumed to the extent of 80 per cent by this government, there would be no need for this type of legislation.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Whicher: It would not be intelligent.

Mr. White: Is it the intention of the Liberals—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member has not accepted the question, so there will be no answer. The member for High Park, please!

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I think that of all the forward legislation produced at this session, this bill is the important one. Listening to the Opposition trying to tie in an election to this bill, Mr. Speaker, it is just cheap politics—nothing else but cheap politics. The Opposition, Mr. Speaker, has been harping away about an election for months, and there may not be an election until the fall of 1968. For heaven's sake, stop talking about an election, we are talking about a bill. We are talking about a bill that is going to provide—

Mr. MacDonald: That is a feeble line—

Mr. Cowling: My friend, will you just shut up for a minute until I say something? I have been waiting for weeks to make a little speech, will you not let me make it? Or are you going to keep on mumbling all the way through?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Cowling: This bill provides some very definite relief for our senior citizens. And I think in the riding of High Park we have as many senior citizens and people living on fixed incomes as any other place in the province. I am helping them by supporting this bill.

The hon. member for Essex North made a great speech, as a matter of fact I have not heard him open his mouth all year until now.

Mr. Reaume: The member for High Park has been away a lot.

Mr. Cowling: I was thrilled with it. It was just a wonderful speech, in his own inimitable style, but as usual he missed the point; he could not see what a great job this government is doing by helping our people on fixed incomes.

You cannot have it both ways, you cannot hold the line on taxes and then pay out money. That is the reason why you fellows are over there, and we are on this side. You want it both ways when it is impossible—you cannot have it. We are going to help people by assisting them up to the extent of $150 a year with their municipal taxes.

I say that is a great beginning. And probably in another year there will be a change made, amendment made to the Act, whereby it will be increased. But this government is doing something now. All you do is talk about it. Action, that is a fact—$150 a year we are going to help the senior citizens with. To my mind that is important.

I was just saying, Mr. Speaker, that I think of all the legislation that will be debated and discussed, and will be to the benefit of this government in an election, whenever it is called, it is this particular legislation. As far as the Opposition is concerned, they can harp away. That particularly includes the New Democratic Party; they do not do anything, just talk, never come up with an idea, just talk.

Mr. S. Lewis: Let us have that cheap politics again.

Mr. MacDonald: Cheap politics—you took our ideas.

Mr. Cowling: Your ideas are no good, that is why we do not accept them; they are just no good, they are not practical. You are dreaming.

Mr. Speaker, we are all going to be very interested in seeing, at voting time, who votes for the bill. I will miss my guess if all the Opposition members do not support the bill, after all the talk we have heard this afternoon. I think it is a very great piece of legislation and I think our people on fixed incomes will applaud this effort by the Conservative government to do something about their tax situation and do it now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, as a point of information to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, I would point out that the Hamilton bill required ten years' residence, up to $100 relief, on a means test, and that the cost to the taxpayers is $302,000 per annum. Mayor Copps has publicly accepted this bill.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, the government has attempted to indicate, in some way or other, that if they removed the lien provision from this bill they would be imposing an undue burden and making others in the community share that burden.

My friend here says we would be subsidizing the older people; I am simply saying, Mr. Speaker, and pointing out to the House, that there is no basis whatsoever, on any equitable principle, why a person 65 years of age or older should, because they happen to be a ratepayer, be subjected to the education tax.

In most cases, those persons have paid the education tax for many, many years. In most cases, none of those families have anyone within the education system. To suggest in a specious way that, in some way or other, if there was a total relief up to the $150 as is provided in the bill for a person who owns his home and who is an elderly person, it would be a subsidizing of that person, is consistent only with the Tory view that they will not subsidize or assist anyone in this society, without making them, at some point, pay the price.

The Minister of Reform Institutions—his conception of the principle of this bill is that in some way it is designed to punish the children. That is the principle under which the Minister is operating.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I never used those words.

Mr. Renwick: This is again peculiar, a part of the Tory philosophy, that all taxes, of any kind, are in the form of a punitive and a penalty concept on the people in the society. What we have endeavoured to say, and what we are going to say, again and again, is that you must not destroy the psychological security of elderly people by imposing a lien on their home for education tax.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? I wonder, when we get to the vote, if he will be following his leader voting against it, or following his deputy leader, and voting for it?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member for London South spends most of his time deliberately trying to confuse issues and then sits back and smiles

and thinks this is the way you treat the serious business of the House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are smiling.

Mr. MacDonald: I am smiling because I am looking at you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well you are no bargain either.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member has stated his point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine. The position of this party was clearly indicated. We will support the principle and oppose the lien section when we get to committee. I was consistent with the deputy leader when he presented that view.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, the member for London South was well aware of what our position was on the bill. I come back again, because I do not think we can leave the bill without the Tory party recognizing that they cannot impose a lien on the house properties of elderly persons.

Apart altogether from what other relief elderly persons may be entitled to, and should have, in our society, the Tory party will pay the price at the polls if they persist in levying this lien on elderly persons in our society.

It will be no good for the Minister of Reform Institutions to say that they are collecting from those children who should be supporting their parents.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Those who refused to, not those who should.

Mr. Renwick: If the Minister of Reform Institutions wants to set up some kind of a system by which he selects those children who refuse to support their parents, and those who are able to do so, and impose a punishment upon them—that is fine, let him introduce that kind of a bill.

But that is not the kind of a bill which is in front of us today. Not only do you penalize the elderly person by imposing a lien on his property, which over the years could amount to anywhere up to $1,000 to $2,000 on, in many cases, the sole, single asset which that person may have.

Not only do they impose that, but they then require that they retrieve from whoever inherits that property—little realizing that, for practical purposes, families today are in a position where the burden of the education of their children, the burden of the support of their children, is becoming so great, and the gap between their income and their ability to bridge that gap, that it is becoming a crisis throughout the province of Ontario, that it is now inconceivable that the government will adopt what we realize was the forerunner of this bill, when the bill from York East came through the Legislature.

We noticed, at that time, the kite flying that went on when that bill was introduced, because this government, both in this field and in the field of urban renewal, in the HOME programme, so far as the elderly person is concerned, is determined to perpetuate the proposition that any benefit that such persons get, must be pyramided and ultimately collected.

All I am saying is, look at the ridiculous position that the government is going to place itself in. The government of the province of Ontario is going to be the lienholder against the homes of every elderly citizen in the province. There is no reason why this should be so.

There is no possible, conceivable equity and I defy any member of the government to point out—if you rule away this specious argument about the subsidizing of other people, and if you rule away the proposition that you are in some way penalizing those children who are able to, yet do not support their parents—I would like one Minister to stand up and say how you can justify this kind of a lien.

Let me give you one example—there are many; in my riding there are hundreds; in the riding of the member for Woodbine, there are hundreds. And this one woman is a Mrs. Clute on DeGrassi Street in Toronto. Her husband died about a year and a half ago. The only asset is the house in which she lives.

It is free of encumbrances. She meets her taxes. Her total income at the present time is just reaching the $105 level per month. She gets certain assistance from the government because of her state of health, for her medical and other expenses and for certain drugs that she has to take. She has nothing else.

The government suggests that that woman is not going to be affected by a rebate of her education taxes—which are then added on as a lien on her property, to be collected from her children—when she well recognizes that she is existing on the proposition that, at some point, she and her husband, after all their years, are going to be able to leave

that house and that asset to their children, who are not able to support them today. That is what they intended to do. That is what this woman wants to do.

All I say is that there is no reason whatsoever why this government cannot relieve that woman—a woman who has lived in the house for many years and has paid the education tax for anywhere up to 30 or 35 years. Why the government cannot totally relieve that woman from that tax is beyond my comprehension. It will be beyond the comprehension of every person that this bill is supposed to benefit. I ask that, before this bill comes back into committee, the government withdraw this provision for a lien on these properties. There is no need for it. There is no place for it. All the government has to do is to adopt the simple expedient that the member for Woodbine put forward on behalf of this party in the Budget debate. That is, that the municipality bill the province and the province pay the tax. Do not put the province of Ontario in the position of being a lien holder on the home of every elderly person in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I think I should make a few comments.

The hon. member for Woodbine spoke about the re-allocation of tax funds. He knows very well, and so do members of the House, that this is under review. He made some rather disparaging remarks, in a way, about the Smith committee—

Mr. Bryden: Oh no, but about your attitude to it.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Not my attitude at all.

Mr. Bryden: I criticized you for using the Smith committee as an excuse for delay.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I think it is wise to wait until such time as we do have it because there are many complications in this financial field. I am not prepared—

Mr. MacDonald: The people are not going to accept it.

An hon. member: You will be surprised.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: You will be surprised.

An hon. member: No, you are.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wonder if we could allow the Minister to make his remarks without interjections?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am not prepared to discuss the financial position—Ontario vis-a-vis the federal authority—but I would suggest to some of you who have some connections and some friends in Ottawa, that they might look upon the request of Ontario with a little bit more favour. We might be in a better position to reallocate the funds that the Provincial Treasurer receives here to a greater advantage to assist some of the cases you are speaking about.

When I presented this bill for first reading a few days ago, I mentioned that the bill embodied the essence of the recommendation of the select committee on aging, which has made a report to the Legislature. We are prepared to move rather fast in that regard. I also said that the Ontario report on taxation was expected in the near future and that it was possible that in that report there would be some recommendations that would assist the particular case that we had to deal with. Instead of waiting until next session, we decided that we would do something about it now.

I also mentioned that bills that had been private members' bills, which had been approved in the House before, had been opposed by me in the private bills committee because most of these bills contained a subsidy to the heirs of these owners at public expense—at the expense of the individual municipal taxpayer.

It seemed to be fair that this method, which we have developed in Bill 105, would be satisfactory. I might, for the benefit of my friends, particularly the member from Windsor, agree that he is quite right in saying that tenants are not assisted by this bill. He is not in the House at the moment, but someone could tell him that we realize that. There is no suggestion that tenants are to be assisted here. The great problem is that the tenants —persons who are not home owners and who are in receipt of old age assistance and old age security—are in need of assistance in some cases. For that purpose the government has provided assistance through The Department of Social and Family Services facilities, in the same way as those people who are home owners may be assisted under certain circumstances.

This is a voluntary plan and there is no intention to suggest to you that it is a scheme that is going to settle all problems in this particular area. It is not regressive legislation. It is bringing a current matter which does need some assistance, according to the

representations which have been made to us over a period of time.

I was going to say something about a remark that had been made by an hon. member in which he had been rather derogatory to myself, but I will not refer to it.

As to the suggestion made by the leader of the New Democratic Party—that there is a certain indignity to this—this is purely private, personal business, between the home owner and the municipal treasurer.

Mr. S. Lewis: And the government!

Hon. Mr. Spooner: All he has to do is to go to the municipality, make an application, purely voluntary, and in due course of time the treasurer of the municipality will forward the necessary documents, sir, to the Treasurer of the province, through The Department of Municipal Affairs. The cheque will be returned to the municipality, so that the municipality will not have to finance these particular tax deferments.

As to the suggestion that this would increase legal fees to the amount of $100, I can only recommend to the hon. member who made that suggestion, that he better get another lawyer.

Now, I would like to bring to your attention—and I have never in the past read editorials from newspapers. I am not adverse to doing that but I have never had that habit—but there was rather an interesting one which I read the other day that appeared in one of the Toronto metropolitan papers, on Thursday, May 4. It says:

> It is no sound criticism of the plan—

and the editorial mentions:

> Liberal Leader Robert Nixon and MPP Vernon Singer are saying, that this "is no relief, just a postponement," because the credit will become a lien against the property.
>
> What matters is that it will relieve homeowners who are hard-pressed now. The total tax credits will be recovered from their estate or when their house is sold.
>
> This is not only economical, but just. Do Mr. Nixon and Mr. Singer really contend that the public should subsidize the heirs of these homeowners, as well as the pensioners themselves?

I think that is a very good question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest—

Mr. MacDonald: What paper was that?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: What paper was that? The Toronto *Daily Star*.

Mr. MacDonald: Sounds like Liberal confusion.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, I might remind you that a similar editorial appeared in that other great Toronto newspaper that is so favuorable to me personally, the Toronto *Telegram*. I would ask the hon. members to vote for this bill in its present form.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the *Star* supported the hon. Minister in 1963.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am sorry, I could not hear a word the hon. member said.

Mr. MacDonald: I said the *Star* supported the hon. Minister in 1963. It is an indication of their periodic aberrations.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I have asked hon. members to vote in favour of this bill.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Today we have heard—and when the bill was given first reading—a statement that the select committee of the Legislature on aging recommended this. I would like to read the recommendation that was made. Certainly in no place does it say anything about anybody having to pay any of this money back.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted. I said that this bill, which I have just introduced, embodies the essence of the recommendation of the select committee on aging.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Davison: Mr. Speaker, may I read recommendation 18?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It is not relevant to this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: You referred to it.

Mr. Davison: "Let the province enact legislation amending The Assessment Act so that local municipal councils who wish to do so may, by by-law, authorize and direct credits, rebates and reductions in residential real property taxes up to $150 per annum for persons 60 years and over." That was our recommendation. Nowhere in there do we suggest that they would have to pay this back.

Mr. Speaker: What is the member's point of order?

Mr. Davison: That no place was there any lien mentioned in this recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: Is the motion carried?

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, there are two more speakers here.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What was that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. S. Lewis: He said do not get anxious.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: To whom?

Mr. Singer: To whoever is anxious.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I think we should be a little more considerate of the girls who are taking the interjections.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to emphasize what the member for Hamilton East said in this matter of quoting the committee on aging as recommending anything to do with liens.

The great weakness in this legislation are the particular clauses that affect liens. We have known in our own jurisdiction, in Canada as a whole, and in the province of Ontario, when old age security was first introduced we began by putting liens on the homes of those who received such security. This turned out in the long run to be useless legislation. All it did was penalize the elderly people.

It was found at that time that many people who required old age security would not accept it, simply because they did not want a lien upon their homes. We are repeating once again an error of the past. It was our experience on the committee on aging, from what we could learn on this subject, that the elderly people literally had a mental block against liens.

There are many jurisdictions in the United States that allow reductions on assessments without placing a lien on the homes of the elderly persons. I know in the state of Massachusetts they reduce the assessment for anyone over 65 by $2,000 a year; in Rhode Island it is $1,000; in Georgia, $3,000; and in the state of New Jersey they just reduce the taxes $80 a year for anyone who is over the age of 65.

This, to me, would be the simple way of doing it, even from a bookkeeping point of view. From a humane point of view, this again would be the proper way to do it—to simply reduce the assessment for anyone over the age of 60 or 65, whatever age group you mention. We on the committee on aging recommended the age of 60.

This legislation that we have before us today is simply harking back to a principle that has been found to be very difficult to administer. It will also leave out those people who may need the help, but are simply too proud to take it. The people who will take any kind of help they can get from the government, just because it is help from the government, are not going to be stopped by a lien, but the old person who is really very proud simply will not apply for help under this bill.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this principle ignores the whole problem, the whole basic problem of tax on real estate. We know perfectly well that we are governed by legislation passed about 1849 and this is just one bit more of a patchwork on old clothing that is literally falling apart. I would say, as a member of this Legislature and as a member of this party, I realize that it will help some people in a very temporary way.

I would, in principle, like to see legislation passed that would help anyone over the age of 60 years, but I hope that, when we come to the committee stages of this bill, we will strike out those sections that involve the lien. Once again we are discussing legislation that really is not coming to grips with the essential problem—that is, the utter inadequacy of our real estate taxes in the province of Ontario. It is time that we, as a government and members of the Legislature, came to grips with the whole essence of the problem.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On a point of order, may I say this, Mr. Speaker. It has always been my understanding that debate on second reading was to discuss the principle of the bill. We have heard both the Opposition parties say they are going to vote in favour of the principle of this bill and that they are going to contest it or discuss it or debate it when the House is in committee. Is it not fair to propose now that, if that is the position they are going to take, that we vote on second reading of this bill and leave this debate? Otherwise we are going to hear it all over again, I suggest, sir, in House in committee.

Mr. Speaker: Does anyone else wish to speak to the point of order?

Mr. Singer: I do not want to speak to the point of order, I just want to—

Mr. Speaker: As I see it, there are a couple of principles involved within the bill and the lien principle is one. In considering the whole scope of the bill, the members, I believe, are entitled to speak on the various principles embodied within the bill. I would take it that there is too much repetition, on the one principle, that is the part dealing with a lien on the property. I think, perhaps, it should be stated once and let go at that—not repeat it two or three times. That is the only fault I find with this debate.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: To my own point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may. I repeat, sir, that the leaders of both parties and others who have spoken have said they are going to support the principle of the bill but they are going to oppose this legislation in committee of the whole House. How many times do we have to hear this, sir? On second reading, in terms of the overall principle and again as we debate the bill section by section? They have taken a stand in the House, quite in support of the rules of the House, I think, which state we are talking about the overall principle of the bill. They have categorically stated they are going to support it. Why, sir, should you not rule that we vote on the principle now and leave this debate on section by section consideration until the committee of the whole House?

Mr. Speaker: Does the motion carry?

Mr. Singer: No. Mr. Speaker, it puzzles me why—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Can we not rule on this, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I do not like to make a strict ruling in that regard. I cannot see that in discussing the principle of the bill, that is the main overriding principle of the bill which the members are in favour of that debate on the secondary principle involved therein, should be excluded.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But how many times?

Mr. Speaker: In view of that, I do not want to try to restrict debate, although there is considerable repetition.

An hon. member: I quite agree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it puzzles me completely as to why the government continues to indulge in regressive systems of taxation. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs took the trouble and, as he does when he does take the trouble to quote from editorials, he says he never usually quotes from editorials.

I wonder why he did not bother to read, in the editorial that was in the same newspaper, the *Star*, on Saturday, May 6 or Monday, May 8, two very interesting paragraphs about the whole system of municipal taxation, the system for which he is responsible, Mr. Speaker, and the system for which I would have thought he would have been happy to hear any advice, including that of the Toronto *Daily Star*?

Just one paragraph, because I am not going to burden the House with reading at length, any editorial, just one paragraph.

Mr. Speaker: May I ask the member, does this paragraph deal with the principle of the bill?

Mr. Singer: Oh, it does, it deals with the principle of the bill insofar as it relates to municipal taxation, Mr. Speaker. This bill relates to municipal taxation and surely you would not want to limit me in discussing the principle of municipal taxation.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, on a point or order, this bill does not relate to municipal taxation at all, and the member knows that. Therefore, the member's suggestion of reading any editorial, May 6 or May 8, is out of order.

Mr. Singer: Well, I never heard the like, I really never did. This bill, Mr. Speaker, by its nature relates to a rebate on municipal taxation for a certain group of people. How can you talk about a rebate on municipal taxation unless you talk about municipal taxation? It is impossible. You cannot just single out a little bit of it.

An hon. member: The two are synonymous.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry that we get under the skin of the Minister of Municipal Affairs but he has a very thin skin these days.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member for Dovercourt never gets under my skin—

Mr. Singer: I do not come from Dovercourt.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: —and he should not make that suggestion.

Mr. MacDonald: There is no member for Dovercourt.

Mr. Singer: I do not even come from Dovercourt, Mr. Speaker, so I—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member get ahead with his remarks!

Mr. Singer: Yes, I am trying to, but it is very difficult with all those fellows over there.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not even know where he comes from.

Mr. Singer: But I thought this should be an important part of the record. In two paragraphs in this editorial, Mr. Speaker, there are two glaring deficiencies and these are things that the Minister has failed to grasp completely:

> Property ownership is not necessarily a measure of ability to pay, and the property tax weighs more heavily on the poor than on the rich. Property tax was much fairer in the old days of a farm economy. Then a man's wealth could be measured by which property he owned, but today wealth is held in many ways, stocks, bonds, leases, and so on.

And it goes on in this editorial, the one on Saturday and the one that is coming tomorrow, to set out that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and his colleagues, just have not begun to cope with the inequities of this regressive system of legislation that taxes homes as the only means of wealth.

Mr. Speaker, they carry this forward into this bill. It is an anomaly, really, that this Minister brings this bill before us, having been figuratively, perhaps not literally, beaten over the head by the private bills committee a couple of years ago when, after his violent protest, the city of Hamilton bill went through, containing the clauses that the member for Hamilton Centre referred to a few moments ago. The Minister was there and he was livid.

Mr. MacDonald: Agitated anyway, if not livid.

Mr. Singer: Yes, he was most unhappy, Mr. Speaker. It is a good thing he does not have high blood pressure because that would be the end of him—but he was livid that day. And the committee overruled him. The government did not choose, that having happened, to reverse the decision of the committee and the government put its seal of approval on the Hamilton bill, it put its seal of approval on two other bills, the Amherstburg bill and the Burlington bill. Surely there was some sort of a promise, some sort of an undertaking that was given at that time to those three municipalities, Mr. Speaker, and now, out of hand, the government breaks that promise.

The government was responsible for bringing that legislation forward; it could have stopped it; it has stopped other legislation—and we do not know, Mr. Speaker—as it might now be stopping the city of Toronto private bill; as it might now be stopping the private bill dealing with the University of Western Ontario.

It has stopped other bills in the past. It might have stopped it if it did not want to carry that promise forward. But it allowed those bills to go forward.

The last sections of the bill deal with the Amherstburg bill, the Hamilton bill, and the Burlington bill, section 5.

It allowed those things to go through the House and did not say "boo". The East York bill went through and the Minister sat silent—completely silent, Mr. Speaker—and did not say a word when that bill went through, even when, under pretty substantial attack, I thought to try and get him to bring in some general legislation.

Now we have the government—and this is the fascinating thing, Mr. Speaker—we have the government moving ten years backwards in its advance, ten years backward into the old 19th century Tory rules of procedure—I am sorry, more than ten years, Mr. Speaker, 16 years.

Fascinatingly, in 1951 under the same aegis, same Tories, there was a bill brought before this House and passed, called an Act respecting old age assistance. You will never guess what was in section 14 of that bill, Mr. Speaker. Section 14 of that bill said:

> Every notice of the granting of a pension registered in a registry or land titles office under section 13 of The Old Age Pensions Act, or any predecessor to that section, is discharged on the 31st day of December, 1951.

Very simply, Mr. Speaker, that means that that advanced government in 1951 decided there would no longer be any liens for old age pensions. Those people in the House who used to search titles back prior to that date, will remember that, frequently, you used to search and find notice of lien under The Old Age Pensions Act, and they had to be discharged before you could deal with the property.

But in 1951, this Tory government, or the predecessors of it, saw fit to take the big

advance into the future, 16 years ago, and repealed that section and removed the lien—while we move forward by moving backward. In 1967, back again go the liens; back again are going to go these notices onto the title; back again is going to go this burden; and absent is the real relief.

Mr. Speaker, how can one help but wonder about the principles that govern this so-called advanced government? They move backward every time they appear to move forward. Really, Mr. Speaker, it escapes all reasonable and logical understanding as to why they would want to penalize old people by putting liens on their property—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: We did not penalize them at all.

Mr. Singer: —and on their families, Mr. Speaker. It just escapes all understanding, why they are not at least as advanced as the then Minister—Mr. Goodfellow or Mr. Porter —those were some of the Ministers of that day, Mr. Porter was the Provincial Treasurer; Mr. Goodfellow, I think had Municipal Affairs, but they saw fit in those days to remove this sort of thing.

But here we have it back again. The advanced thinking of the hon. Provincial Treasurer and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, and the only reason they did it is because they were first browbeaten by the—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Nobody is browbeating.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: —standing committee on private bills. They did not have the courage, Mr. Speaker, to take a stand.

Their actions speak louder than their words, they are taking a regressive and retrograde step. They are continuing to penalize old people, are delighted in the way they are doing it and there is only one answer.

Yes, I am going to vote for the bill for the very reasons that have been told you on several occasions. If I have a little more time, Mr. Speaker, I am sure I could have dragged out from the old *Hansards*, but I was not quite able to find them, the resounding speeches that would have gone with the repeal of that old section in 1951.

I can just picture the Cabinet Minister of the day beating his chest hard and saying, "We are a great government. We are not going to penalize these old people any more by putting liens on their properties."

So we have got section 14 in this bill that I have just read to you. "We are advancing." Well, advance as they may; 1951 may advance and 1967 may retreat. It is a government constantly under retreat.

As it retreated from this election, it now retreats to this inequitable and regressive system. Mr. Speaker, let us hope that somewhere over there, there is a little light comes down and that some of their more intelligent backbenchers, when they get this thing back into caucus, will have the government do something about this lien principle.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, now that the select committee on aging has been brought into this debate, I would like to make a brief remark.

Mr. Bryden: The Minister brought it in on first reading.

Mr. Carruthers: I would say to the members of the Opposition, all the members of this House have a responsibility, as legislators, to the taxpayers of this province. There has been one fact overlooked entirely during this debate. It is a fact that was brought out many times during our discussions on the select committee on aging. The fact, Mr. Speaker, is this.

On one end of the life span we have a rapidly increasing group of dependent young people. On the other end of the life span we have a rapidly developing group of elderly people, elderly citizens, who are also, to a great extent, dependent upon society. And in the middle you have the tax paying productive group.

How can we justify placing an extra burden on the already overburdened group of taxpayers?

Mr. Singer: How did you justify it in 1951?

Mr. Carruthers: I ask the member for Downsview and the members of the Opposition if they can justify this, then stand up and tell us how they are going to raise the money.

Mr. Bryden: We have told you a million times.

Mr. Carruthers: You have not.

Mr. Speaker: Does the motion carry?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Just a moment.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Are we not going to have a vote?

An hon. member: That is a good idea.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Is that a unanimous vote?

An hon. member: Oh yes.

Mr. Bryden: If it would make the House leader feel better, we would be very happy to make it unanimous. On the basis that has already been outlined—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Is this a unanimous vote?

Mr. Speaker: There is no dissenting voice, so I declare the vote to be unanimous.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves second reading of Bill 106, an Act to amend The Agricultural Development Finance Act.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is on the principle of the bill or not, but perhaps the Minister might take a moment to tell us how this came to be The Agricultural Development Finance Act when it is associated with the rate of interest of the provincial savings office.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I wish I could do that. I did make certain inquiries from people, particularly senior officers of the department.

The story goes back in time quite a piece —I would say, Mr. Speaker, to the time when banks were first set up. As I understand it—and I will stand corrected—the banks were set up to provide a means of financing certain agricultural pursuits.

This does not seem to be an appropriate title for the Act, I agree, but it has been there for a long, long time. It goes back some 30 odd years, I do believe. I think generally speaking this was the initial purpose associated with the establishment of the bank.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves second reading of Bill 107, an Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, I wonder if the Provincial Treasurer could indicate to us if the various provisions incorporated in this amending bill have been discussed with the civil service association, and if so, if the association is in agreement with them?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that it is my understanding that they have and that these amendments are designed to improve certain inconsistencies in the present legislation, with respect to broadening the basis upon which past contributions can be paid into the public superannuation fund. This is my understanding, but again, I stand to be corrected.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, through you to the hon. member, that, when these amendments are proposed to me, I take it to some extent for granted that they have been cleared in this manner. If it is otherwise, then of course I shall have to make certain statements to the House, but it is my understanding they have been cleared at that level, as of course they should be.

I think they are all related to the bargaining process in general terms, so I accept these amendments that are proposed to me on that basis.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 23rd order; House in committee of supply; Mr. A. H. Cowling in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS (*Continued*)

On vote 2003:

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, on April 18, 1967, an article appeared in the *Telegram*—it also appeared in some other newspapers as well, but the one I am referring to appeared in the *Telegram*—and it was captioned: Came Out Too Soon. Two Judges Criticize Juvenile Releases.

It reported statements made by two juvenile court judges at the convention they had at Geneva Park. According to those two judges,

youngsters are returned to poor home environments from which they quickly run away. They are released too soon. To quote those statements:

> "Here in Ontario the overall general policy is to let them go after six, seven or eight months to make room, but some are not ready," he said.
>
> Brampton juvenile court judge H. D. G. Andrews agreed that some delinquents are released too soon and suggesed it was caused by some mistake of judgment. Lawyer Harold Stafford, MP, of Elgin, said a common complaint from training school graduates is that they did not learn anything while they were incarcerated.

May I have the Minister's comments on those statements?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I can give him any comment on this. This is a matter of opinion. If someone has given an opinion that the length of stay is too short, that is their opinion. The length of stay in the schools is based upon various factors and, in the opinion of our training schools advisory board and the other officials, these youngsters are put out on placement at the time when it appears advisable.

I do not know what else I could add to that. The hon. member is talking about opinion. Obviously, I could get other opinions on that as well, but what is the point of making that? Some will say their stay is too long and some will say their stay is too short. I do not know that I could give him any further opinion.

Mr. Ben: Is the average stay, as recited in the article, correct?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The average stay is reported on page 76 of the annual report. We have the average length of stay in school per pupil for each one of the schools running from 6.46 months to 12 months, as you can see on page 75.

Mr. Ben: If I may offer some other version of criticism. In the *Chatelaine* of March, 1967, Sheila Kieran wrote a most interesting article. She quoted some of the Minister's employees, and I will be reading from page 89 of this article.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I wonder if the hon. member would turn the microphone a little closer to himself.

Mr. Ben: I am sorry. For the Minister's guidance I will be reading from page 89:

> Taking a group of children who have committed a criminal offence, a good case can still be made for the view that training schools are society's dumping ground where we banish children we don't know how to cope with. At the Ontario training school in Guelph Dr. Frank Blum, the staff psychologist, and Mrs. Grace Wannan—I hope that is the proper pronunciation—until recently the staff social worker, last year rated 46 inmates then in the institution on a scale they had informally worked out together.
>
> Dr. Blum and Mrs. Wannan didn't always agree with each other's assessments but their findings are worth noting. Approximately 14 per cent of the children were rated as social and cultural delinquents who were not disturbed; 47 per cent were marked as unsocialized and psychopathic; 24 per cent, including children who had been sent from mental hospitals as being too aggressive for safety, rated as disturbed and not belonging in a training school.
>
> The rest were regarded either as immature or lacking ability, of low intelligence, brain damaged, perceptually handicapped or a combination of these. Thus of the total 46, only six or seven youngsters were delinquent.

Is this an accurate analysis of the conditions at this particular training school, that only six or seven children out of 46 were delinquent and all the rest were in some manner or other ill? Is it true that you are sending to this institution, children which the mental hospitals will not accept as being, as they put it here, "too aggressive for safety"?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, in the first place, the hon. member is referring to an article written by someone. I do not know anything about that someone—

Mr. Ben: The article, if I may—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have the article, written by a person who is well known within the inner circles of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Ben: That is new to me.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it has some bearing on it, because certain comments were made which have come to my attention and which, I think, were not those of someone designed to be considered a dedicated and objective writer.

Mr. Ben: If I may, do you consider everybody who questions you to be a questionable character?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say there was anything questionable about the person's character.

Mr. Ben: That is the implication, that is the implication.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I say if you are going to document a case, you should make sure you are documenting it by someone who has written that document with an impartial view to doing a good and effective job just on that article.

Mr. Ben: And you are implying that this was not an impartial view?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I am. I am not implying that, I am saying that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister prepared to point out the errors?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I am, and I am going to.

Juvenile and family court judges dealing with problem children all the time send a small percentage of those who come before them to training school, usually as a last resort, and after many other things have been tried.

I do not know how Miss Kieran or anyone else can tell, at a glance, that that youngster should not be there. Using the term that "some of the judges are using the training schools as a dumping ground" or "society is using the training schools as a dumping ground for these children," that is beyond our scope, beyond our control.

We have to take into a training school, anyone on whose behalf application is made by a juvenile or family court judge. So this is beyond our control. I might say, too, that Dr. Blum denies making any statement concerning youngsters not belonging in a training school, and, in fact, denied this to the editor before the article was published.

Mr. Chairman: Just before the member proceeds, I wonder, from the standpoint of procedure, whether it would be helpful in our discussions if we stayed with the juvenile schools now that we have started them and then later on, if you want to discuss the senior adult institutions, we could deal with those separately. Rather than going from the juvenile to the adult institutions we should stay with one particular group and then deal with the other. Would this be agreeable to the member?

Mr. Ben: I am quite prepared to do that.

Would the Minister please refer me to the statement in the article which states that the doctor said these children were not supposed to be in a training school?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I thought the hon. member had quoted that. I will repeat it: "Dr. Blum and Mrs. Grace Wannan did not always agree with each other's assessment but their findings are worth noting," and he quotes their findings. Further down in that quotation, within that quotation the statement is made: "24 per cent, including children who had been sent from mental hospitals as being too aggressive for safety, rated as disturbed and not belonging in a training school. The rest were regarded as either immature or lacking in ability," and so on and on, "Thus of the total 46 only 6 or 7 youngsters were delinquent."

This quotation Dr. Blum, as I said, denies having made and having advised the editor of the publication before this appeared in print, and it still appeared in print.

Mr. Ben: There are a few other statements following the particular paragraph I just read:

> A refuse heap. Many people with experience in training schools believe that many, if not most, children in these schools should be getting other kinds of community care. Donald Sinclair, former assistant to the chairman of the training schools advisory board of Ontario, believes that the number may be as high as 60 per cent.
>
> Training schools, it should be pointed out, do not dash about eagerly combing the countryside for kids to incarcerate, but, in many provinces, these schools are the institution, sometimes the only institution, that cannot refuse children committed to them. This, one superintendent says bitterly, makes us a refuse heap for kids for whom proper resources don't exist." Small wonder we are often unable to do the best thing for them. Quebec is one province where training schools are not under such an obligation.
>
> School directors may refuse a child, usually one whose low intelligence, or degree of disturbance makes him unsuitable for a school programme, and it is up to the courts to find a proper place for him.

The implication here is that you are accepting these children of low intelligence quotient, that you know you cannot do anything for, and that you are throwing them in with the children there who do need diagnostic services and comprehensive assistance, thereby handicapping the ones that can be helped. Is that

so or is it not so? Does the hon. Minister deny this statement too?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member asking me whether these children, who in the view of some, do not belong in training schools, are in fact going into training schools?

Mr. Ben: I am asking the Minister, is this a fact; is it or is it not a fact that he is using training schools as sort of a refuse heap and taking everyone into these schools regardless of whether anything can be done for them or not—people who are mentally ill, people who have a very low IQ quotient, people who are in other ways mentally disturbed?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had pointed that out in my earlier statement, that it is beyond our control to determine those who come to our schools. When a judge sends a child to our school, we are obliged by law to accept him, so it does not make any difference what the condition of the youngster is.

We are not in a position to make that decision. There are youngsters who are sent to our schools whom we do not think belong in our schools, of course.

Mr. Ben: Since when has the judge been specifying which particular school the child is to go to?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The judge does not do that.

Mr. Ben: Well, then, let us make that clear. The hon. Minister is the one who groups them in this fashion. He is the one who could separate them but he does not. The judges merely determine whether or not a child shall go to a training school, but not which training school.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is correct.

Mr. Ben: All right, so why is the Minister trying to pass the buck?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not trying to pass the buck. I thought the hon. member was making the point that we had youngsters in our training schools who did not belong in training schools, in his view. We classify them in accordance with the classification system which has proven to be very effective.

Mr. Ben: Which puts mentally ill children who are overly aggressive in with children who are capable of reformation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If a child is mentally ill and mentally certifiable, he should not be in our training school, and when we find such a child we make application for certification to a mental institution. We do not want to keep youngsters who are mentally certifiable. And where that occurs, we do have them certified.

Mr. Ben: Where are they sent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We make application to The Department of Health for certification of this youngster and they deal with him as they see fit.

Mr. Ben: How do they deal with them as they see fit? After all, the court sends them to you. Where do those children go after they have been certified as mentally ill? They are still your responsibility under the court order. Where do you send those children?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know what the hon. member would expect us to do. If the youngster, in the view of our psychiatrists, should be certified and they so certify, they are sent to The Department of Health, on application, and they are looked after by The Department of Health.

Mr. Ben: How do you know? You do not even know where they are sent. You just slough off your responsibility like that by saying it falls within another Minister's department. Under the court order, they are your responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we are not qualified to look after youngsters who are mentally certifiable. The Department of Health is the department which is charged by the people of this province, with the institutions and the treatment centres, to look after those who are mentally certified. It becomes their responsibility, of course it does.

With respect to Quebec, let me tell the hon. member, he read that part which stated, "Quebec is one province where training schools are not under such an obligation. School directors may refuse a child."

I have been to Quebec, I have followed this system through, and I can tell the hon. member that it would be a lot easier for the training school system of this province if we had that right, if we had that authority, but it would not be any good for the children.

What happens, in fact, is that youngsters are sent from school to school; the files are sent; the superintendent refuses to accept that youngster; he can say "my programme is not for them," and I have seen where some of those youngsters wind up. I would not condone that in the system here in Ontario and

I am sure the hon. member would not either, because they are just shunted from school to school and the superintendent, having the right to refuse them, obviously will pick the ones he thinks are going to be more easily handled by that school.

Mr. Ben: Oh, but wait a minute, that is not the solution, Mr. Chairman, nor is it, in fact, an answer because the Minister could very well set up an institution that would be charged with handling the incorrigibles and these problem children from the other institutions.

In other words, they do not have to reject them completely; they could still set aside one institution that could handle these very difficult emotional problems. Furthermore, I am curious to know, Mr. Chairman, how these children, who are mentally certifiable, get into the Minister's department when we are supposed to have such an enlightened procedure down in the family court.

Did they not know that this child was mentally certifiable before they sent him to a training school?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In some cases, Mr. Chairman, it is not apparent at first, and when we have them in the system it is discovered that this is the case. However, the hon. member is merely going into this whole debate, which has been gone through during the estimates of The Department of Health, and which, through the white paper, the programme outlined in the white paper, and the diagnostic and assessment centre which is going to be set up, means that all of these youngsters will go through a diagnostic and assessment centre.

Those who are to go to a training school will be sent to a training school. Then we will be in a better position to know which type of setting to put them in than we do at present and many of them, presumably, will not even be sent to a training school. But this was the crux of the whole debate on the Minister's white paper.

We do have various settings. The hon. member is under the impression that we just put youngsters into any school at all, without any classification programme, and he is entirely mistaken. We have different programmes in each one of the schools and the youngsters are sent where it appears most likely that there will be greater success with them.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, continuously when members of the Opposition get up to criticize the operations of the Minister's department, he calls us two-week wonders, our statements are always questioned.

If we state that some inmate made such and such statements, he disposes of those immediately by saying, "Well, who are you going to believe? Are you going to believe the inmate or are you going to believe the officers?" Now we come with an article that is written in a most responsible magazine, that was commissioned by the magazine, and the first thing the Minister does is get up and attack the author.

She is supposed to be a Liberal this time. The next article that comes out will probably be written by a New Democrat, and he is going to question that particular article because it was written by somebody of a political faith other than his own.

Here are some more statements, Mr. Chairman, if we can discuss the training schools under this particular section.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, may I just ask the hon. member a question before he proceeds? I want to understand on what basis he would like this debate to be carried on. If the hon. member is suggesting that any time he gets up and makes some statement, or asks a question, that I should merely agree with him, then there is no point in it. Of course, I want to give him our side of a story which may not be complimentary of our system.

Mr. Ben: That is exactly what I am asking the Minister to do. It is the last thing in the world I would expect, to have the Minister agree with us.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I mean, what sort of rules of debate does the hon. member want?

Mr. Ben: I want to hear the Minister's answers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have given you the answers and you suggest that every time you get up, I say you are wrong. Where I think you are basing your information on the wrong information, I think it is my duty to say yes.

Mr. Ben: Oh, no, no. I think the members of the Opposition have learned something. We have learned that you do not have a special school set aside to deal with certain elements; that you do find children who are mentally certifiable in your system. We have discovered that the juvenile court system is not what it is made up to be; that children who should obviously have been spotted as

being certifiable—not just mentally ill, but certifiable—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say that.

Mr. Ben: The fact is they are getting into your institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say that they were obviously certifiable. I made the statement that no matter how fine a system is, there are some who will slip through; there are some who do get into our system and after being there for a while, it becomes obvious that they should be certified.

I do not want to be put in the position, Mr. Chairman, of criticizing the juvenile and family court judges because they are just human beings too. I suppose if they had a battery of psychiatrists in the court, even at that time, some of these youngsters might slip through because, at that time, it may not develop, it may not appear that they should be certified mentally. I do not want to be put in the position of criticizing the court.

I should point out, too, that the article from which the hon. member is reading is supposed to be a criticism of the system across Canada and it is entitled "The Scandal of Canada's Child Prisoners," which, in the first place, is a terrible title and, in the second place, gives the impression that she has studied the whole system across Canada, but, in fact, gears itself in the odd little place with quite a needle for the Ontario system, which is the best in the whole of the country. Everyone agrees to that.

Mr. Ben: I am glad to find that everybody all across the country agrees with that, which means that this counts us as being anybody.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Ontario system is the best in the country.

Mr. Ben: All right. Again the Minister brags how good his schools are. To quote from this article just a little further along, so the Minister will be able to follow it:

> Without question, the most appalling training school I saw was the one for boys at Guelph, Ontario. It is a maximum security institution designed for boys who have repeatedly run away or flaunted discipline in other Ontario training schools. The building, only about ten years old, is ugly and forbidding. The first sight for visitors is a posted sign with a list of prescribed items which may not be given to inmates, including candy and soft drinks.

Well, frankly, I do not know why she bothered to mention the sign proscribing candy and soft drinks. I proscribe the giving of candies and soft drinks to my own youngsters by visitors and I cannot see why you should not do it.

> Inside the boys live in a row of tiny cells and wear tan dungaree uniforms. There is an "educational programme." much of which I found inadequate. While the schoolrooms are bright and modern, the workshops are cramped and ill-lighted. I saw four illiterate boys who were in what I was told was an occupational therapy class, which seemed to consist of using paint by number and mozaic sets. Several of the boys were scrubbing floors—hardly an educational occupation—and three of them had been locked in unlighted cells because the carpentry teacher was absent. No one apparently had thought of turning on the central light switch or giving them anything else to do.

Would the Minister comment on those statements?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, if we could do away with the building referred to by the writer of this article, and put these youngsters in the open dormitories of Cold Springs forestry camp, I would be most delighted. We all would be, sir. We cannot, because Guelph training school is an unfortunate necessity which other provinces and the federal government have had to make use of. They have made use of this because it is a particular institution for most difficult youngsters, and unfortunately is necessary. It would be wonderful if we could put them outside in open forestry camps.

A similar facility in Quebec, incidentally, which the writer thinks so highly of, is a fantastic maximum security institution which we would not even use for our adults. The hon. member must know that. He must know that Guelph is, in fact, if you want to put it that way, a maximum security institution for youngsters—for those that are so difficult to handle that you could not leave them in other training schools.

If he thinks we can get along without that, then he is living in a dream world. It is difficult also, Mr. Chairman, to argue with a journalistic ten minute evaluation of the educational programme, which is all it was. It was a ten minute evaluation of our educational programme.

However, people with considerable competence in this area—school inspectors, an in-

spector of diversified occupations, an inspector from The Department of Education, and a vocational inspector—indicated that they were extremely pleased with the programme. They commented on the high calibre of the teachers and instructors and their extreme dedication. The illiterate boys the writer refers to were not illiterate boys, but boys of low ability in a crafts class, doing such things as leather work, copper tooling, aluminum etching, painting by numbers and so on. A class directed to those unable to take up vocational training because of low ability.

The hon. member wishes me to give him the rundown of those people who are in the institution—the professional staff and what they are engaged in. I would be glad to read—

Mr. Ben: I did not want that, but if I may, on this point, Mr. Chairman, can I not go back to the previous statement attributed to Dr. Blum? The Minister made a statement that Dr. Blum had not made the statement imputed to him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Ben: But is the statement which is imputed to him correct or incorrect, now that we have got to the point that Guelph is a maximum security institution for delinquent boys? Could these statements now be true, whether or not Dr. Blum made them, namely 14 per cent were "social and cultural delinquents," who were not disturbed? Twenty-four per cent were marked as "unsocialized and psychopathic." Four per cent—including children who had been sent by mental hospitals as being too aggressive for safety—rated "disturbed" and the rest were either "immature" or "lacking in ability", of low intelligence, brain damage, perceptually handicapped, or a combination of these.

So we accept these figures, whether or not he admits making the statement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the figures here with me. I am not too sure that we have them at all, so I cannot give him a comment as to whether that statement is correct. I would doubt very much if what was attributed to him is in fact correct.

Mr. Ben: Where would these figures come from, Mr. Chairman? After all, the Minister has admitted that he has got problem children here, and I applaud the Minister that an institution is set aside for these problem children. The Minister could have got up in the first instance, when I raised this point, and said, "Well we have Galt training school and this is where we send these children," and fine, I would—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we are confusing Galt and Guelph.

Mr. Ben: I am sorry, Guelph.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the first instance, I think—

Mr. Ben: It is Guelph we are discussing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it should also be pointed out when the hon. member refers to problem children, all of our children are problem children.

Mr. Ben: Oh yes, but not the most difficult problems.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know. The hon. member quoted an article in which percentages were supposed to have been stated by someone in our department, and that person in our department, Dr. Blum, states he made no such statement. So I merely cleared that up. Surely this is what the hon. member would want me to do? He has asked me if these figures are correct. At the moment I am not in the position to say whether that is true or not.

Mr. Ben: I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister had the article before him. He had answers to certain criticisms in that article. The answers he gave, sir, were that Dr. Blum did not make the statements he is alleged to have made. Why should he not have at his fingertips the accurate figures then? Obviously one or other of the members of the Opposition were going to ask what the exact figures are, especially when it relates to children coming from mental institutions, and how many children have come to Guelph from mental institutions in the last—I was going to say fiscal year—but the last reporting year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would not imagine that any youngsters come from a mental institution to Guelph; it would be the other way around, youngsters from Guelph would be going to mental institutions. Presumably there would be nobody coming into our department from mental institutions.

Perhaps this might help clarify it. I have a memo here from Dr. Blum to the superintendent:

> Thus of the total 46 only six or seven youngsters were delinquent.

This is quoting from the Kieran article, and he states:

> This is nonsense. It implies that the concept "delinquent" has a specific meaning. A "to-be-able-to-point-at quality" which is obviously not so. If by "delinquent" she meant the everyday conception of the young, tough, healthy and rational criminal at the beginning of his criminal career, she was correct. We find as do people in other countries, that the healthy, young, rational criminal has been replaced by the mixed-up young offender.

Now, if we want to get into a great philosophical discussion—

Mr. Ben: Would the Minister please read that point leading up to the part "then she was correct". May I have that part again?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: "If by delinquent she meant the everyday conception of the young, healthy and rational criminal at the beginning of his criminal career, she was correct."

Mr. Ben: What other type would she be writing about when she is writing in a magazine like *Chatelaine* which goes to people 99 per cent of whom would have no other concept except that which is accepted on the street?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I do not know, but if this writer is as able and as desirous of doing a qualified job of research she was supposed to have done in writing this article, then she would appreciate the fact, as the hon. member says, that while most people would consider all of the youngsters in our institutions or in our training schools delinquent, they certainly are not delinquent. I would say a vast majorty of them, or a very large proportion of them, are not delinquent by these standards.

Mr. Ben: Nobody has said that all the Minister's charges are delinquent. As a matter of fact, we are trying to get away from the use of the word delinquent in relation to his charges.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do not use it at all.

Mr. Ben: The Minister has admitted that in ordinary usage, and I point out that this magazine is for common consumption—not for consumption of those in a profession, that is the common definition or common concept of a delinquent, so the figures in that regard are accurate.

An hon. member: It is 5 o'clock, Mr. Chairman, this is the private members' hour.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think we have speakers to take up the complete time. We can carry on a few minutes yet.

Mr. Ben: Now, if I may continue:

> Two girls' institutions in Ontario at Lindsay and Port Bolster were also dreadful although in a more subtle way. Lindsay is designed for brighter girls and the classroom utilities are airy and modern. The building, though only six years old, comes complete with the long corridors, cold terrazzo floors and the ugliness that characterizes bureaucratic architecture. The girls wear the uniform so dear to the hearts of The Department of Reform Institutions and so demoralizing for kids who have little enough identity to start with.
>
> Port Bolster is a tiny institution near to, and administered by, Lindsay and carries some of its less attractive features. The building is small and designed in theory for deprived girls who can make good use of a home setting.

Apparently the department imagines that children wear uniforms at home, the way they do at Port Bolster.

> The rooms of the seven inmates are neat —in the way that motel rooms are neat. As in many, but not all Ontario schools, the children are forbidden to hang things on the wall; the rooms are as bereft of any personal touch—aside from a few objects placed with military neatness on side tables—as if they were occupied by ghosts. I can only guess at how demoralizing this restriction —designed to protect the walls and not the girls—is to youngsters who have so little of their own and so many of whom already lack an adequate sense of self—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, what is the objection the hon. member has to some of these things?

Mr. Ben: Well, the girl states that Port Bolster is supposed to be for girls who have been deprived of things. She says you give them a uniform, and they are supposed to be in a home setting, a cottage type setting.

They cannot hang pictures on the wall; where does the home setting come in if you cannot even hang pictures on the wall? The article mentions, if we go on further that there is one institution there where they are permitted to hang things on the wall. I think it is in Galt where they are permitted to hang things. The children sleep in locked

cells at night but during the day the doors are open showing the tiny cells and their brightly decorated walls. Robert Vaughn and David McCallum the men from U.N.C.L.E. were distinct favourites as pin-ups.

In one institution you permit them to decorate their walls with pin-ups so why not in Port Bolster? Is there some psychological or psychiatric reason for this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are all sorts of reasons, Mr. Chairman. In some instances the youngsters have decided they do not want them. In some instances the youngsters decide they want them. In some institutions some of the youngsters have objected because of the way others have been taping up the walls and so on.

There is no special rule for this. Generally speaking I have yet to see an institution—and I have visited them all of course—I cannot recall any institution or training school, in which there were not pictures on the walls. They have all sorts of pictures on the walls. There is some trouble sometimes where, for a period of time for some particular reason, they decide: "Now, look, if this keeps on you are not going to have any pictures for a while," but there is no policy.

I think the question the hon. member raises about the clothing, which he read in here, concerns me a little bit more than the others because the others really do not have much basis in fact.

It is a difficult problem to struggle with in our institutions. Except where it refers to Port Bolster, this reference to uniforms, overstated though it is, is possibly the most valid point made in the article. Even though there are many good arguments in favour of a uniform type of clothing as is worn in many high schools throughout this province, we have made a great deal of progress in providing youngsters with individual clothing. We are attempting to do this.

To start with, all youngsters in every school have clothes they have selected themselves to wear on weekends, on visits, when they go home on vacation at Christmas or Easter or during the summer. At Port Bolster, in school, in the winter, the girls may wear coloured blouses—some they have made themselves, some they have bought at the big department stores. Over the blouses they wear different coloured jumpers—some they have made themselves, some are bought at the big department stores. In the summer they wear different coloured blouses and skirts, some of which they made and some of which are bought at the big department stores.

The hon. member wants me to go into this. It is very detailed, Mr. Chairman. We have a problem in logistics, in the manner of getting individual clothing cleaned and going back to the individual youngster. This is, as I say, a problem which we have been concerning ourselves with over a great number of years.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, the admission by the hon. Minister that there is at least one valid criticism in this article leaves me so speechless that I am going to sit down and yield to some of my colleagues.

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth) moves second reading of Bill 18, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview) moves second reading of Bill 10, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Mr. Ewen: Mr. Speaker, in moving Bill 18, standing in my name on the order paper which has just been read, I would like to say this at the offset: with my experience on the youth committee and having had the opportunity of visiting several provinces in this country, and a few of the states. I have had an opportunity to talk to a great many of department heads of different states and provinces, and also to doctors and insurance adjusters, with respect to the injuries of young people driving these motorcycles.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, at this time, spring has arrived. At long last we are witnessing the return on our highways and streets of the motorcyclists. To the already heavy toll of automobile fatalities and injuries we add those of the motorcycling public. For the year 1965 and 1966, Mr. Speaker, the statistics on motorcyclists killed and injured were as follows:

Registrations in 1965 were 19,350. In 1966, 38,000—an increase of 196 per cent.

Killed were 32 in 1965, and in 1966, 62; a 194 per cent increase.

Injured, in 1966, were 3,589.

The statistics indicate that one vehicle in ten is involved in an accident and that one accident out of every 60 results in a death.

Put another way, it means that there is one cyclist killed every six days, while ten suffer injuries each and every day of the year.

These figures, Mr. Speaker, are regarded as very serious indeed. They show that the increase in dead and injured has risen alarmingly in proportion to the number of vehicles registered. Thus, if registrations go up this year, as they are bound to do, we must be prepared for a similar increase in the slaughter.

The encouraging fact is, Mr. Speaker, that ample evidence exists now to prove that we do not need to sit here and watch this toll of dead and injured increase in direct proportion to the increase in vehicle registration for another season. I intend to read into the record today, the evidence to prove conclusively that, by making the wearing of safety helmets by motorcyclists mandatory, we can reduce the proportion of dead and injured, we can save young lives, and that we can prevent injuries this year simply by a piece of legislation one sentence in length.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to read into the record the following letter from the superintendent of motor vehicles of the province of British Columbia, a Mr. R. A. Hadfield:

> This is to acknowledge your letter of December 1966. The following is the wording of section 207 of The Motor Vehicles Act in this province. This section came into effect on July 1, 1965: "No person shall ride on a motorcycle unless he is properly wearing a safety helmet of a type approved by the superintendent."
>
> Our experience since the effective date of the legislation leads us to believe that it has been effective in reducing the number of fatalities as a result of motorcycle accidents. I am attaching a statistical summary of motorcycle accidents for the first ten months of 1966 which shows a comparison for the first ten months of 1965.
>
> We have reason to believe that many injuries have been reduced from the serious category to a minor category as a result of head protection. The implementation of this legislation was not without some opposition from persons who felt it was an infringement upon their liberty. However, the attitude of the government has been that the overall gains are certainly worthwhile. There has been plenty of evidence of the saving of lives. Public opinion grows stronger as time goes on in favour of this legislation. The level of compliance has been extremely high and it is certainly very doubtful that there will ever be a reversal of the helmet law.
>
> You may be aware that the Canadian standards association is working on a Canadian motorcycle helmet standard. It is hoped that this will be ready for adoption by the middle of this year. When that has been achieved, a big step will have been taken in reducing the probability that inferior helmets will be offered for sale. It may be that the governments which are sitting on the fence about this law will be prepared to move towards a similar position to that in British Columbia, with the assurance that there will be a good market supply of helmets to an approved standard.
>
> *(Signed)*
> R. A. HADFIELD,
> *Superintendent of Motor Vehicles.*

Now Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to the record some of the statistics which were enclosed with Mr. Hadfield's letter. Please bear in mind that the legislation did not come into effect until July 1, 1965. Let us therefore, consider the periods for the first six months, for example:

Accidents in 1965 were 332. In the same period in 1966, they were 307—a decrease of seven per cent.

Killed in 1965, were ten and, in 1966, nine —a decrease of ten per cent.

Injuries were 330 in 1965 and 288 in 1966 —a decrease of 12 per cent.

As far as I can determine, Mr. Speaker, these are total figures, not related to the registration figures. Unfortunately I do not have the registration figures for B.C., but it is reasonable to assume a sizeable increase in the number of motorcycles on the road in 1966 over those of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the necessity of raising this matter today. In most of the areas discussed in this House, our province bears favourable comparison with any other jurisdiction on this continent. Unfortunately the same cannot be said in respect to highway safety and this matter of motorcycles in particular.

I do feel most sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that we should not rest until we have assurance

from the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) that an amendment to our Highway Traffic Act, similar to that of British Columbia, will be placed on our statute books before this session is prorogued.

The argument that such legislation impinges on the individual's freedom or civil liberties is simply unacceptable. It is comparable to saying that the fire brigade has no right to come into my home or my apartment to put out a fire.

We have all seen how safety helmets have gained total acceptance by everyone in the construction industry, and how—by means of The Department of Labour's effective advertising campaign—the wearing of safety helmets has become a mark of the professionalism of those involved.

As with the construction industry, there is almost unanimous agreement among the medical profession, insurance companies, motorcycle manufacturers, the Ontario motor league, as well as the Hamilton automobile association, of the urgent need for helmets for motorcyclists and passengers on motorcycles.

Incidentally, while I am mentioning the Hamilton motor league, I have a letter here addressed to me on March 18:

> At our legal committee meeting—chairman the hon. Russell W. Treleaven—on March 14, we reviewed Bills 10 and 18 dealing with motorcycle operation.

and then it goes on:

> Bills 10 and 18 state that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make regulations describing the type and specifications of helmets worn by motorcycle drivers and passengers. We are not sure whether this creates a situation of *caveat emptor*—

—that is a legal term, but for the layman I would imagine it is "let the purchaser beware" and he goes on to say:

> —which would impose on the purchaser of helmets the need to determine whether or not they met the regulations laid down by the government. For example, under section 34 of regulation 227, HTA regulations, it specified that seat belts could not be sold in Ontario or offered for sale in Ontario, unless the belt conforms with the standards of performance set out by the schedule and bearing the mark SAE J-40 or a CSA monogram. We sincerely hope that the same provisions will be made to prevent the sale of motorcycle helmets which do not meet prescribed government standards and specifications.

I might also add that there is a bill before the Indiana Legislature at the moment, which will make it unlawful to sell, or offer for sale, protective face and head equipment for motorcycle operators, not approved by the commission. Failure to comply with this will result in a fine of $25 to $200 or imprisonment for five days to 30 days. That was written by Alfred Holtby, the managing director of the Hamilton automobile club.

Other jurisdictions where the wearing of such helmets are mandatory are Manitoba, Nova Scotia, New York, California, Connecticut and Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, another argument which has been put forward against compulsory use of safety helmets is that in the city of Toronto, for instance, about 70 per cent of accidents involving motorcycles and automobiles have been the fault of the automobile driver.

Mr. Hugh Bacque, of the Bacque Adams Insurance Agency, who concentrates on motorcycle insurance, tells me that in many of the cases the driver of the automobile fails to see the motorcyclist. Mr. Bacque is convinced that the use of a brightly coloured helmet, with reflecting tape for good visibility at night, would be a big help in overcoming these particular problems. In other words, not only would helmets reduce the numbers killed and seriously injured, it would also reduce the number of accidents.

Other arguments are concerned with the helmets themselves. We do not yet have approved standards, although the specifications for one are being developed. In my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, any helmet is better than none at all, and this argument is simply another red herring thrown across the path—another excuse for inactivity in this vital area.

In a way I mention this statement with my tongue in my cheek, because just recently I have run across a couple of situations in my own area, where a young lady bought a helmet and it fell off the motor bike and cracked in half.

There was another young lad killed the other day in the city of Hamilton, where the helmet did break and cut his jugular vein, and I believe the cause of his death was that he bled to death. So it is very important we do have a helmet that will meet standards.

Of course, when you get into the helmets, they run into all kinds of prices. For example, my own boy bought one and the list price on it was $50—a friend of mine was selling them and he let me have it at his cost, which was $25. So there is a nice cushion there

and somebody, I think, is abusing the privilege there.

Frank Tumpane has written in his column of April 7:

> When a motorcyclist does get into a crash the odds are that his head will take the impact, and it is obvious to any layman —an observation confirmed by the experts —that a helmet will reduce the possibility of serious injury. But Ontario still permits motorcyclists to drive around in their bare heads.

Let us assume for a moment, that all motorcyclists and motorcycle passengers in Ontario were required to wear protective helmets, how effective would these be in saving lives? An Australian study concluded that the risk of fatality of motorcyclists in accidents is reduced, by wearing a helmet, to about one-third of the risk without the helmet. We must assume that Australian motorcycle accidents do not vary substantially from those in Ontario and that the same result would apply in the province of Ontario.

If, therefore, the House had required all motorcyclists and passengers to wear protective helmets in 1966, it can be argued that the passage of this law might have meant a saving of 40 lives in the first eleven months of last year. The evidence on every hand would strongly support the effectiveness of protective helmets and one cannot help but wonder why motorcyclists themselves do not choose to wear them.

While much can be said against compulsory wearing of protective helmets, I urge the House to consider the following facts when evaluating the matter.

The first fact is that motorcycle registrations continue to increase. The number of motorcycles increased in Ontario by 14,000 in 1966. If this increase continues in 1967, we can expect a total of 50,000 motorcycles in this province by the end of the year. And I might add, while I see the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree) here, in discussing this with the dealers who sell these bikes and talking to many students who have already purchased one, that the Minister ask—oh, he is not in the House but I hope he reads this—what happens with these kids, does he suggest they buy a car?

The first argument they give you is that they can get insurance for $50 on a motorcycle where the average for a car, the least he would pay, would be $300—and $300 to a young student going to school, is a lot of money. They are just not buying the cars, they are buying the motorcycles and the dealers just cannot keep up with it. So we mentioned about 50,000 and we are not exaggerating one bit.

The second fact in motorcycle fatalities is their increase at an even faster rate of registration. They almost doubled in the first eleven months of 1966, with a total of 61 compared to 32 in the corresponding period of 1965. By projecting these figures, we could reasonably expect fatalities due to motorcycle accidents in 1967, will reach over 100. We are no longer talking about 40 lives that might have been saved in 1966 if helmets were worn by all motorcyclists.

We are talking about more than sixty young men and women who will die in Ontario this year unless something is done about it. Reiterating a third fact, is that many other jurisdictions have already enacted or are considering legislation that would require motorcyclists to wear safety helmets—Alberta, British Columbia and Nova Scotia require helmets as well as New York city, Michigan and Georgia. I do not know if their record is any better than ours.

The fourth fact is that the standards for safety helmets have already been established by the British standards institution and by the American standards association. The research has been carried out and I suggest the adoption of these standards could be done as readily as the recent adoption of the B1 standards by Ontario.

I therefore urge the House to support this bill and, in so doing, take a major step forward in helping to prevent the deaths on streets and highways of Ontario.

There is another unsatisfactory aspect of the situation concerning motorcyclists, and this involves their licensing. At present, all applicants must pass a written test similar to automobile drivers. This test deals with rules of the road, and so on.

Having passed this test, the applicant is then given an appointment for a practical driver's test—usually two or three weeks hence. On that day he is issued with a one-day permit—a permit which allows him to drive to the test area only, and he must be accompanied by a qualified motorcycle driver, either in a car or riding on the rear seat.

I understand this is not the case really—the Act reads this way—he can make a phone call and drive his own bike down there, and it is a bit ridiculous when a kid does not have the opportunity. I go on to say here, Mr. Speaker, how is the applicant expected to learn to handle the bike? He cannot practice

except on the date of the test. Surely this is ridiculous.

Temporary licences must be issued so that applicants can practice legally. I realize this is a dangerous period, but the hazards can be reduced by insisting that each learner-vehicle must carry a large white sign, front and back, with the letter "L" for learner inscribed upon it. This practice is followed in England for both cars and motorcycles, and it is a good one.

It is also true that the temporary licence must be issued for a limited period, and be not renewable after, say, two test failures.

Also, I see no reason why suitable training courses cannot be organized for young motorcycle drivers, similar to our school-sponsored car driver education courses.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have ridden motorcycles know the enjoyment they bring on a lovely spring or summer day, the sense of power and freedom and speed not possible in a car. It is invigorating and fun.

However, the motorcycle, itself, provides no real protection to the driver or passenger, and consequently almost every accident spells injury or death. The proportion of motorcycle accidents is actually lower than that of automobile accidents but unfortunately almost every motorcycle accident produces serious injury or death.

The need to take effective action now to reduce these figures to the absolute minimum, seems to me most obvious and urgent.

For that reason, I hope the hon. Minister of highways will be able to introduce legislation along the lines I have suggested, so that it may be enacted into law before this session prorogues.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I am sure we welcome the support which has just been given to the passage of legislation by this House, to make safety helmets mandatory. This is something that has been talked about time after time here, and we hope, now that the member of the government party has put his full weight behind it, he will be able to persuade the Minister and the Cabinet that he is talking sense.

The member has given us a pretty full and comprehensive report on the need for safety helmets on the part of motorcycle riders. There seems to be very little left that one can say. He has pointed out the skyrocketing death rate and accident rate in this province due to the use of these small machines. He has pointed out the way in which motorcycles are increasing in number, and will increase over the days ahead, and I would like for a moment to refer to a report which has been recently put out, in October, 1966, by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It is called "Motorcycles in the United States".

That report points out that death rates per 100,000 registered motorcycles are more than double the rates for other motor vehicles. This in itself points up the extreme danger in using motorcycles on the highways. No data is available on the mileage death rate for motorcycles which could be compared to the mileage death rates for other motor vehicles, but we know that this is very high. Most of the deaths were male—young men more than young women ride motorcycles. The ratio of male to female deaths is about nine to one and motorcycle deaths occur in large measure in the age group of 15 to 29.

The two causes, collision with another motor vehicle and non-collision traffic accidents are not the same. Collision with another motor vehicle accounts for 62 per cent while the non-collision traffic accidents makes up 32 per cent of the total. And the second one, of course, includes overturning and running off the roadway.

Statistics in several states indicate that about 80 to 90 per cent of all reported motorcycle accidents result in some type of injury to the rider.

Of course, this is a much higher percentage than motor car accidents because of the position of the rider or the driver, as the case may be. In the one case he has some protection, in the other he is pretty well exposed.

Experience in other countries, as well as United States and our own is that the head is most frequently involved in fatal motorcycle injuries.

These studies point out that many persons also receive multiple injuries; 50 per cent or more receive some type of injury to the head of all people injured in motorcycle accidents. But injuries to the lower extremities are less likely to have fatal results than are head injuries, and so the head injuries dominate as the important factor in serious injury and in death.

In reported motorcycle accidents in various states, it is found that about 90 per cent of the drivers of motorcycles are male, and nearly 70 per cent are between the ages of 16 and 24. Accidents occur most frequently in the daylight hours, on weekends, on dry roads and during summer months. This bears out what the hon. member has just said.

A young person who gets out on a motorcycle on the clear highway likes to feel that surge of power, and he likes to demonstrate something to people around him, or even to himself.

Reckless driving, failure to yield the right of way, following too closely and excessive speed were considered as circumstances contributing most to the accidents.

One study in the United States found that 20 per cent of the injured persons were riding the motorcycle for the first or second time, while 70 per cent had either rented or borrowed the motorcycle. These are new drivers, and again it points up the necessity for driver training. I have been very interested in visiting other jurisdictions to find that there are places where driver training is given precedence, where both private and public enterprise will set aside areas and build them up, put in the equipment, and then charge the young people a certain fee to teach them how to drive safely. This could very well be adopted by Ontario and I commend it to the Minister.

The British safety council has said that motorcyclists are 50 times more vulnerable to serious injury than are car drivers. Recent Australian studies which have just been referred to conclude that the risk of fatality to a motorcyclist in an accident is reduced by wearing a helmet to about one third of the risk without a helmet.

During World War II the British army had the same experience and they reported that it drastically reduced deaths and injuries to military motorcyclists by making the wearing of helmets compulsory.

Studies in Europe seem to indicate that motorcyclists have accidents more than twice as frequently during the first six months of riding experience than they do after gaining more experience. So it is the new people, and it is the people without the helmets who seem to be in greatest danger.

In this country, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia mandate safety helmets, as do several of the states south of the border. I have a list of them here, but some of them have already been mentioned and I do not need to repeat them.

But one of the big questions that has already been mentioned and which has been talked about on the other side of this House by one of the Ministers, is that we have no guarantee yet that safety helmets can do the job. There are no real standards for safety helmets, we were told some time ago. But those standards are now pretty well established. Safety standards for helmets have been developed by the British standards institute and by the Snell memorial foundation of California. New standards prepared by the American standards association were released on August 1, 1966, and all major domestic and foreign helmets manufactured in the United States are expected to certify that the helmets are meeting the ASA standards.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that safety standards are adequate now. We have, through the American standards association and these other organizations, evolved them. Mention has been made of some danger and that danger is seen when youngsters buy safety helmets which do not meet the standards. This is the great problem we face today. Because young people who buy motorcycles, will also buy safety helmets. But those safety helmets have no standards in this province. They may find, as one of the youngsters did, that those helmets are dangerous because they do not meet the standards which already have been laid down in other jurisdictions and which we now know about.

The way to make safety helmets safe, Mr. Speaker, is to mandate the standards and make sure that every one of the helmets sold in Ontario meets these standards.

In the bill I have introduced, there is a second part which deals with motorcyclists who ride between traffic lines and thereby constitute a danger. I have already spoken in the House on another occasion about the subject of this bill and I simply bring it to the House's attention that the bill would mandate that motorcycles would take their proper place in ordinary lines of traffic, except for the necessary passing and turning movements. No longer would motorcyclists be able to sneak up between lines of traffic, on the white lines, and get by and then swing in in front of motor cars and other traffic at that point.

This constitutes a danger on our city streets and a danger on our highways. The motorcyclist should take his place along with the motor car as the occupier of a lane of traffic, and he only moves out of that lane when he has to make the necessary turning or passing movements.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to adopt the principles of these two bills, that safety helmets be made mandatory in Ontario and that standards be set up, and that this matter of weaving in and out of traffic lanes and driving between traffic be looked at and that the motorcyclist be mandated in this. He

must take his place as a person who has to observe all traffic regulations.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, the bills introduced by the hon. members from Wentworth and from Yorkview certainly make abundant good sense. I was a little surprised at the member for Wentworth constantly referring to the hon. Minister of Highways in his appeal for Ministerial approval. Perhaps he knows something that I do not know, and that is that the hon. Minister of Highways has taken over The Department of Transport, in addition to his present obligation in The Department of Highways.

Mr. Young: Just in the fullness of time.

Mr. Singer: That may well be. This perhaps would be a good move because the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett), who in the past apparently has had responsibility for this, has completely ignored the responsibility. It may be the member for Wentworth knew far better than I where the appeal should lie.

An hon. member: Let George do it!

Mr. Singer: Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, and I am very surprised at this, the hon. Minister of Transport has not seen fit to sit in the House when this very important debate concerning what apparently is a part of his department has been going on. I guess Monday is not his day.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: This is important, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing in the rules that indicates that we cannot draw to the attention of a Cabinet Minister the fact that he should be here when a debate concerning his department is going on. I think the record should clearly show that this Minister is not interested enough to be here when this important debate concerning his department is going on.

Now over a year ago, sir—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): That is quite an assumption to make.

Mr. Singer: It may well be quite an assumption I make, and I make it with some substantial validity. I am sure if the Prime Minister wants to get into the debate he can in due course.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, but all I will say is this—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is out of order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I will speak to a point of order, then.

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister has a point of order.

Mr. Singer: Well, let us hear what his point of order is. If he would rise in that way instead as lord of the manor, it would be different.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: My point of order is simply this, that in discussing the attendance in this House, as the hon. member has done, and attributing a motive to any man who is not here, I think is a very dangerous practice for anybody. I do not attribute any motives as to why any member is or is not in his seat at any one time. I just say this is a very bad practice for the member to follow because as I say—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order at all.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is a point of order. It is a—

Mr. Singer: It is not a point of order at all!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now let the Speaker make his ruling.

Mr. Singer: It is not a point of order!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He will make his rules. I just think the hon. member is on very dangerous ground to sit there and attribute reasons why—

Mr. Singer: I am not sitting here, I am—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —any member of this House—

Mr. Singer: You have usurped my place here on a spurious point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I think that the Prime Minister's point of order is well taken. We are discussing now a bill—two bills—before the House. I do not think the time should be taken up to discuss other matters that do not pertain to those two bills. Therefore, I would think the member would be well advised to return to the principle contained within these two bills.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, surely when a particular piece of legislation is desired and that legislation comes under the supervision

or under the aegis and control of a particular Minister, it is a part of the importance of that debate to point out whether the particular Minister has interest or does not have interest in that.

Mr. Speaker: After having stated it—

Mr. Singer: All right, I have stated it. I should not be interrupted on spurious points of order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I think we should recall what the Minister of Transport had to say when this matter was raised a year ago. You recall, sir, you were here, and the Prime Minister was here. The Prime Minister is not interested in hearing what the Minister of Transport had to say. The Minister of Transport stood up in his place and he said: "You would not expect me to regulate people's dress, to tell women what kind of shoes they should wear. Why then should I tell people what kind of hats they should wear?" And that is in *Hansard*, that is part of the record, sir.

Therefore, I think it is most important that we observe very carefully the attitude of the Minister of Transport because if we pay any attention at all to the theory of responsibility of Cabinet Ministers, we must look to the words and the actions of the responsible Minister.

As I say, I was interested in finding out if the member for Wentworth has some preknowledge that I do not have, and perhaps if it is now the responsibility of the Minister of Highways we could be getting somewhere. But he has given no indication that it is his responsibility, so it must be of the other Minister.

I think it is high time that we began to look for reasonable safety measures in protecting motorcyclists. Those of us, sir, who, like you, served in the armed forces, will recognize the real danger that riding on motorcycles presented to the members of the Canadian forces. Those of us who were overseas will remember that we kept busy a couple of Canadian hospitals overseas and gave our nurses and doctors abundant practice in the care and treatment of those injured in motorcycle accidents.

I think the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) will perhaps know about this—that if the figures were ever calculated, we suffered more injuries from young men being injured and killed on motorcycles than perhaps we suffered from the enemy. It was fascinating to watch the training that was given to these young men, and the dangers of riding these motorcycles. As they became more enured to the danger, the risks and the recklessness, and after they had certain training and experiences—somewhat contrary to the figures the member for Yorkview brought forward—they were much more likely to become injured on the motorcycles than at the beginning.

At the beginning, the motorcycle is a pretty frightening thing. But after you get a little over-confident and over-cocky, the real danger of injuring yourself and injuring others becomes much more apparent.

There is hardly a day goes by when you cannot pick up the paper—today's paper, one of Toronto's afternoon papers read: **Death of motorcyclist boosts Metro toll to 53. Thomas Holmes, 18, of Dundas Street East, died Saturday of head injuries he received Friday when his motorcycle was struck by a car at Lakeshore Boulevard and Bay Street.**

Hardly a day goes by that you cannot pick up a paper and read of that sort of tragic death. One of the main reasons for it is head injuries, and it is because this government has not seen fit through its responsible Minister, to bring legislation before this House which will provide the obvious protection that is demanded and needed.

I am not going to cover the same ground that the member for Wentworth and the member for Yorkview did, suffice to say that there are standards that can be prescribed, and there are other jurisdictions which have prescribed this sort of protection and it is working satisfactorily. Surely if it is good enough for the Canadian army and for the police forces and for various other units of this kind of public service to prescribe that their people must wear crash helmets when they are on motorcycles, surely it is good enough, as a safety measure, for the government of the province of Ontario.

Surely the specious excuses of the Minister of Transport that he would not want to regulate people's dress are full of sound and fury and signify absolutely nothing. Surely the time has come when we must be concerned with the dangers to young people who we allow to drive the roads on motorcycles, and they have to be protected against what may be their own foolishness.

A motorcycle is a dangerous enough vehicle even with the best protection, with crash bars and with proper training and with helmets and so on. Without helmets, it is just an invitation to disaster and why the government resists is beyond me.

The Ontario motor league in submitting its brief, and I referred to this in the estimates of The Department of Transport, to the members of this Legislature in connection with several matters concerning the use of the highways and highway safety, dealt at some substantial length about the dangers inherent in the use of motorcycles. Let me read it, there is just a bit here under the submission on the first page of the section that deals with motorcycles:

> The league has become increasingly aware of the use of motorcycles and allied type vehicles on the highways of Ontario. We have obtained certain statistics from The Department of Transport with respect to the registration of such vehicles and their involvement in accidents in the province.

The member for Wentworth and the member for Yorkview have already made reference to these statistics. In 1964 there were 10,000-odd registrations; in 1965 24,000, an increase of 130 per cent in one year in registrations. They estimate that the registration could top 38,000 in 1966, another increase of better than 50 per cent for the year. So it is going up just at a fantastic rate. I think it was the member for Wentworth who talked about the low down payment and so on that was needed, and the appeal that the motorcycle has.

Well, in fatal accidents the increase concerning motorcycles went up 190.9 per cent from 1964 to 1965—more than doubled, almost tripled. Personal injury accidents from 798 up to 2,170, 171.9 per cent—almost tripled. Property damage accidents went up 224.1 per cent. Total number of accidents increased by 175 per cent. Number of motorcyclists killed in those two years, from 1964 to 1965, went up from 8 to 21, 162.5 per cent increase. Motorcyclists injured, from 735 up to 1,889, or an increase of 157 per cent. Passengers killed went from 3 to 11, and passengers injured from 173 to 476.

They go on to conclude, and their conclusion, sir, is obvious:

> The statistics adduced show a need for immediate legislative action to promote and require the safe operation of these vehicles for the protection not only of the motorcycle operator, but also for protection of other users of the road.

They go on to deal with a number of safety measures, including brakes and batteries and crash bars and seats and handlebars, riding training and provision of driver manuals and that sort of thing. One of the most obvious measures, one of the most obvious measures that lies within the immediate grasp of this government to bring a substantial increase in the amount of safety to these people who use motorcycles is the mandatory ordering of crash helmets for all drivers and passengers.

Just why the government is reluctant or afraid or concerned about doing it is one of the mysteries that lies in the Treasury benches. Just why the Minister of Transport, when he was here—in case anyone thinks I am attributing motives to him let them dismiss that thought from their mind—he stood in his place and said: "I did not want to regulate matters of personal dress." Even if it would save lives.

I think you have to add that. Those are not his words, those are mine—even if it would save lives. I think, sir, when the Minister stands in his place and says that, the time has come when somebody on those Treasury benches should take that Minister into the corner and talk a little sense into him. And if that does not work, then perhaps they should get another Minister. Maybe it will be the Minister of Highways who will take the necessary measures that are proper and meet to protect the people who are using motorcycles on the roads in Ontario.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport is very much interested in this subject as evidenced by the fact that he and senior members of his department provided some information to the hon. member for Wentworth whose remarks initiated this debate today. His absence here is in no way a reflection on his interest. It simply happens that he had a prior commitment and was not able to be in the Legislature during this hour, for the same reason, I suppose the leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) is not in here at the moment, and the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) was out a short while ago.

All of the members have obligations of one kind and another, and it happens that the Minister of Transport had a prior engagement at this time and cannot be here for that reason only.

I want to express a brief personal view about this—the essence of this bill which I know has very considerable merit. I have no doubt that we could, by passing strict legislation and by using strict enforcement, improve safety records of one kind or another. I have told the story in this House before about the experience of the Steel Company of Canada where tens of thousands of dollars were spent encouraging employees to wear safety glasses

and other safety equipment. Those recommendations were not universally accepted by the employees, and finally in exasperation the management of the company said: "From now on, if a man is found in a cold heading department or one or two other departments without his safety glasses on he will be dismissed immediately."

That solved the problem. From that point on everyone always wore safety glasses and a number of eyes were saved.

One could extend this argument to the society as a whole, and one could require every bathtub to have a non-slip surface, because I suppose more people break more limbs and perhaps even go their doom in bathtubs than almost anywhere else in a modern industrial society. I can think of an illustration that may be more readily accepted by my friends opposite who are smiling at my remarks. I suppose we would save some lives if we made it mandatory to buckle a seat belt every time one got into a car, but who wants policemen stopping every vehicle to insure that this kind of legislation is enforced?

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): This is a ridiculous argument!

Mr. White: Well, all right; this is my reservation about it. Dealing more specifically with safety helmets I very much like the idea embodied in this bill, and I am glad to support the idea to which the hon. member for Wentworth has given voice. I am wondering at the same time why we would stop at motorcycles. Why would we not require them for hondas and bicycles and tricycles and scooters and automobiles of one kind and another? This points up the perplexity I have in matters of this kind.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do support the bill, but at the same time I am very glad to see The Department of Transport exploring all of the pros and cons with great care so as not to inflict this additional limitation on our citizens in the absence of very real proof that this would save a lot of lives.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Speaker, just a word in support of this bill. The Welland paper: Motorcycle Mishap Takes Youth's Life. Police said today a crash helmet would have saved the life of Brock Dickie, 87 Oakland Avenue, Welland, if he had had a crash helmet on. Just in support of the member.

Mr. Speaker: This concludes the debate on these two bills.

It being six o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

No. 90

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 8, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 8, 1967

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman, concluded 3155

Estimates, Department of Public Works, Mr. Connell 3180

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Dymond, agreed to 3187

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

(Concluded)

On vote 2003:

Mr. Chairman: Before the member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent) starts—I was going to suggest that perhaps it would facilitate the work of the House if we were to consider both votes at the same time, votes 2003 and 2004. I noticed in reviewing the estimates that some of the votes from 2003 seem to intertwine and overlap into 2004. I suggest that we stay with the juvenile institutions first and then when they are finished we might go on with the adult institutions. Is this agreeable to members of the House?

On votes 2003 and 2004:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask, before we left the area of the juvenile difficulty, if there was a special advisory committee that directed the Minister's attention to some of the more difficult problems in this area specifically, or whether his advisory committee deals with the whole area of penal reform?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, the training schools advisory board has this as one of its duties. It visits all of the training schools and makes recommendations to the Minister with regard to what they have seen and studied at the institutions.

Mr. Nixon: Was this set up two years ago, approximately, or has it been in operation for some time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It has been in operation for a great number of years. Its duties were somewhat changed with the new Training Schools Act, but essentially this was their duty, if I recall, ever since they were set up.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am quite concerned about the availability for training as far as the rehabilitation of the inmates is concerned. Before I make some comments on that, could the Minister tell us how many are on this advisory board and, if the list is not too lengthy, who they are and what their ages are? Does the Minister have that information? There has been an indication that some of the people on this board are somewhat out of touch with the modern requirements.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, on page 62 of the annual report the hon. member will notice that at the time of the printing of this report, James Felstiner was the chairman. He has now taken on other very important duties with the juvenile and family courts. One of the other members is Barry G. Lowes, who is the chairman of the Metropolitan Toronto school board. The other three are Dr. Lewis, Mrs. Sanderson and Dr. Bennett. The present chairman, who has replaced Mr. Felstiner, is Dr. Elborn, who was formerly the Deputy Minister of The Department of Education.

Mr. Nixon: Is he not retired from that position, retired from The Department of Education?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. The only young man who is on the board at the present time is Mr. Lowes. The other four could by no means be considered young people, but they have given very distinguished service in their respective posts. Dr. Lewis, Mrs. Sanderson and Dr. Bennett have given very distinguished service in this department on the training schools advisory board for a great many years.

Mr. Nixon: Is Dr. Lewis the former head of the college of education?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, he is a psychiatrist with The Department of Health. Dr. Lewis graduated from Queen's University, received a specialist's—

An hon. member: Good!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not my *alma mater*! He received his specialist's certificate in psychiatry from the Royal college of physicians and surgeons. He is consultant

psychiatrist in the mental health branch of The Department of Health and serves on the medical advisory committee of The Department of Transport.

Dr. Bennett served The Department of Education as a school inspector for 42 years. He is a member of the Toronto public libraries board and has served on the training schools advisory board since 1942.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the Minister has any plans to expand that advisory board?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we have not considered expanding it. We considered, when an opening occurs and we are able to find—

Mr. Nixon: The complement is not set by statute?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have an idea it is; we will give the hon. leader that answer shortly. I think it is set at five.

Mr. Nixon: I do not believe we on this side would want to be critical of the board simply because they have had too much experience, by any means, because surely the experience of Dr. Elborn particularly—and no doubt the other gentlemen whose names the Minister has read off would add up to a good deal of knowledge about educational matters indeed. But aside from Barry Lowes, who is deeply involved in the education system of Metropolitan Toronto, it appears that the board might benefit from a fresh approach to the needs of the young men and women who, presumably, are in the institutions that we are discussing this evening.

I know that a good many members of the House were in receipt of a letter from some inmates at Burwash. I do not know whether the letter was sent to all the members, but I know several members received it, and I should tell the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that it is anonymous in its origin.

Nevertheless, it is well drawn and it is an interesting approach to some of the problems that are faced by the people who drew this small brief, if it might be called that. But I was much struck by their comparison of the educational facilities at Burwash, which is the institution under concern here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. leader of the Opposition is now referring to an adult institution.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I was going to suggest to him that we deal with the juvenile institutions until we are finished, if that is agreeable to the hon. member?

Mr. Nixon: All right, I am quite agreeable to that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The training school advisory board does not deal with adult institutions at all.

Mr. Nixon: Who advises the Minister on the educational programme of the other institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have a director of education for the department.

Mr. Nixon: Then according to the Chairman he would prefer if we discuss that later in the evening. So at this time I wonder if the Minister would indicate the place of the advisory board in the direction of education at the schools for the juvenile offenders or the people we are discussing at the present time? Do they actually have some recommendations to make in the hiring of teachers, in the adaption of the regular curriculum for the schools, or just what is the essence of their recommendations in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The director of education for the department has direct responsibility for the educational system throughout the whole department, both juvenile and adult. The training schools advisory board is competent and has as its responsibilities recommendations covering any aspect of the training schools.

Mr. Nixon: Does this advisory board meet in a regular way? For example, how do they approach the Minister—directly or do they sit down with his officials after their tours of inspection? Just how do they function?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They meet at regular intervals, visit institutions and write written reports for me and they meet with me.

Mr. Nixon: We will talk about the education at the tail end of this.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of questions I want to ask in connection with the grants—St. Joseph's school, Alfred, St. Euphrasia, and St. John's school, Uxbridge. I notice in the Minister's report he does make some mention of the fact that they are trying to set up schools with smaller units. The Hagersville school is built on this pattern, and it is mentioned two or three times. On page 5 of the report it says:

> In planning new institutions, the department will aim for adult institutions contain-

ing a maximum of 200 inmates and for training schools with a maximum of 125 pupils.

Now, in the report later in connection with the training schools, the ones to which grants are given, the numbers are given here as 150, 180, 160, which perhaps are not too high above the ideal that is being striven toward. But I wonder if the Minister in giving these grants has placed any conditions upon these private schools to the effect that they ought to have long-term plans for revamping their schools so that they meet something of these ideals which have been set out. In other words—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has referred to grants; I am not quite clear what he means by that.

Mr. Young: There is in this vote 2003, grants to these schools, $1.8 million.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am just asking my Deputy. I did not realize they were listed as grants. Actually, we now pick up the complete cost of the operation of all of the private training schools.

Mr. Young: Yes, I understood that and this is the complete cost. But my question is—are you insisting on some long-term planning to get these training schools, as well as your own, into conformity with your ideal of the family type institution? What is being done in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is not a long-term plan and I think I mentioned this Friday. The training school which is planned for Sudbury is an example of moving into this area. It is going to be an interdenominational school and it will be on the cottage-type plan, and this is the pattern we hope to develop within the whole system.

Mr. Young: You hope!

Are negotiations going on so that this kind of thing is being done and standards are being set up all along the line so that the private as well as the provincially owned schools are in harmony with this kind of pattern?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we are meeting with the private training schools constantly. We are gradually moving to the situation where standards across the whole system will apply to the private training schools as well. As I mentioned the other day, we are taking over the after-care service and, on a gradual basis, integrating the whole system so that hopefully it will be difficult to distinguish a private training school from what we call the Ontario training school system in the not too distant future.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment about the adult—

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further under the juvenile institutions? Carried?

The member for Grey North.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Are you still on this vote? Yes.

Mr. Chairman: At the present time we are dealing with the juvenile institutions.

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman: Under the adult institutions, the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I drew to your attention a few moments ago a letter that several members of the Legislature received which purports to have been written by inmates at Burwash. They are drawing to our attention some difficulties with the education system at Burwash, and they feel that their opportunities are somewhat less than they might be. The Minister has frequently indicated the doubts that he has based on communications from inmates, and particularly when they are anonymous, but this, as I say, is so well drawn, that I would like to bring it to the Minister's attention for his comment, and I would read an excerpt from this where they give their experience as inmates at the Burwash farm and I quote from it:

> One must depend entirely on the generosity of The Department of Education, Ontario, for supplying correspondence courses or The Department of Veterans Affairs which is not recognized for credits. Advanced schooling or specialized must be paid for by the individual inmate.

He goes on to say:

> There are no study facilities. One must study on one of five card tables in a dormitory where there are 65 men playing cards, and so on, and two radio speakers blaring continually. The reference books are limited. There is no one qualified to instruct except two school teachers employed by the institution who concentrate on assisting with correspondence courses focusing on grades 8, 9 and 10. There is no interview period available with these teachers.
>
> These men have just started here approximately four months ago and have

largely met with failure. There are trade facilities for approximately 60 to 100 men at the most which consist of bricklaying, sheet metal and machine shop. The population of the institution is approximately 700 men. Therefore, this opportunity is offered to only a select few.

I read that for the Minister's consideration. His experts are there to advise him, and I wonder if this is a fair criticism of the programme that is offered at Burwash.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised. I am not surprised at some anonymous letters that might come from any of the institutions, but it would be surprising to me to find in any of our institutions that someone who wants to take a course, be it academic, vocational or trades training, would find it difficult. I am advised that our big problem is to fill the courses. Perhaps I could read the note that was passed to me.

One of our big problems in the development of trades training and academic programmes is that of encouraging the inmate to enrol as a student. You will appreciate that academic and trades training is voluntary.

I think the hon. leader of the Opposition would appreciate that.

One cannot force a man to take education or training against his will, and the relatively unskilled jobs have a greater attraction for most Burwash inmates. Our problem is not to provide classroom shops and instructors. This is relatively easy. Our problem is to fill the classrooms and shops with students.

We have two full-time academic teachers, we built a new classroom and library facilities last year. We have two full-time instructors in bricklaying, two full-time instructors in machine-shop and sheet metal. In addition, we have maintenance trades —electrical, motor mechanics, and so on. We can provide trades training and academic instruction to every Burwash inmate who needs it, wants it, and is prepared to take it.

I think the hon. member mentioned that there was a complaint that anyone who wants to take a correspondence course has to pay for it.

Mr. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This, I am told, is incorrect.

Mr. Nixon: The basis of the instruction is through the correspondence facilities of The Department of Education, is it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, the basis of our instruction is right at the institution.

Mr. Nixon: The teachers are hired there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Classrooms with teachers. Again, I would like to emphasize that this is all under the supervision of The Ontario Department of Education.

Mr. Nixon: In the industrial farm programme, are the inmates required to do a share of the work around the farm?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is yes.

Mr. Nixon: Well, it occurs to me that one of the trades training that might be of great use to these men when they are looking forward to their release is instruction in the science of agriculture. I am sure the Minister is aware of the comments that were made just a few days ago in the Legislature whether the inmates in these farms could be made available and paid at the going rate for assistance in the farming areas when there is an emergency associated with a harvest or something like that. My own feeling is that these industrial farms might become one of the most useful trades.

Agricultural technology has become more and more complex in recent years, and I think the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) would agree with me that we should be able to provide these men, if they did have a basis of instruction, in the use of farm machinery and in feeds and in the general practical work associated with agriculture. We could assure them of very adequate employment, indeed, if the instruction were given, as well as simply what amounts to the required labour. I wonder if the Minister has a programme of instruction, or whether in fact it is just labour to maintain the farming programme.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, there is a sort of training at Burwash. Practically all of the facets of agriculture—I should not say all of them—a great number of the facets of agriculture are being taught at Burwash. As to the sufficiency of it, this is, as I mentioned the other day, one of the studies being made by the trades and industries advisory board on which there is farm representation precisely for that purpose to find out if it is sufficient, if it is up to date, and how it can be improved.

I fully agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition that this is an area where there could perhaps be a great deal of expansion. We are looking forward to this, not just for emergency requirements on the farm, but as careers for many of those who would probably be very well suited for it. As I have said, this is what the trades and industry advisory committee are studying at the present time, but there are these basic courses at Burwash.

Mr. Sargent: Over the years, Mr. Chairman, we have been constantly plying the Minister with questions as to when the shameful conditions in county jails will be rectified, and the repetition that he is studying this, or going to get on with the job is getting pretty hard to take.

It reminds me of the story of the fellow who went in to buy his wife a corset and the saleslady said what bust. He said: Nothing, it just wore out.

Your answers are just wearing out because we are not getting action. The shameful conditions in our county jails, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think you will agree this is out of order. We dealt with this—

Mr. Chairman: We are getting back to vote 2001.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was anxious to hear the story about the corset, that is why I did not stop him.

Mr. Sargent: What are we on now, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: We are on combined votes 2003 and 2004 on any of the adult institutions. They are listed on pages 123 and 124. The detail is shown on the same pages.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about institutions.

Mr. Chairman: County jails, I think you will find, are not before us now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are under vote 2001.

Mr. Chairman: Under the main vote, 2001.

Mr. Sargent: Well, let us talk about institutions then.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we had quite a discussion on that.

Mr. Chairman: We discussed it at length under vote 2001.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I would like to ask the Minister his plans for regional institutions across Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Still out of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we had quite a discussion during vote 2001, under the proper vote, on county jails and we are now discussing the institutions which are the direct responsibility and being operated by The Department of Reform Institutions.

Mr. Chairman: Those are all listed on the bottom of page 123 and throughout 124 and part of 125.

Mr. Sargent: So the deck is closed on county jails then?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: At the present time.

Mr. Sargent: At this sitting of the House?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, the provincial institutions before us are—

Mr. Sargent: Next year we will talk about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will be glad to answer them next year.

Mr. E. Sopha (Sudbury): Glad to have you back.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the Minister what is his policy insofar as the electronic devices in the institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What?

Mr. Sargent: Listening devices.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do not permit them in our institutions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: I take it then it is a matter of policy that you do not allow in Ontario jails or institutions, no bugging of prisoners?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In any of our institutions, Mr. Chairman. This is not permitted.

Mr. Sargent: Well the Don jail have—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Don jail is not our institution.

Mr. Sargent: The Don jail is not part of yours!

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on vote 2003?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister at this time if he can give us an estimate as to the cost to manufacture licence plates using reflective materials?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid we do not have any such figures because we have never been asked to provide them.

Mr. Newman: You mean, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) has never asked the hon. Minister or consulted with him as to the feasibility of using reflective materials for licence plates?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that this was one question that was not asked of us. The Minister of Transport has discussed the feasibility of our department manufacturing such plates. We never got to the stage where we were asked for the cost.

Mr. Newman: The hon. Minister has never discussed costs at all then?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is what I was explaining.

Mr. Newman: Well does he not think it is about time that he started to discuss the costs, or figure out the costs, because he is going to manufacture reflective licence plates, whether he likes it or not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we have no likes or dislikes in the matter. If the Minister of Transport orders them and wants a costing of them, we will provide the information at that time.

Mr. Newman: Well, all I was trying to do was to prepare the hon. Minister in advance.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know what the hon. member was trying to do.

Mr. Newman: The hon. Minister of Transport can come along and at the flick of a finger the hon. Minister can give him the price to manufacture reflective licence plates, a most worthwhile safety device, a safety device that has been promoted on all sides of this House.

May I ask the Minister if his department manufactures any of the new highway traffic signs, the type that were mentioned by the hon. Minister just a few days ago in the House?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we do not manufacture those.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make reference to the fact that the superintendent of Burwash industrial farm is retiring this year, I believe, and I wanted to take note of the several years of close cooperation and contact I had with Mr. Heddle, and to express the delight that always came to me at being associated with a man who demonstrated the consummate fairness, openmindedness and objectivity that Mr. Heddle always did, in dealing with his inmates.

My experience tells me that the department will lose in him a very valuable servant and agent, and a man who was able to carry the heavy responsibility of that institution, which is always much in the news, both north and south, by reason of the large numbers of people who appear to want to depart from it at all seasons of the year, and the prisoners who want to depart are no respecter of the climate or the environment when they go.

Indeed, if I may just digress, it seems that when one goes to Mr. Falzetta's court at Sudbury, every day of the week he has four or five, or half a dozen.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) and the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) will appreciate this. Magistrate Falzetta is a very curious soul, and he always asks them why they leave Burwash and I think he makes some notes about it. Maybe he is going to write his memoirs. He asked one chap one day when I was there why he had left and he said: "There is nobody bilingual, no one speaks French at the institution."

The Minister might rectify that by bringing all the French speaking people from the other institutions and distributing them fairly, so a person of one of the founding races will be able to enjoy his own language. I say to my friend from Perth (Mr. Edwards), who is not in his seat—perhaps someone will tell him—that a prisoner will be able to speak in his own language, which is his inalienable right, the French language.

But I suppose this situation will continue because Burwash collects the recidivists and for reasons of their own they want to get going. It seems that in the spring, for some unknown biological, pathological or psychological reason, large numbers of them—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The biological reasons are not unknown.

Mr. Sopha: Large numbers of them depart. I have one I called the Deputy Minister about the other day. Under the new legal aid system, of course, they can now have a lawyer almost as of right and plead not guilty to escaping, though one is at a loss to comprehend what the defence is.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Did you take the case?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. I went to see the young fellow. I will not give his name, I went with a measure of curiosity to ascertain why he could possibly want to defend and he said to me quite frankly that there must be something wrong with him because this was the second time he had escaped.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): There must be something wrong with the guards.

Mr. Sopha: He said: "I escaped at Guelph and now I am doing the time that I got for that escape and I only have four months to go and here I have escaped again." He said: "I cannot explain it. I cannot understand why I do that; what impels me to escape?"

Mr. Sargent: Must be a Tory!

Mr. Sopha: The Deputy Minister will permit me to say he was very cooperative about this and we are going to have a look at this person's problem and see perhaps if some psychiatric help or assessment can direct him along some channels that will bring less inconvenience and suffering to him.

That is all I wish to say about Burwash, because I want to say fairly and frankly that my observations have shown me that it is a very well run institution and the good order of it and what they do there in the agricultural field brings us in the Sudbury district a certain measure of pride because of its accomplishments, particularly in the area of dairy farming and the development of that very fine dairy herd that they have there as well as the cross-breeding of the Charolais that I told the Minister about earlier.

I want to express my deep appreciation here in the public forum of Ontario to the several years of kind courtesy and cooperation that I had from Mr. Heddle, and I may say without going into details, that he and I went through some very trying and harrowing experiences together out of environments that we did not create ourselves, but were created for us by the actions of others. But one could always count on his open and fair-mindedness, and one could see in the visits that one made that the inmates themselves had a very high respect and a very warm affection for Mr. Heddle, which must have emanated from their conception of his fairness at all times with them. I hope his successor will enjoy the same amount of cooperation and achieve the same efficiency that he has in the public service of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, if I just may be permitted I would like to echo the words of the hon. member for Sudbury in respect of the good service that Mr. Heddle has given this province, particularly in his present capacity over a great number of years. We all share in our department the high regard the hon. member for Sudbury has for this gentleman, and I also want to thank the hon. member for his kind comments about the department. We do not hear them too often in this House and, therefore, they are all the more appreciated. Thank you.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I feel that in this province we have a law for the rich and a law for the poor. Mostly the poor people are in jail so—

An hon. member: Is Viola not there yet?

Mr. Sargent: Well Viola will not be there, she is not one of our type. The thing is that in the European penology systems over there they have a system whereby they can serve their time at nights and weekends. I am wondering if the Minister has any policy in the future as far as people in jail maybe on a short three to six months' term could serve their time on evenings or weekends?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: And holidays?

Mr. Sargent: And holidays.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we have been studying these plans. There are so many of them. This is a matter that may one day get higher priority than it has at the present time because we have other plans at the moment which may very well some day in the future lead into that. It is a very interesting proposition, but at the moment we have no active plans for any immediate implementation of such a programme.

Mr. Sargent: So 100 years later we are still using the same old system used 100 years ago. How often do you inspect the jails yourself—and institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I doubt very much whether it is possible for anyone to do as much visiting of the county jails as well as our own institutions as I have done. I have covered our whole system, which is quite a job, all the way up to Kenora and Monteith, and I have visited most of the county jails as well—some of them more than once. Other than that I do not know what could be expected of me.

Mr. Sargent: In Britain, the new report on the Royal commission on penal reforms may recommend camps for prisoners and wives where the wives could live together with the husbands. This is the penal reform they suggest over in England. Has the Minister any views on that here?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not recall reading that in any British report, and whatever the British have to report, I will say this that they have a long, long way to go just to catch up with the province of Ontario in respect of its penal institutions.

Mr. Sargent: I think that is a very untrue statement when you see the county jails across this province. They are a disgrace to you and the whole government.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I ask the hon. member if he has studied the system and the buildings in the United Kingdom?

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about the physical building itself. They still use the buckets; there are no lights in the cells; they are locked up from 8 o'clock at night until 8 o'clock in the morning.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are back to county jails.

Mr. Sargent: Sure, we are back to county jails. Get with it.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, we are still discussing institutions in general.

Mr. Chairman: No. Not county jails. We have finished with them now. As I understand it, the members of the House have finished with the juvenile institutions and are now dealing with the adult institutions.

Mr. Ben: Fine; that is what I want to discuss—the adult institutions.

My hon. friend brought up the English system. Well, I think there is one aspect of the English system that we could adopt here and that is the visiting committees that visit these institutions specifically to impose punishment. Distinct from the practice carried on here, in Great Britain the governor as they call him there—I guess we call him governor in some institutions too—or superintendent, can only impose certain penalties for certain minor infractions. More severe penalties have to be imposed by a visiting committee—maybe a magistrate or two magistrates.

I give this as an example because to me one of the most deplorable aspects of this Minister's department manifested itself last year when there was what was played down as a disturbance, but in fact was a semi-riot in Mercer.

There was never an investigation into that. I suggested at the time that charges in the criminal courts be laid against the persons involved. They had smashed windows; they had smashed furniture; they had broken into the medical dispensary; in fact they had taken over physical control of one of the sections of the prison. But not a single charge to my knowledge was laid against any of those who had perpetrated those crimes.

This government took it upon itself—this Minister took it upon himself—to be judge, jury, prosecutor and witness in reference to that. We do not know what went on there. All we can do is accept the word of this hon. Minister. Now, if we had visiting committees, at least we would have found out what actually precipitated that disturbance or riot, whichever the Minister chooses to call it. We would have been able to exercise some discipline by imposing some sanctions on the people who were involved, but the Minister does not see his way clear to do that.

I would suggest that there is no reason the Minister does not have visiting committees go in there and sit as a court-martial when serious breaches of discipline occur, such as, in many instances damage to prison property, or injury to other inmates. Under those circumstances the governor, or superintendent, should never be permitted to impose his own punishment. The culprit ought always to be brought either before a criminal court or, if a visiting committee is established, before the visiting committee. The visiting committee could be composed of a pair of magistrates or something similar.

I suggest a pair of magistrates because in Great Britain it was shown that magistrates have a tendency to support the governor. As a matter of fact, it was suggested that the governor ought not to be present at the time a hearing takes place. It would be similar to what it was in the armed forces. The

CO or the discipline officer can punish for certain minor breaches of regulations, but if a serious breach occurs the accused has the right to elect to go before a court-martial, and in which instance the court is brought into the station from the outside.

I think this could very well be applied to the reform institutions in Ontario. It would not have been necessary to carry out a one-man investigation into Millbrook for, as I have said, we will never know what the truth was there. All the inmates are, of course, in the eyes of the Minister, liars. Outside of that there is only one other man to give testimony. The same would have applied to Mercer; the same would have applied to the disturbance they had in Guelph some time back. So notwithstanding the rosy picture the Minister paints of his institutions I think there is still a lot to be done.

Now, when I spoke last week I mentioned some of the recommendations that came out of the select committee that sat in 1954 and the Minister tried to dispose of the matter by suggesting that the concept has changed a lot since.

One of the recommendations which does not deal with the concept of the prison, recommendation 34, was:

> That fire hazards in all custodial institutions be lessened by means of (a) installation of gang locks; (b) installation of fire alarm boxes connected with the municipal fire department except where location or local conditions make such a system impossible; (c) holding of periodic night fire drills or fire drills under simulated night conditions; and (e) strengthening of liaison between inspectors of The Department of Reform Institutions and local and provincial fire authorities on all matters concerning fire risks in institutions.

Today we checked with the Guelph fire department. This still has not been implemented. Only now are they taking a survey of the fire protection needs at Guelph. And Guelph reformatory now is within the territorial limits of the city of Guelph. It shows you what fantastic progress The Department of Reform Institutions is making.

Of course, on the report that the Minister publishes, everything is copacetic there, and I do not think we could ask for anything more.

Once again I applaud the fact that this Minister is probably making more progress than any other in the past 20 years, since the Ontario plan came into being. But the fact is the Minister is only one arm of this government, and this government has been remiss and negligent in carrying out the functions that were assigned to it by the select committee of this House. It was not some one-man Royal commission, it was this House that had directed how the Ministers of Reform Institutions ought to carry out their responsibilities, and the Ministers prior to now have just thumbed their noses at this Legislature. That in essence is what they have done.

Now, I think it is a disgraceful situation, and we draw this to the attention of the present Minister, he tries to slough it off, saying, well concepts have changed. Concepts may have changed but the physical aspects have changed very little in that time and so very few of the concepts have changed that were enumerated in here. Perhaps the hon. Minister ought to check back and give this report of the select committee of 1954 a more thorough reading. He might be brought up to date by a 13-year-old report.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I might say to the hon. member for Bracondale, I do not recall that I ever attempted to paint a rosy picture. No one will even be able to paint a rosy picture so long as there are penal institutions necessary and I have never attempted to do that.

The member mentioned that I am attempting to be judge, jury. As a matter of fact, in respect of the matters he has raised about not laying charges against inmates in institutions who commit crimes in the institutions, such as damage and so on, I do not know where he gets that information from. We always discuss such matters, when there is a disturbance, with the local police and with the Crown attorney, to find out whether there is sufficient evidence to lay charges. As a matter of fact, presently we are awaiting a decision by the courts on charges which have been laid against an inmate of Mercer as a result of a disturbance.

We have recently laid charges of assault against two Millbrook inmates and they both received five years in the penitentiary, so I do not know where he gets the idea we allow these things just to be sloughed off.

Mr. Ben: Perhaps the Minister could tell us what charges were laid resulting from the disturbance we had last year in Mercer; it arose out of one girl allegedly being deprived of drugs.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: At that time, in a discussion with the Crown attorney, we were advised that there was not sufficient evidence,

and on the advice of the Crown attorney we did not lay any charges. I think the hon. member, as a lawyer, will appreciate that this is the way you do things.

You first find out whether there is to be a case. If you think you have a case, then you proceed with it. If the Crown attorney advises you that you do not have a sufficient case, you just do not take it. At that time you take whatever disciplinary action is indicated within your institution, such as the loss of privileges and loss of remission and so on. And this is what we do.

As for the visiting system which they have for the United Kingdom, I have studied that. I cannot recall the details. I studied it a couple of years ago and it has some elements in it which are worthy of consideration—but as far as I am concerned, only because it would put us in the position where no one can say as the hon. member says, that we are covering something up. This, in my view, would be the best aspect of it, that the public would then know that they do not have to take the word of the Minister.

Mr. Ben: Precisely.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I say it has a great deal of merit in it. However, the jurisdictions are not at all comparable. They have a one-unit system; the United Kingdom is a small compact country. We have divided jurisdictions. The ones we have in our institutions are very short termers, and I suppose by the time you get a visiting committee to investigate something, the person would have finished his term. It is not quite that simple.

In respect of fire drills and so on, a note has been handed to me which states that fire drills arranged by senior correctional officers at random for day or evening are held at least once a month, with additional drill at night once every three months. Additional drills are frequently called without notice by the fire brigade. The time taken to evacuate buildings is generally 60 seconds. The longest recorded time is five minutes. I think that covers most of the things the hon. member referred to.

Mr. Ben: There are just two points I would like to stress. One, the fire system at Guelph is still not connected to the Guelph fire department system and they must telephone in case of an emergency.

Second, if you could not prove that there was a breach of the criminal code in the last Mercer riot, with broken windows and fire hoses being chopped and broken cabinets, all I can say is that you must have a genie or Samantha locked up in there at the time this happened.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think this is true at all, Mr. Chairman. Let us get that clear. You have ten or 12 females who are running loose, smashing windows and all that sort of thing; some of whom are unwilling participants, who have only been defending themselves. And you rush in there to stop the disturbance, and then you attempt to find out who caused it, who was responsible for it; who were the actual ones who started it and who were engaged in this; who were defending themselves, and who, in fact, did not participate. I think the hon. member can appreciate, as a lawyer, that it might be just a little difficult for someone to decide, "Well, Mary and Maggie and Sadie are the ones who are responsible for this." It is not quite that simple.

Personally, this is what we were told by the police and the Crown attorney. We are not in a position—certainly I am not in a position to make these decisions without their advice.

Mr. Ben: I would inform the Minister I was there the day of the riot and I was informed that evening that charges would not be laid. Discussions had not taken place with the Crown attorney at that stage. Furthermore, the Minister is never going to convince me that the minute one of his matrons stuck her nose into that dormitory, everybody all of a sudden dropped what they were doing.

Mr. L. Bernier (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, I hope we are still discussing district jails, because I cannot sit here and have the Opposition condemn the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, the nine district jails in the north are under this vote.

Mr. Bernier: Under this vote, fine. I cannot sit here and have the Opposition condemn or criticize the Minister, because I know these gentlemen have not been in the Kenora district and I know they do not speak for the Kenora district jail. Because in that particular area we have one of the finest district jails, I am sure, in this province. And I certainly would like to compliment the department. I would like to compliment the warden, Bill Goss, and his staff on the exceptionally fine job they do in that area. When the hon. member for Bracondale is next up in that area, come and see us.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bernier: There is lots of room for you up there; believe me there is. I certainly would like to thank the Minister for visiting Kenora last summer and personally inspecting that institution, showing interest and concern, and it was appreciated by all. Thank you.

Mr. Sopha: Now that we have listened to these encomiums of praise, I would like to ask the Minister, of all the female inmate population in the Kenora jail last year, what percentage or what numbers of the total were Indian women?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would not know, but I would rather imagine pretty large.

Mr. Sopha: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would not know, but I would rather imagine pretty large. I do not have these figures at the moment, but I imagine the percentage is pretty large.

Mr. Sopha: I would like to ask you—I do not want to invite any ribald laughter about it at all, but no one in Sudbury goes to the district jail to see clients more than I do, I suppose. And every time I go in I look at the numbers of female prisoners and I inquire who they are, and invariably either all of them, or all but one, are Indians. What is wrong with us, that we have these Indian women locked up in our institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, what would the hon. member want our department to do about that? The judges send them to our institutions. We have nothing to do with that.

Mr. Sopha: Certainly your department has some responsibility to afford these people the same privilege of having time to pay their fines or other things that are given to other prisoners.

Mr. Ben: You are an Indian taker.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member knows—

Mr. Sopha: What are you doing about parole of these Indian prisoners?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do everything we can for the Indians; the same as we do for any other prisoner.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, the truth is, of course, that these Indian girls are in that prison for being drunk and lots of Caucasian females get drunk but you do not find them incarcerated for it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows—

Mr. Sopha: That jail in Kenora is beyond belief because of the number of Indian girls who are in there. It is a disgrace.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asked me—

Mr. Sopha: This cuts them to the raw, you can see—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It does not cut me to the raw.

Mr. Sopha: You can see it has cut them to the raw. They are all talking now; it has cut them to the raw. Do you hear them all?

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, the dreadful discrimination they practise against the Indians, these Indian women. And somebody has the nerve to get up and talk about what a wonderful institution the Kenora jail is. They tell me in that institution, that when an Indian girl comes in, they do not know whether to take her to a hospital to have her baby or keep her locked up—the magistrate himself told me that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sopha: I do not know what it is, but it is the truth. You do not like the truth, do you?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sopha: He does not like the truth.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There was only one thing that was relevant to my department which the hon. member mentioned. He suggested there was some different kind of treatment for Indian women when they got into the Kenora jail. I was up there, as a matter of fact, especially to study this problem, because our department is cooperating with the Canadian—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, after I raised it here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Will the hon. member just wait? We are cooperating—

Mr. Sopha: You had the figures last year, did you not? When I raised it, you sent down

to the head office to get the figures in an attempt to discredit what I said.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Sopha: What are you banging that gavel for?

Mr. Chairman: Why do you think I am banging the gavel? The gavel applies to you as well as to every other member of this House. The Minister has the floor.

Mr. Sopha: We are talking about Indian women, and the disgraceful treatment they get.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the department is cooperating with the Canadian corrections association in a study of Indians and the law. If the hon. member had merely risen and asked me, from a correctional point of view, whether we believe that many of these Indian women should be incarcerated in the jails or should be sent there by the magistrate, I would say to him, "No."

Mr. Sopha: What is the Minister doing about it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I cannot do anything about it.

Mr. Sopha: Well, goodness gracious!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Neither can my department. All we can do is treat these women as best we can. Let us not have any misunderstanding about us not knowing whether these women should have their babies in the jail or not. No one—I pointed this out the other day—is ever allowed to have a baby in a penal institution.

Any woman, be she Indian or otherwise, is taken to a hospital to have a baby. As a matter of fact, I want to say this about what I saw in Kenora. As far as the institution and its staff are concerned, the Indian inmates get particularly good attention because of the terrible background under which many of them live.

Mr. Sopha: I asked you, what proportion of the female prisoners in your nine district jails are Indian women, and you cannot even tell me. You cannot even tell me that. Do you know what is going on in that department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I know what is going on.

Mr. Sopha: Yet you cannot tell me a simple answer to a question like that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I told you I thought it was pretty high. If you want the exact figures, I will be glad to get them for the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: I would really like to know the total number of female prisoners in the nine district jails last year and how many of them were Indian?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will get that for the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: You see, my friend is right, there is a law for the rich and a law for the poor. But it has an added sinister faculty to it, it is discriminatory against the red Indian woman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a point of order, this has nothing to do with my department.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: I think the member for Sudbury should have the floor, but seeing the chair has allowed the member for Kenora to talk about jails, this opens up—

Mr. Chairman: No; let us make this straight right now. I allowed the member for Kenora and the member for Sudbury to speak on the nine district jails in the north only, and they are run and operated, of course, by the department.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about district jails too.

Mr. Chairman: That is the only type of jail that is before us in this vote at the present time.

Mr. Sargent: I am asking about district jails then, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: It is the district jails in the north that are operated by this department. Those are the only ones that are in front of us now.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in these district jails and county jails—

Mr. Chairman: No, let us stay with the district jails in the north.

Mr. Sargent: The district jails across the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: No, I am not going to permit the member—

Mr. Sargent: All right, the district jails in the north then. Mr. Chairman, the majority of the traffic of the inmates in these jails are first offenders or people who have never been convicted before and this is their first contact with the law. The disgraceful conditions we have in the majority of these jails—

Mr. R. D. Rowe (Northumberland): Who said so?

Mr. Sargent: I am saying so.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, there are no disgraceful conditions in any of the district jails operated by this department. The hon. member is trying to get back to another vote because he was not here to discuss it. Surely we do not have to go over that all over again.

Mr. Sargent: I am within my rights, Mr. Chairman, talking about district jails.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, you are not talking about district jails.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think it is a great dodge for this Minister to brush this aside when this a great area—if this has not been brought up, it should be brought up in the House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It has been brought up, you were not here.

Mr. Sargent: About that mess you have?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You were not here.

Mr. Sopha: The Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said this afternoon that members should not refer to another member being absent. The Minister was not here when the Prime Minister said it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was here when the Prime Minister said it.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, many of these jails are 100 years old—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Aw, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sargent: They go to bed at night at eight o'clock, there is no light in their cell, and they are locked up until eight o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Chairman: Wait now. I would suggest to the member if he is speaking about Sault Ste. Marie, or Parry Sound, or Haileybury, or Fort Frances, or Sudbury, or Kenora—

Mr. Sargent: In the north. Mr. Chairman, I will leave that there. We have established the fact that you have an awful mess in your jails.

But the thing that is shocking to me, going along into the institution field, is that we have institutions which have 32 men shaving on one razor blade a week.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no such institution in my department.

Mr. Sargent: They are only allowed to have one shower a week. Mr. Chairman, this is important.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this is important to people who cannot help themselves and the Minister there grins like—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Like what? The member should never have read that article in the *Star* today. It has not helped a bit.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, they are allowed one change of clothing a week, one shower a week, and they sleep on steel beds.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this hon. member is still talking about county jails.

Mr. Sargent: I am glad you know what I am talking about.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And everything you have said about county jails I have agreed with.

Mr. Sargent: You have opened yourself wide open. You know what I am talking about, do you not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Sure, and I told you I agree with you.

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not fix it up?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is why we are replacing them.

Mr. Sargent: You have been promising for four years to do a regional job across Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member to stay with the vote before us, please.

An hon. member: Want to bet?

Mr. Sargent: I just want to say it is a very serious thing that this Minister has a do-nothing policy for people who cannot help themselves.

Mr. Chairman: Stay with the vote; no generalities at the present time, please.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to discuss the libraries in these places, the clothes they wear and the lack of imagination.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the reformatories?

Mr. Sargent: In the district jails.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The district jails—what about the libraries in the district jails?

Mr. Sopha: They are lousy!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the time of the House but I think it is time we had a Royal commission on county jails in this province.

Mr. Sopha: I would like to ask the Minister why he does not legislate to require that, in the centre where the district jail is located, it be required to be the lock-up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I would very much like to hear what the hon. member's proposition is, as to why this would be a good thing.

Mr. Sopha: For one thing, many of the lock-ups provided by the municipality are truly deplorable. Some of them, without mentioning the localities, would make the dungeon that the Count of Monte Cristo was in, look like the Waldorf Astoria by comparison.

In many cases, you have a fine, fairly new building and adequate quarters — and the Minister well knows that the population of the district jails has been decreasing. The space and facilities are there and I would think it would be ideal as the lock-up, where it is located.

As a lawyer, I have a real desire, out of the interests of justice, of getting those being held away from the police as soon as possible, and into some more objective atmosphere.

Thirdly, the district jail is the ideal place for the granting of bail. It is a convenient place for the justice of the peace to come and, when he comes to the district jail, you do not have to end-run like a fleet end from the Hamilton Tiger Cats—you do not have to end-run the police forces, to get the person out on bail.

The application may be made in that environment to the justice of the peace and he will determine whether the person goes out on bail. It is, in short, an ideal clearing house; the district jail can be a clearing house for people who are going to court or going out on bail, as the case may be. And it provides a facility which is extremely advantageous over the lock-up for those purposes.

In the lock-ups, on many occasions, six, eight, ten, or a dozen people will be crowded into one cell. The fortunate one who gets the bunk first, or the two of them who get the bunk, they have a sleep. The others stay up all night until they go to court in the morning.

I might say this about a lock-up: You know the bill of rights says, over John George Diefenbaker's hand, it says, "No person shall be denied bail unreasonably." Those are the words it uses: "No person shall be denied bail unreasonably."

But in invisible ink experience teaches there is also writ "provided that the duty JP wants to get up in the middle of the night and come and grant bail".

The bill of rights does not say anything in its words about a duty JP, so these people have to stay in these deplorable surroundings for a good many hours until they go to court and can make a proper application for bail.

I say let us use the space in the district jails. What are you saying to me?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister was suggesting it might come under The Attorney General's Department.

Mr. Sopha: I am suggesting to the Minister that he take the necessary steps by legislation, to require the district jail to be the lock-up. All he has to do is amend the appropriate statute, I do not know which one, but amend it and say, by command, that where a district jail is located, it shall be the lock-up and the municipality need not provide one. Could anything be simpler than that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I should suggest the hon. member for Sudbury meet the hon. member for Grey North; because the hon. member for Grey North thinks our district jails are deplorable, and the hon. member for Sudbury, quite properly, says in some instances, he would prefer that we use the district jails because they are good buildings, and are well operated, and so on. I wanted to get that on the record.

The Prime Minister not being here, perhaps I could take the opportunity to say, perhaps, life would be a lot easier to make plans in my department if we did not have so many lawyers. We have a great deal of disagreement on this particular subject; the question of whether a lock-up should be

associated with a jail itself, is a matter on which there is a great deal of philosophical disagreement.

They say the jail is the place where a man is convicted, and should not be associated with a man who is merely being held on a charge. The other problem, of course, as the hon. member knows is that, if the district jail, for example in Sudbury, were the only lock-up, it would create tremendous problems for areas quite a distance from the district jail from where they would have to bring a man into the district jail.

Mr. Sopha: They do. It is a lock-up for Manitoulin. Your Deputy Minister will tell you that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am telling the hon. member that we get complaints about these things. As a matter of fact, this is one of the complaints, one of the problems we have had to overcome in respect of our plans for the regional detention centres. Many of the lawyers say, "You are going to allow that regional centre to be used as a local lock-up. If you do we are going to have to travel another 20 miles", and so on. You run into all this sort of thing.

However, I would tell the hon. member this, that because of our planning for the regional detention centres, I have been in consultation with my colleague, the hon. Attorney General. We are discussing lock-ups generally, which are under his department and out of these meetings.

Also, in relation to the new bailing system which will be evolved, he will find that the solution will be something with which he will agree.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. Minister, and every member of this House, is concerned with the rights of the individual. I would like to ask the Minister if he would allow the use of posters in French and English in every lock-up, every jail and every district jail in the province, telling suspects of their rights under the law in large letters headed by "Your Rights" followed by this legend:

> You have the right to remain silent and refuse to answer questions. Anything you do may be used against you in court of law. You have the right to consult an attorney before speaking to the police and to have an attorney present during any questioning now, or in the future. If you cannot afford an attorney, one will be provided for you without cost. If you do not have an attorney available, you have the right to remain silent until you have had an opportunity to consult with one.

I think every institution in this province, every precinct, every jail, every police court in Toronto and across the province, should have these posters publicly shown where the public can see their rights. I think the jails are one place they should be.

Would the Minister consider these?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, perhaps this does spill over into Reform Institutions, because this is the sort of thing that is posted in our district jails as well.

Mr. Sargent: They are the rights of the people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the hon. member has visited many jails himself, whether he has even visited the Owen Sound jail in the last—

Mr. Sargent: Not as a customer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If he has, he will find that in 1964—

Mr. Chairman: I do not want to open up the question of the jails generally. I want to stay with the district jails if we can, Mr. Minister, and the institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is talking about legal counsel and letting the prisoners know their rights.

Mr. Chairman: I think most of it comes in advance of being in jail.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we also provide for some protection in this area within the penal system, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to read to the hon. member what is required of every institution in respect of advising every inmate of his rights. On June 15, 1964, as a result of a complaint at that time, which arose in this House, I believe, about some inmates being held unduly on hold orders from The Department of Immigration: at that time a system was instituted throughout our whole penal system, in district jails, reformatories and county jails. A letter went out over the signature of the Deputy Minister at that time.

Does the hon. member want to listen to this?

Mr. Sargent: I am listening.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is to the governors and superintendents of all institutions:

Dear Sir:

Certain duties of a jail governor with respect to lawyers visiting prisoners are outlined in sections 53 and 54 of regulation 477 under The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act.

In order to ensure that all prisoners in your jail are aware of their rights to legal counsel, we are enclosing a number of copies of "Legal Counsel for Prisoners" which should be made known to every prisoner in the jail.

One copy should be posted in a conspicuous place in the admitting room and another copy should be placed just outside each corridor where it can be readily seen and read by all prisoners. In the event that a prisoner is unable to speak the English language, the governor will make every effort to obtain an interpreter in order that the prisoner may be aware of the availability of counsel.

In addition to your legal duties as governor, you also have a moral responsibility to ensure, as far as possible, that all prisoners in your jail are not only aware of their rights regarding legal counsel, but also that no one is held without proper authority and that you cooperate in every way to assist in overcoming undue delays in the administration of justice.

If, at any time, you feel that there has been unnecessary delay in holding a prisoner in your jail, the facts should be reported to this office immediately. With respect to a prisoner admitted to your jail on the authority of a hold order issued by The Immigration Department, you are to notify the chief inspector in writing as soon as the prisoner is admitted. A further report is to be submitted when the prisoner is discharged from your custody advising us of the disposition of the case. Please acknowledge receipt of this directive.

Yours sincerely,

J. A. GRAHAM,
Deputy Minister

The form, which was posted, is in very large type and I have satisfied myself, in every institution I have visited, that this is posted in the proper place. This is what the posting is:

LEGAL COUNSEL FOR PRISONERS

1. A prisoner shall be allowed to consult with his lawyer at any reasonable or convenient time.

2. A prisoner may choose any lawyer he wishes and upon request the governor will contact such lawyer by telephone.

3. If the prisoner desires the services of a lawyer but is unable to provide the name of one, he shall be provided by the governor of a complete list of local lawyers. The jail staff are forbidden to recommend or choose a lawyer for a prisoner.

4. Legal aid is provided by legal aid societies which are established in many municipalities and most counties. A prisoner who cannot afford to retain counsel may apply for legal aid through the governor who will submit his request directly to such legal aid society.

5. If there is no local legal aid organization, a prisoner may write for assistance directly to the provincial director of legal aid, Osgoode hall, Toronto.

Mr. Chairman, of course, since the new legal aid bill has become law, a new directive is being discussed with the legal aid people and in the discussion the matter of bilingual signs and bilingual posting and bilingual directives, and so on, is being considered.

Mr. Sargent: I may have missed something, Mr. Chairman. Maybe the hon. member for Sudbury can follow through, but you do not tell the suspect or the accused of his rights at all, that he has the right to remain silent and refuse to answer questions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not under the jurisdiction of my department.

Mr. Sargent: I know, all you are doing is within the legal aid advice programme there. I am suggesting that you let people know of their rights as a citizen. You are only going half way, I think.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister is suggesting that it properly comes under the Attorney General.

Mr. Sargent: Why cannot he make a directive to the Attorney General to put it into force? What kind of a business is he running over there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will suggest that to the Attorney General.

Mr. Sargent: You are going to do that? Thank you.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask what directions have been given to your governors, if any, to prevent the police—you can get me on this—from interviewing a prisoner whom the governor

knows has retained counsel? Are you with me?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I am sorry; I could not follow.

Mr. Sopha: The governor, the staff, know that prisoner X up in No. 3 corridor has retained counsel—he has a lawyer. The police come to the door and ring the buzzer; they say, "We want to talk to X". What directives has the Minister given to the governor to prevent the police from interviewing him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that no such directive has gone out and—

Mr. Sopha: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member feel that the police should have no right to—

Mr. Sopha: They have no right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would suggest that the hon. member take that up with the Attorney General. I am not a lawyer, I do not know about—

Mr. Sopha: Why should I take that up with the Attorney General? He does not run those institutions, you do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I have tried to avoid getting involved with matters which are not under the jurisdiction of my department.

Mr. Sopha: My friend from Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) aptly points out we will not get anywhere with the Attorney General on it, but surely you recognize your duty there? It is most improper for the police to come and interview a prisoner who has counsel.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, the hon. member will appreciate that the prisoner or the inmate of the institution, whether he has been found guility or not, can see anyone. If he wants to be interviewed by someone he can do it. If the police want to interview the prisoner, it would have to be with the consent of the prisoner.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, no. No, no. Do you know what goes on in your district jails? The police come there with complete impunity. The door is always open to them—they are in and out and they have their prisoners down and they are questioning them. And often you go in there and you have to wait for the police to finish before you can use the interviewing room. Three or four of them will be there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member advises me that this, in his view, is going on in the district jail at Sudbury—

Mr. Sopha: Sure it is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will investigate the matter and I will find out whether this is being done contrary to law and contrary to the directives to the institutions.

Mr. Sopha: As a matter of principle no person—perhaps the clergyman, he is innocent—but no other person should be allowed to interview a prisoner who has counsel advising him, without informing counsel, as a matter of principle.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member suggest that if the prisoner's wife wants to visit him that we not permit that until we advise the prisoner's lawyer?

Mr. Sopha: Well, I would trust that the connubial spirit in which she comes cannot be classified as an interview unless she is asking him for some money.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What about a friend?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That destroys the connubial spirit.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, may I just make an interjection here—I may be wrong, but a prisoner can either consent or refuse to see anybody.

Mr. Sopha: He does not know enough to.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is all right. He can refuse and he is told that he can refuse.

Mr. Sopha: I will give you a glaring example. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), is here. I am sorry, I have to tell it and then run the risk of drawing his ire. I had a fellow charged with murder where the Crown attorney suspected there was going to be some kind of a defence of psychiatric aberration. Nobody had said so—he was sitting in the district jail at Sudbury. In anticipation of that, during your term, they got that nefarious psychiatrist that used to work up at Penetanguishene—his name escapes me for the moment—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I know who you mean.

Mr. Sopha: To him everybody was sane in the world. They brought him up and did not inform me. He went over to the jail; the governor consents to the fellow being brought down with impunity; delivers him into the

hands of this psychiatrist and I do not know anything about it until it is all over.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is wrong.

Mr. Sopha: Most improper; most improper and I properly went to the Crown attorney and I said, "What in hades are you doing with my client; what are you doing that you hire a psychiatrist to go and examine him without my consent?" That is the type of thing I want the Minister to prevent. His staff should be notified: No interviews when the fellow has counsel, or without informing counsel.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is the first time I have heard of this. I do not know what the implications of it are. As I have promised, Mr. Chairman, I will go into this matter and find out just what the legal rights of the prisoner are in this respect. And I will be very glad at that time to contact the hon. member for Sudbury and give him what the result of this investigation has been, because at the moment, not being of a legal mind, I cannot tell him what the implications are.

Mr. Sopha: Let me ask this: after all the years when it was not considered necessary, did the civil servant in your department who thought up the idea that everybody has to sign the vistors' book, get an extra week's vacation or a star to sew on the inside of his underwear or something, for that one?

For years we went to the district jail and nobody had to sign to indicate his presence. Suddenly from a couple of years ago, every time you go near the place you have to sign the book. Now what was the necessity for that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that this is something that really should concern the hon. member. I think we should know who is going into an institution. This is a penal institution.

Mr. Sopha: Well, they all know me.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know, but the hon. member will also appreciate that if we start sending out directives saying "Get everyone to sign unless you know them," some day somebody is going to get up in the Legislature and say, "Somebody was in such and such an institution, can you give us the facts?"

And we go to the register and we bring it to this House and say, "There were 14 visitors; they were as follows." And somebody will get up in the House and say, "Ah, you are not keeping proper records, because so and so was in there." Something of that nature.

I think quite properly, everyone going into a penal institution, we should know who it is. After all, we have some security requirements to protect the public.

Mr. Sopha: I am not going to press this, but this was a plain and simple illustration of the operation of Parkinson's law. Nothing else.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Minister, if the police of any jurisdiction want to question a prisoner in an institution, can they go and interrogate in the institution, or do they have to take the prisoner back to their—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that they would do this in the interview room, which is provided for that purpose.

Mr. Sargent: My advice is the interrogation in the Don jail is done—

Mr. Chairman: We are not on that now.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about jails.

Mr. Chairman: I will have to ask the member to stay with the district jails.

Mr. Sargent: In some jails do you allow the interrogations at the local—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not in the district jails.

Mr. Chairman: Not in the district jails, the Minister says.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Or the reformatories.

Mr. Sargent: Where is the interrogation done? Back at the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the interview room.

Mr. Sargent: Not in the jail?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is in the jail. The interview room is in the jail, of course.

Mr. Sargent: The reason I am asking this is, do you know of any brutality in interrogation methods in your institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, none at all.

Mr. Ben: We have been discussing here the mentality of some of the prisoners. Your

brochure indicates what the educational level is. Would the Minister give consideration to having Professor Grygier, or somebody carry out a survey to determine what the intelligence quotient of your prisoners is—with all these high faluting IBM machines. I would like to know. This is aside from this debate. Or do you have this information now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we may have this. It may be in the department. If it is, I will provide it to the hon. member. If it is not, it may be a good idea to do some research on this and find out.

Mr. Ben: Fine, thank you.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, two weeks ago the Minister of Public Works and I visited the Guelph reformatory abattoir. It is a $1 million plus undertaking and, at that time, they were processing about 50 head of cattle. What steps are you taking to increase production, or to use those facilities to a greater extent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As the hon. member will appreciate, even though I am Ontario's largest farmer, it is the part of the department that I know the least about.

Mr. MacDonald: He is in hogs, too, at that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that we have to train staff in the new processing, in the new machinery, and so on. My deputy also advises me that we are also going into the making of sausages and the processing of meat, sausages, and so on, and that staff has to be trained in the new developments.

Mr. Worton: Does the Minister feel that it is more or less in effect now? That institution has been opened—it was three years in building—since January of this year, sometime. Just when will it be getting into production?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It has only been opened a few months. There is still some equipment we have to get, I am advised, for the purposes of the programme. It would only be a guess as to how long it will take to integrate this whole programme. So long as the hon. member does not talk about hogs, I will be glad to discuss it.

Mr. Sopha: I would like to ask the Minister, are the staff instructed to do everything reasonable to facilitate the prisoner obtaining assistance from relatives or friends outside to pay his fine?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised yes, that the councillor at the institution would be advising him. Obviously, we want to keep as few people as possible and they are not the kind of people you have to have in an institution. From time to time, I do find that people are paying part of their fine, after serving part of their sentence. This happens quite often.

Mr. Sopha: There is another thing I have often wondered about. Are the visits of the jail surgeon on a regular periodic basis in district jails, or only when needed, when called?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is generally when they are needed, when called.

Mr. Sopha: Is there a roster of surgeons? If they cannot get the regular one, are there others they will call?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: I see. Have any difficulties been encountered in any of the nine district jails about getting medical practitioners to participate?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised there has been no difficulty to speak of.

Mr. Chairman: Votes 2003 and 2004?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on 2004, the Guelph institution. The Minister will recall that there have been three inquests into deaths which occurred in 1964, in the case of Ronald Franklin Cross; in 1965, the death of Anatol Chomenko; and in 1966, in the case of Stephen Lazarre.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that we were unable, last year, to raise with the Minister the questions relating to the inquest into the death of Anatol Chomenko because his estimates had passed the House before that inquest was held.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that it was held over from January through into March, and in the intervening period the Minister's estimates passed the Legislature.

We endeavoured to raise it, Mr. Chairman, at the time the Attorney General's estimates were before the House, but were unsuccessful in being able to do so. Specifically, I would now like to ask the Minister whether or not the two recommendations, I know there were more than two, but whether the two recommendations of the Anatol Chomenko inquest have been implemented in the Guelph institution?

I am referring specifically to the recommendation that reformatory physicians be required to examine all patients before they are released from the prison hospital, and to give a written release.

That recommendation bore on the fact that the reformatory physician at Guelph, on the evidence given at the inquest, had released Anatol Chomenko by telephone; that he gave no written release; that he did not see Anatol Chomenko when he left the reformatory hospital; and, indeed, he indicated that on some occasions there had been instances where the guards themselves simply released the prisoner from the hospital in the reformatory.

Was that specific recommendation implemented and if so, can we have the Minister's assurance that the procedure had been changed to accord specifically with the recommendation of the coroner's inquest in that case?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand, first, why the hon. member suggests there was no opportunity to discuss this. It seems to me that we debated this quite fully in the House. I recall reading Dr. Stokes' comments into the record. We discussed this rather fully.

However, I am advised that that particular recommendation, to which the hon. member refers, has been followed since that time.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's recollection is quite different from mine. On July 7, we endeavoured for the first time to raise the case of the inquest into the death of Anatol Chomenko under the Attorney General's estimates.

That was the first opportunity we had had to raise any question about the statement which the Minister made when he made his separate report for practical purposes, reversing the coroner's inquest in the statement he made before the orders of the day, some time in May of last year.

The point which we tried to raise with the Attorney General—and, of course, if the Minister is now prepared to answer it, I would like to ask him—was why he saw fit, without any further reconvening of the inquest, to report from an internal interdepartmental study that was made, that the coroner's inquest was totally wrong.

That was the substance of his report. Is he prepared to comment on that, or are we just going to accept the fact that the coroner's inquest recommendations have been implemented?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am reminded of that portion of the statement which I made. The hon. member will recall that we did not ignore the verdict of the coroner's inquest; what, in fact, we did was to refer it to the college of physicians and surgeons for their views, because it was strictly a medical matter. It was reported to them and they reported back that, in their view, there was no negligence.

I do not know what else the hon. member expected us to do—according to the college—there was no laxity as referred to by the inquest. I do not know what else we could have done in that case. If I recall, we were involved then in matters of medical opinion, and surely, when we go to the college of physicians and surgeons, they would be the highest court in this respect as to a medical opinion. We gave it to them and that was their view, that there was no medical laxity.

As a matter of fact, I recall—and I hope my recollection is correct; if I am wrong I stand to be corrected—they had made some recommendations about having specialists at the reformatory. It was a completely impractical suggestion, which suggests that in some instances, some of the coroners' inquests are not quite constituted in a fashion that could bring out the kind of report one would hope they could.

All we had to deal with, as I recall, was evidence that they claim showed there was medical laxity. The action that was taken was the action I have just referred to.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong the problem, but the sequence of events as set out in *Hansard* last year is all part of an endeavour to circumscribe the activities of coroners' juries and to indicate that for one reason or another they are not competent in the field in which they are charged by law with responsibility, that is to inquire into circumstances surrounding death.

The Minister chose last year, that instead of reconvening the inquest and presenting such medical evidence as he saw fit before a reconvened inquest—

Hon. Mr Grossman: How would I do that?

Mr. Renwick: How would you do that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How would I have any right? I bow to the hon. member's legal experience, but what right would the Minister of Reform Institutions have to reconvene or convene any inquest?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I may have put it somewhat into shorthand. If the Minister wants to go over it in specific—

Mr. Chairman: I think what we should establish at this point, if the member for Riverdale will, is that whatever the recommendations of the coroners' juries are, we are prepared to deal with them at this time. But the procedures otherwise, are really not before us.

Mr. Renwick: I am simply pointing out that we have had three deaths in three years in the Guelph reformatory.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, except that whatever those recommendations are that affect the institution, those would properly be before us.

Mr. Renwick: That would be perfectly right, Mr. Chairman. I think it is very important that we have an opportunity when the Guelph institution is before this House that we be able to discuss the question relating to the three deaths which occurred.

The Minister last time took it upon himself to have a special interdepartmental study made of the coroners' report. Then instead of requesting the Attorney General, or the Crown attorney to reconvene the inquest so that additional evidence, if the Minister disputed the findings of the coroner's inquest, could be brought before the coroner's inquest for a re-hearing, he chose, for some reason unknown, to refer to the college of physicians and surgeons.

I simply say that that particular part of it is laid out in *Hansard* and I do not intend to pursue it at any length tonight. But I have asked him about the one recommendation and he has already told me that the other recommendation was useless. What about this recommendation that "hospitalization be compulsory when it is the decision of the reformatory doctor?"

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would the hon. member repeat that?

Mr. Renwick: The second of the recommendations of the coroner's inquest was that hospitalization be compulsory when it is the decision of the reformatory doctor. If I may just elaborate briefly on that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is that it is and was required at that time. When the medical doctor says that a person should be hospitalized, he is hospitalized. I do not know where the impression would arise that anything else is the case.

Incidentally, I would like to point out to the hon. member and to the House, that there is somehow or other an impression that if three deaths occur in three years in the Guelph institution, that this is something outrageous. After all, over a period of three years, we have thousands of inmates. I think at that time I did go into the figures and I think the death rate in the institution is lower than it is in the general population. I do not know why you would expect that having thousands of inmates in an institution would guarantee against their passing away, or even sometimes committing suicide.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. Minister not think that three unnatural deaths merit an inquest?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As far as meriting an inquest is concerned, Mr. Chairman, the law requires that every death under any circumstances, requires a coroner's inquest. It requires an inquest because it is in a public institution. So it was not because there was anything unusual about these deaths. There is an inquest every time a person dies in a public institution.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I quite realize that the incidence of death in the Minister's institutions is somewhat lower than in the average population of the province of Ontario, because people do not die of old age in the Minister's institutions. They are not in there long enough. They age quite rapidly, but they do not die of it in these institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Neither do they lead a normal life, even in their youth. Perhaps one balances off the other.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister care to make any statement about the death of Stephen Lazarre and the results of the coroner's inquest in that case?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On what would the hon. member like me to comment?

Mr. Renwick: One of the specific matters that I would like him to comment on, is that my understanding is that Stephen Lazarre was returned to the Guelph institution from Burtch on August 25, 1966 accompanied by a report that he was of suicidal tendencies and he was in need of treatment. My understanding is that the report would indicate that the man should have been certified from the Guelph institution into an Ontario hospital, but he was still in Guelph institution nearly one month later when he hanged himself.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This was a case into which, like all other cases of death, an inquest was held. The jury found that there was no negligence on the part of the reformatory officials. I do not know what else I can comment on.

The jury found that every possible attention had been provided and stated that it was: "impressed by the evidence presented, indicating a personal interest in the deceased by the officers and professional staff of the Ontario reformatory, Guelph."

The coroner for the county of Wellington, Mr. H. F. Farmer, in summing up, praised the jury, saying that it was the most comprehensive verdict he had ever seen.

What can I add to that, unless the hon. member wants us to carry out the inquest all over again in this House—which we would have to do, if we go into the details.

Mr. Renwick: What I was asking the Minister was not alleging negligence at all. I was simply pointing out to him that a period of about one month had elapsed in the return of Stephen Lazarre to the Guelph institution from Burtch, with the recommendation, and by that time it appeared to be well-known that he was a man of suicidal tendencies; that he should not have remained in your institution; that he should have been removed to an Ontario hospital. I am wondering whether or not there is any method now in effect, or in procedure established, by which any such person could be moved more rapidly from your institution into a more suitable surroundings?

You must bear in mind that regardless of what Dr. Farmer had to say in that particular case, Stephen Lazarre was in solitary confinement. He was confined in a "C" cell at the time he committed suicide.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member will appreciate that just because the staff in the institution may feel that this person was terribly disturbed and there was something wrong with him, we cannot just put him in a mental institution. He has to be certified for this purpose and just as soon as this was done, he was transferred. At the time he was under psychiatric care for the 30 days, to which the hon. member refers, and he was, at the time he committed suicide, certified and awaiting transfer. It was when he was waiting transfer, I am advised, and the evidence will show it of course, he committed suicide while awaiting the documentation. While awaiting transfer, I should say, rather than documentation.

It was an unfortunate circumstance, but in going into this, I can find no point where one could have said: "Well you should have done this and you should have done that."

The jury went into all that and, as I say, unless we are prepared to try the case all over again here, and we do not have the evidence before us, there is no point unless we take the word of the jury.

Mr. Renwick: I simply leave the matter of those three inquests. The two inquests that were conducted by Dr. Farmer, where very real questions could have been raised, the Minister takes the side of the coroner's inquest. But in the one case where Dr. Cotnam intervened and held an inquest which resulted in criticism of the institution, an interdepartmental study merely appeared to exonerate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I must protest that term. The hon. member will appreciate he keeps referring to an interdepartmental investigation. It was not that. We presented all this to the college of physicians and surgeons for an opinion, because it is a medical opinion.

I do not know why the hon. member keeps referring to this as a sort of interdepartment investigation. It was not that. I get the facts from our own people and then the findings of the jury are handed over in total to the college of physicians and surgeons. That certainly is not an interdepartmental investigation as such. I do not know how he could come to that conclusion.

Incidentally, it is very interesting to find out that Dr. Cotnam was not hesitant in criticizing a department of the government.

Mr. Renwick: Well, he certainly did not get very far when he did, Mr. Chairman, which is perhaps the point of the whole comment that we made.

Now, I would like to move on to the topic which the member for Bracondale raised. I think he makes a very good point, about the question of the awarding of punishments within the institution, that is the awarding of further punishments and the codes of procedures which are established within your institutions giving authority to superintendents to award further punishments. If I understood the member for Bracondale in making his point, what he said was that there should be a limit of a relatively minor level of the additional punishment which could be awarded within the institution by the superintendent, or by the person in authority in that institution.

We all recognize the need for the superintendent to have disciplinary powers in any one of the Minister's institutions, but we question whether or not the superintendent, or the person in authority should be the one who has the final say without any real public scrutiny or outside influence with respect to a determination as to whether or not further punishment is warranted in the circumstances; whether or not there is that kind of relative similarity of punishments awarded for similar instances in the institutions; where there is no real method by which anyone outside the institutions, or outside the Minister's own department knows whether or not a person has been subjected to further punishment; and whether or not it was merited in the circumstances, even if there were only one case a year, where the additional award of punishment was unmerited.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What sort of additional punishment is the hon. member referring to?

Mr. Renwick: Well, confinement for one thing—whatever other additional punishments which are within the authority of the superintendent and whether or not there is some way in which the exercise of that additional punitive authority would not be subjected in some way to outside review of scrutiny.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are limits to what a superintendent can do. The inmate may only lose the good conduct remission he has earned. As far as confinement, and I understand this is what the hon. member is essentially addressing himself to, I do not know how you could possibly have any other kind of system. The system that the hon. member for Bracondale was referring to seems to me, at least on the face of it, somewhat impracticable. By the time you would get around to having the visiting team, that is what the hon. member is referring to, things may have gotten out of hand. There are times when you have to take quick action.

Again, we are dealing with people who are essentially short termers. The average term, I think, is about nine months, which means there are many beneath that, and even those that are beyond that, are not too far beyond the year or year and a half.

So whether you could set up a system like that and still have it practicable, at the moment I am not too sure. If the hon. member can come up with some ideas as to how such a system could be made practicable, I for one, would welcome it, because we do not like the impression getting around that there are some superintendents who may be abusing their authority. We feel certain that if such instances do occur, they are very rare. But if they are not, I would like to know about them, and if there is any kind of system which could be established which is practical, and which does not in fact destroy the discipline required in a penal institution, we would be very glad to hear it. If the hon. member has such ideas, I would like to know.

Mr. Renwick: Well, I only have one. I cannot suggest for a moment that it is necessarily all that practical, but would it be possible that there could be an outside committee? For example, for the Guelph institution, an outside committee composed of two or three reputable citizens from the city of Guelph. The job would not be to intervene in the actual awarding of the punishments, but they would once every month, or once every two months, or once every three months, review the punishments which have been awarded in that particular institution.

If they saw fit on inquiry being made by them, to interview the particular prisoners, or other prisoners, again bearing in mind the problem which the Minister raised of not destroying the fabric of discipline of the particular society in the Guelph institution, at the same time some method of review could be made of the punishments which were awarded by the superintendent, over a period of time, to the extent of making whatever inquiry was necessary.

I am quite certain that the particular trio of citizens who might perform that kind of a function are not the kind of people who are going to be put on by the prisoners and fooled to any great extent. I think it would be a valuable safeguard, or safety cock for such an institution if there were, on an experimental basis, such an after-punishment review undertaken on a periodic basis and such a board would feel free to report directly to the Minister.

It may be that it would bring out for the Minister matters which he is not now familiar with. It may also be that it would be of considerable assistance in developing some kind of assistance through the Minister's institutions elsewhere in the province.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. members's suggestion has a great deal of merit. I want to say that we want to do everything possible to let the public know how our institutions are run so they will have more confidence in the way they are being

run. As a matter of fact, my committee connected with it has been addressing itself to this particular problem generally, that is, how can we go about doing these things which the hon. member is talking about so that the public may be assured that everything is in order. On the face of it the hon. member's suggestion has a great deal of merit and I will refer it to the committee.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, further to this, the last time it was brought up the hon. Minister stated that too much time would elapse before this committee could be formed for this prison whereas the punishment ought immediately to follow the crime, so to speak, in events like this. I got the impression that what the Minister had in mind was setting up a province-wide committee, but this is not necessarily so. The hon. member for Riverdale offered one suggestion. For instance, he talked about reputable citizens in the community. Well, if I may be permitted to suggest solicitors in that vein—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh! Not more lawyers!

Mr. Ben: The fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that in many instances I am sure the punishment is not consistent. What was restricted in Great Britain was the number of days that a prisoner could lose—good behaviour days—remission time. For instance, I believe it was restricted to three days; the superintendent could not impose a penalty exceeding three days of good behaviour time and so many days in isolation or the cooler. For instance, in Great Britain:

> Such member, or members, have power to hold an inquiry and, if not desirable, to award punishment to agree not more severe than any of the following sentences which may, however, be combined:
>
> 14 days close confinement.
>
> 15 days bread and water diet for periods of three days, alternating with periods of three days ordinary diet.
>
> Forfeiture of the stage, privileges or of remission of sentence for 28 days, in any cases of mutiny, and so on.

The idea is that it is quite conceivable that a superintendent, being aggravated, could, when a certain individual appears before him, put him in close confinement—into baby dolls—for two weeks or even a month and have him lose seven days or ten days good behaviour time—whereas in another prison, the man would not receive such a sentence, and there might be more uniformity if there was a visiting committee. At least, as the Minister has pointed out, there would not be these charges levelled against his department.

Getting back—I am not going to just discuss inquests—but the last time I paid a visit to Mercer, and this was not for the purpose of looking at this disturbance, I noted that the drugs were not dated and, therefore, I suspect, outdated.

In other words, a record was not kept of the age of the drugs. They kept the record of quantities, but not of qualities, if I may put it that way. There was no system of rotating drugs to make sure that the drugs were up to date and I suggested, at that time, that a system be implemented of dating drugs and keeping control of drugs not only as to quantity, but also as to quality. I would like to know if these changes that I suggested have been implemented in the prisons.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, while I am waiting the answer to the last question about the drugs at Mercer, I should advise the hon. member that we, as I announced previously, have been reviewing all of the regulations for the past year.

It is quite a lengthy job, it is a detailed one, and we hope, very shortly, to be able to bring in a completely new set of regulations. We feel that the time for delineating certain limitations, insofar as awarding punishment by superintendents is concerned, would be more practical if, as, and when the federal government carries out our recommendation in respect of remissions.

Until that goes into effect, it affects our disciplinary system quite badly and there is no use making a change in the regulations now and then having a change come down from Ottawa which we hope will happen, and then having to change the regulation again.

We hope to do it concurrently, and in view of the fact that we are not ready to bring in all the regulations at this time anyway, we might just as well await that. This matter of laying down, in more precise fashion, the limitations on superintendents, is under consideration when we review the regulations.

Mr. Ben: Does the Minister anticipate having uniform legislation in the immediate foreseeable future or is it in the fullness of time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It depends on what you call in the fullness of time. In the immediate future could, in the view of some people, mean in the fullness of time—it depends how long the time is. I would say we

have been working on it for well over a year and there are many distractions which take you away from that—because there are many priorities.

I would say that it is well advanced and we ought to have it in the not too distant future. I would like to give the hon. member the answer to the question he asked about the drugs.

I am advised that no changes are necessary—that drug records were up to date then. Drugs are checked regularly by the physician and the head nurse and destroyed if their shelf life has expired.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, this is unadulterated nonsense because this is question I put directly to the nurse and she admitted that there was absolutely no record as to the quality of these drugs—that there was no way of telling when these drugs came in there.

I specifically put that question to the nurse. I said, "When did these drugs come in?" and they could not tell me. They stated there was no record when these drugs came in and they saw the point.

When you come here and read that off, all right I am not going to attack you, but I will attack the person who sent that note to you, because it is utter hogwash.

The same thing applied in Guelph because I made it a point, during the Chomenko time when I was down there—because the Chomenko name cropped up—to check their drugs and they were not dated. I was told, point blank, in Mercer, that they did not have a record as to when those drugs came in. They only had a record as to quantities, and they kept the quantities up to date.

It is sheer hogwash and I suggest that you investigate yourself and go down there right now, after this session finishes before they get out of there, and see if they have a record of the dates of those drugs. I will accompany you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to a lot of things but the implication that I have to get out of here and go down to Mercer before Miss Nicholson, who is the administrator of female institutions, gets down there ahead of me is outrageous, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark.

Mr. Ben: I will not withdraw the remark.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think that is uncalled for. We do not have those kind of people working for us.

Mr. Ben: You do so. I will go down right now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the second place, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that, on the face of it, there is an invoice which comes in with all our drugs and we know what date they come in, so we would have that.

Mr. Ben: You do not know which date the ones on the shelf are. You know when they come in, and what quantity, but not when they are put on the shelf. I was down there and I asked.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I gave the hon. member the statement of the administrator.

Mr. Ben: All right. I will go down now and you can let me in and we will go and check the drugs, right now.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Minister a brief question. Could the Minister tell me how many visits have been made to your institutions by MPPs and secondly, what was the condition of the furniture after they left?

Mr. Chairman: Order. Vote 2004.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us not rush the business. The Chairman does not need to bellow out and try to cut off the debate, without even looking to see whether other hon. members are trying to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I object to the "Ah, ah, ah" from the members, because the Chairman sits there and says "vote 2004", without even looking around, trying to cut the speakers off. Let us just get back to the rules of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: He is fair.

Mr. MacDonald: He may be fair, but he likes to cut the debate off.

Mr. Chairman, what I would like to ask, and I was getting up in a completely uncontroversial manner before this little storm broke, is that mention was made earlier of an anonymous letter with regard to conditions in some of the institutions. In connection with that, there are references made to the educational facilities in Burwash. I think there were six points made, and I would like to put them to the Minister and ask him for his comments. I am not in a position to vouch for the authenticity of it, but perhaps now is

a chance to clarify whether or not the points are valid:

1. One must depend entirely on the generosity of The Department of Education, Ontario, for supplying correspondence courses, or The Department of Veterans Affairs—which is not even recognized—for credits.

2. Advance schooling or specialized courses must be—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Could we deal with them one at a time, perhaps?

I do not follow the meaning of that—"depending on the generosity of"—does the hon. member make sense out of that?

Mr. MacDonald: I quote:

1. One must depend entirely on the generosity of The Department of Education, Ontario, for supplying correspondence courses.

Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is wrong with that? "Depending on the generosity"—I do not know what that means. Is the implication that we have no teachers at Burwash?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, perhaps I will read all of it, because there are references to the teachers, Mr. Chairman.

The next point is:

2. Advance schooling or specialized courses must be paid for by the individual.

3. There are no study facilities; one must study on one of five card tables in the dormitory where there are 65 men playing cards and two radios—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member was in the House when the hon. leader of the Opposition asked these questions and—

Mr. MacDonald: I understand that he raised questions with relation to this letter. I did not understand that he had referred to the education.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, he did, and we answered. The hon. member will find them in *Hansard*.

Mr. MacDonald: Completely? Very well. Thank you, sir.

Votes 2003 and 2004 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested in the outer halls here tonight that I table my speech and have it appear in the record. But I only give about one speech a year in the House, so I did not want to miss this opportunity.

I am not much for putting things on the record, as many people are around here; I do not think it is that important. But one thing that I would like to mention for the record tonight is the fact that my former Deputy Minister had retired—he was here this afternoon, but I am not sure that he is here tonight—as at the end of February and I would like to compliment him for the many years of service that he has given this government, first in The Department of Highways and latterly as Deputy Minister of Public Works.

He certainly was a brilliant man through his Department of Highways days, and he certainly gave The Department of Public Works excellent service. He is, I think, the type of person who is a good representative of the type of civil servant that we have in this province.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Connell: Second, it is well-known as far as my new Deputy Minister, Mr. Hilliard, is concerned, that I give him a hearty welcome to The Department of Public Works. With all due deference to other Deputy Ministers, I am quite of the opinion that he is possibly one of the best—or the best—administrative head of any department in the government service.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is a pleasure to be a Minister of this department during this Centennial year. I almost hesitate to say that this is the ninth set of estimates I have had the pleasure of giving, as far as the department is concerned.

I might just mention that during the last 100 years there have been 19 Ministers of Public Works. I will not mention all of their names, but I would like to mention the first one, the hon. John Carling, who held the portfolios of Agriculture and Public Works. It is a peculiar combination and that name has gone on to become rather prominent in this province in some ways.

It is rather interesting to me to see that in some ways he was the representative of Agriculture. And I might just make the comment with regard to Mr. Hilliard and myself, that as one ex-farmer and a farmer heading up The Department of Public Works, I make so bold to say that I do not think it is a bad combination.

I would like to compliment my own staff. They are a dedicated, hard-working group. I might say that in The Department of Public Works we are never allowed the luxury of making a mistake. I will say to my own people that through the years I have been very fortunate in being their Minister as they never have, on any occassion that I am aware of, done anything that has been embarrassing to myself or to the government.

I would also like to add that under our new Deputy Minister, we have gone into a rather strenuous and objective reorganization of The Department of Public Works. This is not complete by any means, but we are working on it and I think we have made some rather good headway up to this point. I will read into the record a little bit of what has gone on there as far as the organization is concerned.

Steps have been taken to effect a reorganization of the department to facilitate the expansion of programmes and the increasing responsibilities the department now has. In recent months, considerable work has been done by organization and methods of Treasury board, together with several members of our staff, to study and recommend how the reorganization should be undertaken.

One of the first and major recommendations is the establishment of two administrative divisions within the department. This has been accepted and approved and each division will be headed by an executive director responsible to the Deputy Minister.

The finance and administration division will be in charge of Mr. D. Y. Lewis, who has had valuable experience with the department as director of the legal branch since 1957.

The operations division will be in charge of Mr. D. G. Creba who, since entering the department in 1958, has performed the duties of chief architect. These two appointments are now effective.

Mr. Lewis will continue to head a departmental reorganization and implementation team composed of staff members of the department and of organization and methods. This team will be engaged in implementing further reorganization, including both the Toronto and regional offices.

The work of the regional offices of the department throughout Ontario will be broadened by delegating additional responsibility and authority to plan and carry out the buildings maintenance programme.

In addition to giving regional offices more responsibility and greater authority, the change procedures will expedite maintenance work in the field and eliminate much of the requisitioning presently being done through head office.

Further reorganization of the department will proceed and will be announced soon. Recommendations will be made to Treasury board for additional approval of the organization affecting the creation of new branches.

As indicated previously, the whole process within the department will take considerable time to implement, since it is necessary to develop operating procedures to fully achieve our purpose.

I handed out the blue book a few days ago there was some criticism last year, strictly from the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden), that there was not enough information in the book, at least not the type of information that he would like to have. I promised him last year that we would try to change this book quite extensively, with additional information. I cannot imagine it will have all the information in it that he needs but I really believe that we have gone a long way in providing quite a bit of additional information.

Written on the outside of the blue book there are five sections. One is a very short résumé of works completed, and the second section is on projects that are now out to contract and under construction. The third part covers those projects approved for construction; the fourth section is the preparation of working drawings and specifications. This is the area in which a great deal of the work will be done this year in getting ready for next year's estimates.

In the last section—and this is a bit of a change—it has always been my argument as a Minister that we were not given the opportunity, and I am not critical of anyone, but we have not had the opportunity to do as much advance planning as I would like to do or my people would like to do within the department. You will notice there is quite a list of projects in that fifth category that come in under the category of preliminary planning. I think with that in mind we will be able to

do even a better job next year of getting additional information in this blue book.

As far as the estimates themselves are concerned, there are a number of changes. They are quite a change to me, but basically the estimates and their set-up have been changed quite a bit this year in all departments and we have gone along with that. I would say the votes are numbered somewhat differently, but there is actually quite a bit of additional information in the estimates book. The reason for this, of course, is to give more detail to the House, and the new set-up in the estimates book is of course to fit in with Treasury board requirements, and it certainly helps to fit in with our own reorganization. As I mentioned earlier, I think it was put in there to help confuse myself also.

Many of our votes and items for 1967 and 1968 have been altered in form and content from the estimates I presented last year. Our estimated expenditures for 1967-68 are increased over last year by 21 per cent for ordinary, going from $15,829,000 to $19,110,000. And 27 per cent for capital, moving from $41 million to $52,053,000.

The general increase is to allow for higher rates of salaries and wages, increases in cost of materials, new and expanded programmes in departmental re-organization and an increased complement of staff, all of which supports an augmented capital programme of planning and construction.

I do not intend to say too much about some of the work that we have completed as I believe it will come up later on in the estimates. But I just would like to mention about the office development to the east for the use of the civil service. It is pretty well proceeding on schedule. And although the building contractor has experienced some delays, we expect the first phase, the Hepburn and Ferguson office building, will be occupied next August and December respectively. Portions of the Macdonald block will be occupied as they become progressively available throughout the year.

Tenders on the structural steel for the office towers—and this is the second stage of this set-up—tenders on the structural steel for the office towers, the Hearst and Mowat blocks, are being called ahead of the general trades to permit a start in January or February of 1968 on construction of phase two immediately following substantial completion of the original contract for phase one.

We also expect to be ready for tender call by next September on the three-level underground parking garage and office services building to the immediate south of the Whitney block.

Those are my comments. I suppose I will be criticized for being brief again, but I think as we go through the estimates, I am quite prepared to give you full details on any questions which come up later.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure again to be the critic for The Department of Public Works. I have listened with interest to the hon. Minister outlining his very brief remarks on his department. He has told us that there has been a reorganization of his department, also he has brought to our attention the improvement in the Ontario Public Works book. I must say, Mr. Chairman, it is an improvement over last year. And I must say that it helps considerably one who is a layman to figure out exactly what trend the department is taking.

I will say there have been some improvements and renovations in this Legislature since the last session, which is befitting in the Centennial year, Mr. Chairman. However, it is a wonder to me that the Minister has not made some changes in the east and west galleries of this assembly. Each year almost every day while Parliament is in session, I see more and more school children from every part of the province of Ontario come here and visit the Legislature. I watch the students from my seat, Mr. Chairman, as they take their seats and watch them as they step very carefully down those narrow steps, as though they were in a great fear of falling.

These steps are a danger to life and limb. There certainly ought to be at the very least a railing so that people could have assistance in walking up and down these steps. It would appear to me that the architects of The Department of Public Works could certainly use their skills to improve vastly the seating in the east and west galleries and make the way to the seats somewhat less hazardous.

I would like to compliment the Minister on front of the Legislature building here and say that the decorations are quite attractive and in keeping with the birthday of a country. This is bright and colourful and outstanding, sir, especially at night, with the gleaming lights.

I brought to the attention of the government on more than one occasion, that this Legislature building should be cleaned up by sandblasting the dirt and grime from its surfaces. It has been argued that by doing so

it would destroy the ivy on this building, which has been growing there for nearly 75 years, along with the dirt and grime. Surely experts in The Department of Agriculture and Food and The Department of Public Works, with all the research that is carried on in The Department of Agriculture and Food could get together and work out a scheme whereby the building could be cleaned up and the ivy saved in one operation.

When one is walking up University Avenue, Mr. Chairman, the dark and dismal grey old building stands out among all the clean and shining buildings such as the Frost, the Ferguson building, the 11-storey Hepburn building, the Macdonald block and the Whitney block. It makes one feel that a big improvement would ensue if this historic old Parliament building could grow older and cleaner at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, if a man did not wash for nearly 75 years, he would not be so attractive, even if he was covered partly with vines.

I would also like to congratulate the Minister of Public Works and the city of Toronto for having eventually got around to repairing the walk down the centre of the park in front of the Legislature building. Many people have commented on this new walk and the comments have come mostly from the ladies who are employed in the building, because more than one high and slender heel has parted company with the shoe because of the cracks and broken construction of this walk.

When I was first elected to the Legislature, there were beautiful flower beds, Mr. Chairman, on each side of this centre walk. These were most attractive and added greatly to the beauty of the park and to this building. However, ever since the construction of the subway, these flower beds have never been restored. Many people feel that they would enhance the scenery around this Parliament building, especially in the Centennial year and with so many school children visiting this assembly.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding The Department of Public Works in the past has carried out lease arrangements, under which various government departments have had buildings built for certain department branches. For instance, The Attorney General's Department have required buildings for the Ontario Provincial Police and such buildings have been built in the city of Ottawa, also Midland, and also one in the town of Glencoe.

In these cases, The Department of Public Works has entered into an agreement with the contractor on a ten-year lease. In some ridings, Mr. Chairman, where other provincial police buildings have been built, the government has purchased the land and owns the buildings. This seems to me to be a rather hit and miss arrangement and I wonder if the Miniser would inform us if such leases are drawn up between the departments and the various contractors, where the provincial police buildings have been erected. It seems as though the land has been bought where it is the most expensive, and on the other hand, where land is cheaper, the leasing arrangements are entered into.

Would the Minister advise us the amount that is paid per year for such leases, and why does the government lease buildings in certain areas under these conditions?

During the early part of this session, the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) brought up the subject of standardization, or the modular construction of government buildings. I mention this again, because of the people of our province being so concerned with the increasing burden of taxes with each successive year.

At this time, when government is building so many new edifices, at a time when the province is so much in need of so many buildings, including hospitals and schools, it is felt that the time has come when standardization in construction should be brought into effect in construction of certain parts of buildings.

I would like to know if the Minister has made any study at all of standardization, because I have noticed some of The Department of Lands and Forests buildings that have a look of similarity in some sections of this province. Would the Minister inform us if there are any government buildings in which standardization has been adopted to any degree?

I feel the time has come, through studies, of standardization of building of schools—and thereby great savings could be instigated in the cost of their construction. If some schemes are not implemented in some form or another, then I have every reason to believe that some great changes are going to take place in Ontario. There is a large portion of our population who are not receiving anything like $12,000 a year. These are the people who elect us to office and they are also the ones who suffer the burden of high taxes.

We have heard a great deal in this Legislature about the new science and technology centre which is built as a Centennial project for the province, in the city of Toronto. There has been much discussion and debate concerning the cost of this building, and the date on which it is to be completed. We hear that it will not be completed until 1968, which is a big disappointment to many people in the province of Ontario.

My information is that it is to be built under the jurisdiction of The Department of Public Works and, when a vote comes up and this building can be discussed, I will have some questions to ask the Minister, which, I hope, will bring forth some straightforward answers, both with respect to the cost and all details, as to exactly what is taking place in regard to this building.

Mr. Chairman, it appears The Department of Public Works has spent large sums of money during the past fiscal year. It is somewhat difficult to determine the exact extent of such expenditures.

As a layman, Mr. Chairman, it is very hard to understand, as some projects cover more than one year, for instance, while others are amalgamated with other government divisions, some of which have remained or are eliminated altogether.

Estimated public works expenditures for completed, present and planned projects appear in detail in the 1967 estimates book, where as to 1967 this was not carried out. So it is difficult to assess, only in a general way, the kind of a job the department is doing at the present time.

It is somewhat disturbing to read that the total estimated spending by the department for the next year will exceed last year by $14,334,000 and that nearly $2 million of this money will be additional salaries.

We would like to know how many extra people are to be employed, and why and where. It seems to me to be a very large item of expenditure, and yet the salaries of the night cleaning staff are so ridiculously low.

As a matter that has involved government mal-administration and needless waste of public funds, up to the amount of a quarter of a million dollars, this has come to my attention, Mr. Chairman.

It concerns the construction of an abattoir for the slaughtering of hogs and cattle at the Guelph reformatory. It is to replace the old abattoir. I do not intend to criticize the government for establishing such a building as a training centre for inmates of the reformatory, and a means of supplying meat for other government institutions. The government proposal in this connection is admirable. However, I do find fault with the manner in which construction of this abattoir was planned and supervised by The Department of Public Works.

The first mistake of the department was after it was announced, in 1963, that the new abattoir was to be built—the architect hired for the job had no experience in designing such a building. The result was that it had to be demolished, redesigned and reconstructed at a cost to the public of more than $200,000—as we are informed, after The Department of Reform Institutions refused to accept it, as they considered it outdated and inefficient.

Originally, it was intended to have this abattoir operate under the federal Department of Agriculture, meat inspection division, making it possible to use the plant for custom killing, in order to supply meat to other government institutions.

For some reason, presumably because the plans for the new federally-inspected plant must meet specifications of, and be approved by, the federal Department of Agriculture, the new abattoir was placed under provincial inspection only, and thus the use for which this abattoir was constructed, is now very limited.

The plant has sufficient floor area to make it an efficient meat processing establishment, both for training of inmates in the field, in which there is a great shortage of qualified workers, and for the supply of meat products to provincial institutions such as hospitals and jails and so forth.

There is nothing being done in the area at the present but we would like to hear from the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman), or the Minister of Public Works, if there are any plans for using this abattoir for the training of inmates. There will be further questions on this subject later, under the estimates. Mr. Chairman, I have other remarks to make under the different votes which I will bring up as the votes are called.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, last year I made quite a lengthy statement about the estimates of The Department of Public Works. I am not now going to repeat everything I said then, although I think 95 per cent of it is worthy of repetition, since the department has obviously not responded to

the suggestions contained there to any significant extent.

I will just review, very briefly, some of the points I made, which I think are still valid, but which, apparently, have not made much impression on the government. I suggested at that time, and this is my primary argument, that this department, or the Minister of this department, in his estimates, should set forth a statement of the government policy with regard to public works construction; not as a janitor—which was his own description of his position—but as a spokesman for the government indicating the government's policy on the matter.

I suggested, at the time, that construction policy is important in respect to its economic aspects since, obviously, government capital spending can be important in an economic sense. I also auggested that it is important in its social aspects, since government expenditures on social capital can be important to the future development of the province.

We do not get any statement, from any point in this government, of the government's policy with regard to capital expenditures, in terms of either economic implications or social implications. It is quite obvious from the statement that the Minister has just made this evening, and statements he has made in past years, that we will never get it from this department.

I regard that as regretful. I think the government should have a policy with regard to capital spending. It obviously has no policy. It drifts along in this, as in so many areas. When there is an urgent need for a facility in a specific field it thinks about it ten years, then draws up working drawings and maybe in another ten years it gets something done.

Mercer could be taken as an example, except one could say that even yet the government has not had anything done on Mercer. It is stated in this blue book, which I will mention in more detail in a moment, that tenders are to be called in May, 1967, for Mercer, about 20 years late. We are not sure, at least I do not think the Minister said in his introductory statement that they have actually been called, so we cannot even—

Hon. Mr. Connell: They were called three days ago.

Mr. Bryden: They were called three days ago. So finally tenders are called on Mercer. But you see we do not have any sort of overall statement at all of what the government's position is with regard to capital spending. We know—it is obvious to everyone—we have been in an inflationary situation for some time. The federal government at Ottawa has been suggesting—I have not heard it recently—but over the last year they have been suggesting that public expenditures in the capital field should be reduced. In other words, we should cut back on capital spending for social purposes when every conceivable kind of private spending in the capital field proceeds. I have never heard from this government whether they agree with that position or not. I can only assume that they more or less go along because they obviously exercise very great restraint in their capital spending.

The expenditures are up this year, or the proposed capital expenditures are up this year over last year. Of course, last year they were down in relation to the previous year. But it is by no means clear from the Minister's statement, or anything else, if the increase is projected capital expenditures represent anything more than the inflationary situation in which we now find ourselves.

This sort of information, Mr. Chairman, is just never available from this department, which I think should be the department in the government that supplies that type of information.

What is the precise nature of their capital programme? Does it involve increased expenditure? If so, for what purposes? When I ask if it involves increased expenditure, I want to know if it involves increased expenditure in terms of real dollars. Or is the increased amount merely a reflection of increased construction costs?

We do not know. But there is some increase. But are we meeting the capital requirements that the province faces in education, in reforms, in mental health? The only guess I can make is that we are not. But it is just about impossible to tell from the information which the Minister of Public Works has provided us. He persistently refuses to give any sort of overall statement of the government's policy with regard to capital expenditure, exclusive of expenditures on highways.

Now, the Minister made reference to the blue book that is produced this year, and I think he suggested to me that I should be at least better satisfied than I was last year or in previous years. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will concede that I am. This book is a slight improvement on the totally useless document that has been presented in past years. And that is the most one could say.

In past years, the document presented, setting forth the details of the government's capital programme, actual and projected, was

totally useless. Now it is a little less than totally useless, but it is still far from the sort of statement that the government should present to us.

We now have—apart from the work completed section—four sections. One relates to projects actually under construction, the next relates to those approved for construction, which I assume are in most cases to be started some time during this fiscal year. Then the next one relates to those that have been approved for working drawings, and finally those that have been approved for preliminary plans.

That breakdown is an improvement, that is helpful. We can get some idea from this breakdown as to those which are now actually in progress, those which will soon be in progress and those which are still under consideration. I will concede that. But we stilll have great difficulty relating anything that appears in the book entitled "Capital Works", to anything that appears in the book that is entitled "Estimates".

I would submit to the Minister, I suggested to him last year and I think the point is still valid, that in the section of his book on capital works, relating to those projects that are under construction, or are approved for construction and presumably will get started some time this year, he should indicate first the amount of money that he expects will be spent in the current fiscal year; second—this is not necessarily the order of priority, but these are the items that should be listed—second, the money that has already been spent in past years; third, the total amount that it is anticipated will be spent, and finally, the target date for completion.

Without that information it is very, very hard to relate the book to either the estimate book or to the overall plans of the government. I will concede that the Minister has now moved ahead from his previous practice in that he has entered a figure in relation to the projects that are under construction—and I think possibly some, though not all of those which are approved for construction.

He has not said what his figure relates to. I assume that it is the figure that he expects will be spent in this current fiscal year.

I have not had time to add up all those figures to see if they add up to the total of capital construction in the blue book. It seems to me that they should. If they do, he no doubt will advise me; if they do not, I think he should explain why they do not.

But I think we should have in here figures for the anticipated expenditure on the current fiscal year which add up to something that can be seen in the estimate book. I would stress once again, Mr. Chairman, that we should also have the figures of anticipated expenditure for the future.

It is very difficult to figure out what the project is when we only have one year's expenditure, the major projects, as we all know, usually take more than one year. How can we figure out from one year's expenditure exactly what is involved?

To take a case in point, somewhere in this book under the projects actually under construction, under The Department of Tourism and Information, it is stated that $10 million is to be spent on the Centennial centre of science and technology. My recollection is that a contract has been awarded for the construction of that centre and the contract is for approximately $21 million.

How does the $21 million fit in? There is nothing in the Minister's book that suggests any expenditure of $21 million; it just happens that this information has come forward quite independently. But I say to the Minister that this book should show that $21 million, it should show the $10 million which he apparently forecasts will be spent this year. But it should also show what was spent last year, if anything, and what he expects will be spent next year.

On the famous Vanier institute, which is to replace that disgraceful institution called the Mercer reformatory on King Street, I think it is merely stated that tenders will be called and the Minister has said that, in fact, they have been called. There is no indication as to how much is to be spent this year on this project or, as I recall, how much will be spent overall, or when it is expected that this project will be completed.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has in the past usually go off easily in the presentation of his estimates. He has got off easily because he has refused to give information which this House and the people of Ontario are entitled to have. He has improved his blue book marginally over previous presentations but it still falls far short of what I think we have a right to expect.

That comment applies only to the blue book, which is a detailed statement of projects. Even that is indaequate, but in the larger picture, Mr. Chairman, one can only say that this department still—I should not perhaps criticize the department, because they merely have to carry out policy—but the Minister falls completely short of his responsibilities as a Minister of Public Works.

He is not willing or able, or possibly he does not consider it worthwhile to give us any statement of government policy with regard to capital expenditure. I have submitted in the past, and I am not going to repeat my arguments, that it is most important that we should hear such a statement from the government; if not from this Minister, then from some other Minister, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) or the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall). But we get it from no source, no source at all.

We do not know whether the government is in favour of increasing capital expenditure or reducing it; in fact we do not even get information that indicates to us whether or not capital expenditure is being increased in any meaningful sense. I am going to ask the Minister of Public Works to tell us, either in his summation of these introductory remarks or later, as to whether the increase in money terms that he has included in his budget is anything more than a reflection of inflation.

I am going to ask him what the policy of the government is with regard to the provision of social capital. Obviously they do not put very high priority on it, because even in this period of extremely high construction costs we have only about $49 million of capital expenditures for this department. Obviously, schemes which the government has announced with a beating of drums in other contexts are not being translated into reality in this situation, because all the various programmes that the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) and others have announced could not possibly be covered by $49 million.

It seems to me that the time has come when we should have some explanation by some Minister of this government as to the discrepancies between the various bold programmes announced and those that come before us in terms of dollars and cents in the estimates of The Department of Public Works.

Failing any other Minister, I would say that it is up to the Minister of Public Works to give us that information. I am by no means hopeful that we will get it. Last year, Mr. Chairman, I went into some detail as to what I thought was incumbent upon a Minister of Public Works in presenting his estimates. The most that has come out of those suggestions has been a marginal improvement in the blue book relating to capital works. Otherwise we have had nothing from the Minister tonight except a statement as to the reorganization that has taken place in his department.

I have no doubt that reorganization is quite good in technical terms; it will undoubtedly improve the capacity of the department to carry out construction programmes of the government. But we will have no statement of policy as to the overall programmes of the government in the capital field, either as to the total that they consider justified in terms of capital expenditure in the current year or as to the priorities which they consider should be emphasized in this year.

I am not hopeful that we will get any such statement from the Minister, but at least I would like to have an accounting from him as to exactly how he has arrived at his capital expenditures for the current year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will go on with these estimates and then we will carry on with the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 91

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Fire Departments Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 3191

Summary Convictions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 3191

Questions to Mr. Dymond re shortage of nurses, Mr. Sargent 3191

Questions to Mr. Wishart re organized crime, Mr. MacDonald 3192

Question to Mr. Randall re wage parity, Mr. MacDonald 3192

Question to Mr. Randall re housing at Port Colborne, Mr. MacDonald 3192

Question to Mr. Rowntree re Quebec's proposed deposit insurance scheme, Mr. Nixon .. 3192

Question to Mr. Simonett re cost of water to householders in Brantford, Mr. Gordon 3193

Question to Mr. Robarts re rental controls, Mr. Young 3193

Estimates, Department of Public Works, Mr. Connell, continued 3193

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3228

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Sarnia Christian school, Sarnia, and eastern high school of commerce, Toronto; and in the west gallery, our Lady of Peace separate school, Islington, St. Elizabeth separate school, Islington, and the adult training centre, Toronto.

I believe that some of those guests are in the Speaker's gallery, as well as in the east and west galleries.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the bill simply provides a method of enforcing arbitration decisions.

THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This bill, Mr. Speaker, authorizes the service of the uniform traffic ticket summons on a holiday. The holidays will include Sunday.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health, notice of which has been given.

Is the Minister aware of the front page headline in last Friday's daily paper in Owen Sound, stating that the nursing shortage is so acute that 303 patients have to wait, and a whole floor of the hospital had to be closed; and if so, what steps has the Minister taken to solve this problem?

I do not want to hear that it is under study either.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Then, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I have no answer for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the Minister had notification of this question before. What is the answer?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The Minister said that he did not have an answer and therefore the member must accept.

Mr. Sargent: There must be an answer when you cannot get nurses in this province!

Mr. Speaker: If the Minister had an answer, he would give it, but he does not have to give an answer to the member.

Mr. Sargent: When will he have an answer, then?

Mr. Speaker: Proceed with your next question.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I think I ought to point out to the hon. member that he just said that if this matter were under study, he did not want an answer, and I said that I had no answer. However, I am not aware of the headline to which the hon. member refers, because I did not see that newspaper, nor has the hospital board advised either my department or the Ontario hospital services commission about it.

I think that the hon. member is aware, of course, of the answer to the question himself. The direction of the hospital lies within the jurisdiction and authority of the board. A regional school has been established in Owen Sound. It will take in its first class next September and will produce twice the number of nurses that have been produced in the independent school which has been run by the Owen Sound hospital for many years—and very successfully.

In addition, a school for the training of registered nursing assistants was approved for establishment at Walkerton and it will take in its first class this year, too.

These are moves that have been made to cope with the need for additional numbers of nurses in the area.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question on this?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the attention of the Attorney General:

In view of the admission by assistant commissioner H. H. Graham, of the Ontario Provincial Police, that there is a Canadian mafia and it has working relationships with the mafia in the United States, would the Attorney General comment on the news stories which have broken in the last 24 hours concerning mafia links with Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any statement attributed to commissioner H. H. Graham of the nature that the hon. member has suggested, and I, therefore, have no comment at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General cares to inquire, he will find that in radio broadcasts from Queen's Park today, at least in the Sudbury area and, I suspect, in other parts of the province, there are comments attributed to commissioner H. H. Graham, to that effect.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have inquired directly of the commissioner and I am not aware of any statement made to that effect.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, is the Attorney General denying that the statement was made?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is not some confusion. There is a commissioner, Thomas Graham, on the Ontario police commission.

Mr. MacDonald: There is no such confusion.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, inquiry has been made directly of H. H. Graham and we had no such statement from him.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister of Economics and Development. I asked him one yesterday, so we will have two now.

During his estimates on April 6, pages 1827 and 1828, the Minister stated that his department is studying the issue of wage parity in the automobile industry before coming to any conclusion regarding its validity.

Has the official policy been crystallized, and was it being expressed by Homer Marion, a staff consultant with the Ontario development agency, in an address to the rotary club on April 28, when he stated that wage parity puts the 20,000 new jobs created by the auto pact "in jeopardy", and that the UAW seeks parity "to protect United States jobs by preventing them from flowing into Canada"?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, the first part, government policy on wage parity has not been crystallized, and my statement on page 1828 of *Hansard*, dated April 6, 1967, sets forth this government's viewpoint and it remains unchanged at the present time.

In reply to the hon. member's reference to the remarks made in an address to the rotary club of Toronto on April 28, 1967, I can best answer this by quoting from Mr. Homer Marion's opening remarks: "The opinions I express here today are my own, and not those of anyone else."

Mr. Marion was making some purely personal observations and was not reflecting government policy, I assure you.

In answer to the member's question of yesterday, I am advised that the Canada Cement Company is transferring employees from the Port Colborne plant to its other plants. The company owns 12 dwelling units —four single, and four double. Six of these are occupied at the present time. I am further advised that the company does not wish to dispose of these properties and proposes to retain them against its future needs when the plant is reopened.

At the request of the city of Port Colborne, Ontario housing corporation is currently conducting a survey to determine the need and demand for senior citizens' accommodation in the municipality. The council's request did not include a survey for family accommodation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

In view of recent statements by the Attorney General of Saskatchewan, does the Minister have any reservations about Quebec's

proposed deposit insurance scheme which will cover Quebec incorporated trust and loan companies operating in this province?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the Quebec authorities are presently working with the officials of The Department of Finance in Ottawa regarding the Quebec incorporated companies operating outside of Quebec. I am not able at this time to make any statement regarding the merits of the Quebec scheme.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. I am deeply disturbed to find a most grievous error on page 2992 of *Hansard* of May 3, 1967, in which I am quoted as follows:

> We must assume that the Provincial Treasurer is Lin Kow to the Prime Minister.

Now, as hon. members are well aware, what I did say was: "We must assume that the Provincial Treasurer is Lin Piao, rhymes with 'meow,' to the Prime Minister." That is to say, the chief comrade in arms to the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), the anointed one, who, in the fullness of time, will don the purple robes and carry the orb and sceptre of power.

I deem it most urgent that I make this correction, since I have discovered that a gentleman by the name of Lin Kao is now the object of attack in another jurisdiction because of his alleged NDP sympathies and modern revisionist tendencies.

I know the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) would strongly resent being identified with such a person. I trust that in making the correction, I have lifted from the Treasurer any cloud of suspicion which may have resulted from the erroneous words attributed to me.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Minister of Energy and Resources Management whether he is in a position to answer a question I put to him on April 24, recorded on page 2509 of *Hansard*, and to which he has not yet replied?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I might say to the hon. member that as soon as a decision is made as to what action this government is going to take, I will answer the hon. member's question.

Mr. MacDonald: Can the Minister indicate whether such a decision will be made before May 23?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I would say that if we are going to take any action it would be before May 15, that is the last filing time we have with the NEB.

Mr. MacDonald: I will repeat the question on May 15 then.

Mr. G. T. Gordon (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Could the Minister inform the House what the approximate cost of water will be to householders in Brantford after the proposed Lake Erie-to-Brantford pipeline is built?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, in November 1966, the municipalities in the Brantford area were given engineering details with respect to a proposed Lower Grand Valley water supply system, with rates to be established if, and when, the city of Brantford agreed to the proposal.

In view of the fact that the city of Brantford informed the Ontario water resources commission, in a letter dated February 28, 1967, that it was not in favour of proceeding with the proposed programme, no further action was taken by the OWRC in the establishing of water rates.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I put a question to the hon. Prime Minister on the record yesterday. I wonder if he has an answer for me?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Yes, I have not a copy of the question here, Mr. Speaker, but as I recall it, the hon. member asked whether consideration was being given to the establishment of a review board.

I can only say that, at the moment, we have no plans in hand to institute rental controls which are inherent in the type of board to which you refer.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 10th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

(Continued)

On vote 1901:

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, in replying to the two Opposition speakers last night, or making some comments on their statements, the one

question was asked, by the member for Kent East (Mr. Spence), what our leasing policy was as far as buildings are concerned. I think it is worth giving our policy rather clearly.

When a request is received in this office to rent space in any given city or town, the following procedure is followed:

An estimate of rental is forwarded to Treasury board on what it would cost to rent space in any given location. This estimate of rental is based on office records and personal knowledge of the area. When we receive Treasury board approval to rent space, the following procedure is followed:

First, we check government-owned space that may be suitable and/or available. Second, we check the present government leases in the particular area. Three, we investigate space submitted, which has been placed on our available space file; and four, we check the local newspaper advertisements, signs in the area, contact local realtors and other leasing agents.

All those locations are inspected and the department is asked for a recommendation as to which of the locations would best suit their need. When the recommendation is received, an offer is obtained for the space which offers the best recommendable offer, taking into consideration the type of space offered, location of same and what service is offered, such as janitor service, decorating, partitioning, and so on.

If, in any city or town, there is no space available considered suitable for the client department, or can be recommended by The Department of Public Works, the following procedure is implemented:

First, an advertisement is placed in the local newspaper, stating our requirements and any other pertinent information. This advertisement is placed usually one day per week for three weeks in smaller towns, and could be placed for longer periods, depending on the reception and offers received.

Secondly, all space offered from these advertisements is inspected or if available space is not satisfactory new buildings are considered.

It should be noted that at different times it is necessary to have new buildings constructed for particular client departments which require a specific location, layout and equipment; for example, the Ontario Provincial Police.

At all times in the property office, there are space files kept for most cities and towns, whereby a record of any available space is kept. The information on these files is compiled for any person submitting information on space that they wish to rent at any given time during the year.

This, I might say, is the general procedure on leasing matters which is followed by our property section in The Department of Public Works.

Also mentioned by the member for Kent East was the standardization of buildings, that more standardization should take place. This has been an argument of many people for many years; for example, schools, that we should follow one set of plans and this type of thing.

Actually, it is most difficult to have one set of plans. I know The Department of Education has them, but very few school boards would use them. In our own department, we do do considerable standardization. Many of our police buildings are of a standard construction.

Many of our Highways garage buildings and storage buildings are of a standard construction, and I might say that in our blue book, you will notice in the last section, where we are doing some planning on three health labs, that they will be of almost identical type of building, depending, of course, on the contour of the land where they are to be situated. And, of course, we do try to standardize the furniture.

When you get into colleges of education and the larger hospitals—this type of building —it is most difficult to have it a standard type of building, it is almost impractical. Each architect has his own ideas and requirements have changed, particularly in health. And education requirements are changing so quickly from year to year that it is just impossible to have a standard type of building.

The hon. member for Kent East mentioned the abattoir. I cannot recall exactly what his questions were, but there has been considerable discussion about the abattoir over the years as to the reason of its taking considerable time to build and that it has not been in operation as quickly as it should have been.

I hesitate to give long accounts, but I believe I should in this case. If the members will bear with me for longer than I would care to be, I would like to give you an accurate account of the progress on this building over the years.

The requirements and regulations were most demanding. The associate architects' drawings and specifications met all requirements in every respect, with a minimum of

cost. And a detailed review on this matter is as follows: The planning for a new abattoir at the Ontario reformatory, Guelph, goes back to 1958, when it was learned that the old slaughterhouse was in very poor structural condition and economically impossible to repair.

Several sets of preliminary plans were prepared at various times during the period of 1958 to 1962, at estimated costs varying from $75,000 to $825,000, the latter figure being an estimate prepared by officers of The Department of Public Works dated June 21, 1960, based on a comprehensive meeting with the officials of The Department of Reform Institutions on August 8, 1958.

On September 7, 1962, a well-qualified and highly-reputable firm of architects was commissioned to design a completely new abattoir building for the reformatory. Plans were prepared which were based on previous studies and the known requirements of The Department of Reform Institutions, and on a comparative evaluation of commercial meat-processing plants of similar size and nature.

Our associate architects were governed by, and strictly adhered to, the broad and exacting requirements of the federal Department of Agriculture as set out in The Meat Inspection Act; the meat inspection regulations; the Human Slaughter of Animals Act; the humane slaughter regulations; the health of animals branch circular No. 69 dated June 27, 1963, entitled "Approved packing house materials and agents"; the health of animals branch circular No. 47, dated August, 1963, entitled "Requirements of The Canada Meat Inspection Act and regulations respecting packing plant construction layout equipment and other facilities"; the requirements of the agricultural engineering extension services of the federated colleges at Guelph; and the Canadian farm buildings planned services, catalogue No. 822-564.

The plans prepared by our associate architects were fully approved by the Veterinary General's department, The Department of Agriculture, Canada, and have since been approved by the veterinary inspection branch of the Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food.

Tenders were called early in 1964 and the low tender figure came in at $837,599. It is pointed out that this amount represents an increase of only $12,559 over the estimate prepared by our department in June, 1960, which was based on preliminary drawings prepared by The Department of Public Works staff, guided by generally the same demanding requirements which faced our associate architects in 1962-63 during their planning of the abattoir.

Neither of these quoted figures included a security fence, furniture and furnishings and some additional dressing equipment considered desirable and necessary by officials of The Department of Reform Institutions.

As mentioned earlier, the design of the abattoir, the animal-holding barn, the cattle yard and runways and the facilities and equipment required were governed to a very large extent by federal and provincial regulations.

A factor governing the design of the animal-holding barn in particular was a possibility of a sit-down of the inmates in the reformatory. To prevent any suffering or damage to animals which might be held at the abattoir in the event of a strike or sit-down by prisoners, the officers of the health of animals division stipulated that holding, feeding, watering and cleaning facilities be provided for a minimum of 60 per cent of the animals which would normally be slaughtered in one week. This made it mandatory for our associate architects to plan such accommodation for approximately 80 animals.

During the associate architects' early planning for the new abattoir, a very disturbing situation developed in the province in which it was learned that meat unfit for human consumption was being sold to the public in some parts of Ontario. As a result of these disclosures, The Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food moved quickly to enact legislation to bring the construction, equipping and operation of all packing plants in the province up to the stringent standards required by the various enactments of the federal Department of Agriculture. This legislation is entitled, The Meat Inspection Act, Ontario, 1962 63, section 6 of which specifically covers the agreement by the province with the government of Canada.

Prior to the enactment of this legislation, the regulations of the federal government did not necessarily apply to all slaughterhouses and abattoirs in Ontario. Following the adoption of the federal regulations, our associate architects had to insure that every requirement was completely complied with in the Guelph abattoir. Had it been possible to construct the plant a few years earlier, the design could undoubtedly have been much simpler and cost much less, but the abattoir would not have been as efficient, modern and sanitary as it is now.

Some of the many provisions in the various Acts and regulations which govern the design of the abattoir are:

In the animal holding barn: the district veterinarian health of animals division, Canada Department of Agriculture, would not approve our associate architects' plans until they had been referred to officers of the agricultural engineering extension service at Guelph.

On August 22, 1963, the architects met with officers of this service and were told that the basic space requirements for animals in a holding barn were as follows: Beef cattle, 35 to 50 square feet; calves, 15 square feet; sheep, 15 square feet; hogs, 8 to 10 square feet. It was stated that holding accommodation for at least 80 beef animals must be provided, plus separate pens for animals classified as TB suspects and TB reactors.

Taking an average space requirement of 40 square feet per animal, the space required for holding pens amounted to 3,200 square feet plus 800 square feet for two additional segregated pens for suspects and reactors.

Also, section 7, paragraph 5 of the federal meat inspection regulations provides that no animal that has entered the yards or pen of an establishment shall be removed without permission in writing from the inspector in charge. This regulation also made it mandatory to provide adequate holding pens. Sections 19 to 22 of the Canada meat inspection regulations provided for the holding of animals which are to be held or condemned, also making it necessary to provide suitable and approved holding pens.

Additional requirements of the officers of the agricultural engineering extension service included a mechanical ventilation system to provide for changes of air in the holding barn on the basis of 100 cubic feet per thousand pounds of stock. This requirement could be reduced to 25 cubic feet during zero weather.

It was required also that steam heat must be supplied if inside temperature fell below 40 degrees. Other requirements for the holding barns set out in circular No. 47 by the health of animals division include: Acceptable masonry and metal construction, proper and acceptable drainage, paved floors and runways, acceptable feed and water facilities, paved and properly equipped areas for the cleaning and disinfecting of livestock trucks, acceptable and sanitary system for manure disposal, adequate lighting and ventilating, separate pens for suspects and reactors and facilities for the handling of crippled, diseased or dead animals.

Materials used in the construction, finishing and equipment of the holding barn were required to meet the very exacting standards of the meat inspection branch of the health of animals division, especially those set out in that division's circular number 69, covering approved packing house materials and agents.

Livestock scale. Our associate architects examined livestock scales in various smaller abattoir establishments and discussed the use of scales with owners. Since the operation at Guelph is relatively small, the architects specified a single animal, 3,000 pound gross capacity scale, with pillar type dial and readings of 2,000 pounds in 2-pound graduations.

The Department of Reform Institutions agreed on this type of scale on December 14, 1964. Very strong representations were made by farmers in the Guelph area to have this scale changed to a multiple animal unit with beam type registration. The advice of the general manager of the Ontario public stockyards was requested, and on his recommendation we are installing a multiple animal, 10-ton capacity scale with 20,000 pound type registering beam.

After allowance for the unused, original scale, the net cost of the new unit is $1,420. The installation of the new scale made some modifications in the layout of the cattle pens and runways necessary.

The dressing system. The orginal intention was to operate the abattoir as a simple slaughtering and dressing operation in which some reformatory inmates could be usefully employed. With this in mind, our architects designed a dressing system which was as simple and as economical as the federal regulations would permit. This method is known as a cradle system and is in use in some small abattoirs.

It is understood that there is a great demand for trained packing house workers and in order to properly train inmates on the type of system generally in use in the larger packing plants, The Department of Reform Institutions requested that the dressing system be changed to a real dressing system, which is considered to be more advantageous in a complete training programme. This change has been made at an increased cost of $5,229.

The inedible waste rendering system. When the abattoir was in the design stage,

it was understood that inedible wastes would be disposed of daily to a commercial rendering contractor and no provision was made to install the equipment necessary to process these wastes in the plant. However, the disposal of waste to commercial renderers is not an altogether satisfactory or sanitary arrangement, and as the processing of these wastes into dry, readily saleable products within the plant is an economically sound proposition, we propose to install the necessary equipment this year.

The Guelph abattoir will then be a completely self-contained, highly efficient and thoroughly modern unit, capable of producing meats required by all Ontario government institutions in strict compliance with all federal and Ontario government regulations.

I do not know whether that answers all of the member's questions, or not, but it gives the course of events as followed by our own department.

The member for Woodbine brought up a number of matters. He was critical this year, as he was last year, about me not getting into making statements on policy matters regarding the economic and sociological values of the money spent by The Department of Public Works.

I accept this type of criticism with a little bit of pleasure, but I do not feel that this is my position, to get into this type of policy. We have a Department of Economics and Development which I feel is the department that should get into this area. Certainly we are a service department and we try to comply with and build those buildings and do those jobs, as any service department would.

As far as establishing priorities—you were mentioning that in the blue book there is no indication what the priorities are. Actually, we do not set priorities in our own department. Each department brings forth their own priorities, what they consider their top priority of a building, and this, in turn, is assessed by The Provincial Treasurer's Department. So we in no way set the priorities in our department, but only after it has been considered by the government as to which building should be gone ahead with.

Mention was made about whether we should be considering cutting back or not, and the value of the dollar we are getting, whether our budget being up this year, we are getting the same value dollar-wise. This is in an area that is changing very quickly. Costs went up very quickly a year ago. If we were to give any assessment of that in our department, I would be inclined to say that things are levelling out, and I say that because many architects are coming in looking for work today. They are looking to be commissioned.

I find that we have many more contractors bidding on our jobs today than there were a year ago, and I find that the bidding is much more competitive. If I were to estimate any figure to which our costs might go up, I would say that it would be within 5 per cent or less, for the coming year.

I also would like to point out to the member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) that I realize we do not have all the information he would like to have in the blue book yet. I recognize that, but I wish that he would take a good look at the last section in that book, and that is the section where I explained that our policy has changed a bit. The government is asking us to plan for these buildings a year ahead, so that some indication of the cost of the building and the extent of the building could be presented to Treasury board when we again go for our estimates next year.

I am hoping that in being able to plan further ahead, that we will be able to give a more complete set of figures than we have in the past.

The hon. member for Woodbine also asked me to give target dates for completion. There are hardly any contractors that will give a target date for completion of a building at this time. It is most unpredictable, especially on the larger jobs.

He also mentioned that he had not had time to add up the figures in that book to see whether they added up to our total capital budget.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): They are very hard to find!

Hon. Mr. Connell: I assure you that those figures do not add up, because we also have the privilege of construction or repair jobs up to a value of $50,000. We have about $4 million budgeted for that for our own purposes where we do not have to ask the approval of Treasury board.

I think that pretty well covers the questions as I recall their being brought up, but if there are others that come up as time goes by, I will try to answer them.

Mr. E. Sopha (Sudbury): I would like to ask the Minister what plans are on the board to provide the members of this Legislature with private offices?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I think we have moved a long way forward in the office accommodation that has been provided. It will never be perfect, but as these other buildings are being completed—the Queen's Park extension, and other office buildings—we are continually trying to move departments out of this building. I cannot give the member anything concrete in that line.

As I mentioned when I became Minister of Public Works a few years ago, I dedicated myself to providing the private members with more space. I will never satisfy them, but I am doing the best I can at this time.

Mr. Sopha: If I may refer myself as an illustration, back in Sudbury I advise people on things that they consider to be important to them, and they pay me money for that advice. I have a private office and two secretaries and a bookkeeper who work for me. Down here I am a participant in an institution that spends $2 billion a year, perhaps more money than any save the largest corporations in North America, and I find myself in a room with 10 or 15 of my colleagues with no privacy at all. Whereas I enjoy their company, still I have not even got the facility to communicate privately by telephone and I am jammed into a room which is very small. The Minister tells me there is great improvement. Well it may be true objectively from his point of view, I just do not see it.

I must put it to the Minister bluntly, after eight years I have come to the conclusion that in the process of government in Ontario, among the least important figure in that structure of government, is the member of the Legislature. There are many people in the civil service who are treated with a far higher degree of importance in the structure of government than we are.

That is the attitude of the government that has been in office for 24 years with a commanding majority, and we are the beneficiaries of the attitude that that government treats the faithful that the people have elected to them, and not only that, but the policy is discriminatory.

The member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) has an office. The member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) has an office. The member for Humber (Mr. W. B. Lewis) has an office. I do not know, perhaps the member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) has an office. The member for Parry Sound (Mr. A. Johnston) has an office. The member for London South (Mr. White) has an office. They are all independent private members of the Legislature, just like we are over here.

The second most important man in the House has an office, as he properly should. But the rest of us are bundled in a fairly small room, 10 or 15 in the one room and an equal number of desks in the other room. When does the change take place? When does the transformation of attitude come about that they say these 117 people, as we will be, are very important, very viable and vital cogs in the machinery of government, we must give them an environment where they can apply mature consideration and reflection and rational judgment to the public affairs of the province.

Now that embarrasses the Prime Minister so much that he leaves. He now gets up and leaves, he is so embarrassed by those observations.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I will return to my place in order that I may answer that absolutely puerile comment. I have a telephone call here that is of some importance but I shall be back in due course.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if this matter is now properly before us, I wonder if we could dispose of it? If the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) wishes to speak to it, that is fine with me, but I would like to speak to it before we get on to something else.

Mr. Chairman, the matter of accommodation for members is one that I have raised on a good many occasions in the House, especially a few years ago.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): You wanted to tear the place down.

Mr. Bryden: That is another problem. But we will start from the assumption that it is not going to be torn down in the near future.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine —I was wondering if it would properly come before us under 1904, the Ontario government buildings, maintenance and repairs.

Mr. Bryden: That is what I would have thought, but you entertained quite a speech about it, Mr. Chairman. I do not feel aggrieved but I feel that now that it has been raised and you entertained it, it would better to—

Mr. Chairman: If the members wish to deal with it now—

Mr. Bryden: And then we will not come back to it.

Mr. Chairman: As long as we have that understanding.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I was saying that I used to raise this a great deal in past years. I have not raised it as much recently because what the Minister says is quite true. A tremendous improvement has been made under his administration over a period of a few years, as far as facilities for members are concerned. Even eight years ago, when I entered this House, most of the members had nothing more than a place to hang their hats across the hall, and they shared lobbies where there were a few telephones which they could grab off if nobody else was using them. Certainly that situation is changed. Every member now has at least a desk and a telephone, which is some improvement.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): No, we share phones.

An hon. member: Only the NDP have individual phones.

Mr. Bryden: The NDP has always fought hard on this issue, frequently with no support from the Liberals, which was unfortunate. And, of course, by fighting hard we got anything that was going. I can say that. I remember that we were the first ones to get a telephone and a desk. Admittedly, the desks we got were vintage 1850. I think they came out of the old Legislature of the United Province of Canada, but we did have desks fairly soon after our entry into this House. And right now I will say for us that we have a telephone; and if the Liberals do not have individual telephones then they are certainly a supine lot to put up with it. They should have had them long ago.

I do not know about the Tories, but have they not got individual telephones, as a very minimum; that is, individual lines into a central system for the offices? We have four lines, and individual telephones for each member and I would think that some of the other groups that are larger would need more lines than we have.

We do have attractive surroundings, with desks and telephones and I will give the Minister of Public Works credit for that. To a very important extent it was due to his efforts that we got that much. But I still submit to him that it is far from adequate. I now make this case, shall we say, with a certain detachment. I do not expect that I will personally benefit in any way from any improvements that may be made in the facilities for private members, but I nevertheless believe that it is important that improvements should be made.

I think there is no question at all that a member should have a private office. Certainly as a very minimum, two members should share a reasonably large office. Although there was an effort by the department to foist one off on me I would not have the kindergarten desks that you give to other members; these little things that are not much bigger than the desks we have in this House.

A member has enough material that he wants to store in his desk and that passes across his desk, that he should at least have the standard sized office desk that you would give, say, a principal clerk in the department. Not the sort of extreme luxury that you would provide for Deputy Ministers, and certainly not the superlative luxury that is provided for Cabinet Ministers; I am not claiming anything like that for the members. I am merely claiming that they should have facilities that enable them to work efficiently.

After all, we now have reached the situation where the Legislature could be said to meet approximately five or six months a year. I think most members, certainly any member who is conscientious, works very hard during that five or six months. He not only is preoccupied with the sessions of this House, but the outside business stretches out his day to anything from 12 to 16 hours.

I think he should also have an easy chair to relax in, because it gets pretty tiring if you come here at 9 o'clock in the morning and are still here upwards of 11 o'clock at night. I think all of these things are necessary, and although I want to stress again that I commend the Minister for the excellent work he has done to date, I am going to suggest to him that he has not done much more than make a good start.

It is absolutely true, as the hon. member for Sudbury has said and as I have said in the past, that low man on the totem pole in the business of government in Ontario is the elected representative of the people. He is not treated in quite the same contempt as he used to be, but he still is regarded as a pretty low individual down the pole.

This building ought to be devoted entirely to the Legislature. The province of Ontario has expanded far past the point where we can have a legislative building that has anything in it other than facilities for the Legislature.

There is no reason at all why government departments should be in here.

The Attorney General's Department has been here from time immemorial but there is now no reason why any of that department other than the legislative counsel branch should be located in this building. I do not know why it was that when The Department of Education moved out of the north wing—I think that is the name given to the wing where the library is—the Provincial Secretary's Department moved in. As far as I am concerned, I had understood at the time that the wing was to be turned over to accommodation for members. It would have made more space available.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): So it was, originally.

Mr. Bryden: And why it was that the Provincial Secretary of the day whom, as we know, is a man who places great stock on the prerequisites of office, why it was that he has to suddenly grab that and mark it out as his little empire I do not know; but the members of the Legislature suffered as a result.

I suggest to the government and to the Minister of Public Works that they should be thinking in terms of moving governmental departments out of here and making proper facilities available for private members. When it comes to Ministers, there are no holds barred; they get anything as a priority. In an Opposition office you may wait six months to get a fan or something. But boy, if a Minister wants a subsidiary office in the Parliament buildings, everything is dropped while they go ahead to furnish the thing as if it was for the Queen of Sheba or somebody.

And that is only a subsidiary office where he hangs his hat while he is over here. He also has an even more luxurious office somewhere else in Toronto. I do not object to Ministers having subsidiary offices in this building when their main offices are located anywhere from Downsview down to the lakefront. Obviously they have to have some sort of office facility in this building, as well, for use while the House is in session.

All I object to is the gross disparity between the accommodation given to the aristocracy on the one hand, and to the elected representatives of the people on the other hand.

And also the priority given to the aristocracy. I think the Ministers could have used less space in this building and allowed the members more space pending re-allocation of facilities.

However, Mr. Chairman, I will not pursue the matter any further. I would say that notwithstanding improvements that have been made, I agree entirely with what the member for Sudbury has said—the facilities currently available fall far below what the situation requires and what is necessary for a member, if he is to be provided with the means to carry out his job adequately.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the Minister full marks for good intentions in this regard at least. There have been some improvements, even in the few years that I have been a member of the Legislature. I believe it is the present Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) who put the kibosh on the development of an otherwise excellent plan that the Minister himself, I believe, described to the Legislature some years ago. It was our thought, at that time, that money was going to be spent once The Department of Education moved out of the north wing, to establish us on the floor there, associated with the library—which, I think, is very apropros—so that the members would have an opportunity to go with real convenience to consult the records and the other books that are available in what is, otherwise, a very well stocked library indeed.

The Minister has carried out certain improvements in the library, and it is obvious that that north wing would fit in very well as the members' wing. We could have the facilities there that would give us either single offices or sharing two to an office. The research staff that is provided at public expense, and at private expense as well, would then have easy access to the members and their own offices and the library.

This would be greatly desired. I would urge the Minister to use what influence he has with his governmental colleagues to move the Provincial Secretary, his staff, and all of his records, out of this building, make them more readily available at one of his new buildings across the way and turn the north wing over to the use of the members.

I think this is eminently reasonable; it could be done at little expense even though he would have to amend his plans again. I recommend this most strongly to him and I hope that he would consider it.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to go a bit further than my colleague the hon. member for Sudbury, and

the member for Woodbine. The hon. Prime Minister was once a private member himself, and for him to have the audacity to say that this thinking is puerile is puerile himself.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I was only commenting upon the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury, that anything he could say would drive me out of this House. That is what I said was puerile. I was not aiming at the substance of his remarks at all, I was just commenting on his remark.

Mr. Sopha: I was wrong, will you forgive me?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Thank you!

Mr. Sargent: Do not get too cosy, there.

The remarks made about the office accommodation of a member—most of us are pretty well set up in our own home and have the mechanics to make an office work, but to come down here, and to try and do some dictation in the midst of 15 or 20 people—you cannot even talk on the phone privately.

Our American counterparts south of the border have a full-time office staff 12 months a year, with large sums of money available for the operation of their office. We do not have any chance of an Adam Clayton Powell deal here in this province.

I think all of us here across this province, Mr. Chairman—we are 117 in the new set-up of ombudsmen, as it were, doing a job for our people here—sure cannot do a job the way things are set up now. It is ridiculous, with the correspondence any one member gets, to try and answer that intelligently—we cannot do it under the present set-up.

We have a small caucus room down there, barely big enough to hold our present set-up, but I asked the Minister for a phone for our caucus room—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: That is why we want the big wing next year. I asked the Minister for a phone for this and he agreed to give us two or three phones, but I found out they were going to cost us $10 a month more, each phone, out of our budget, and we did not have the money, so we do not have a phone in our caucus room.

The government is spending so many millions of dollars so foolishly and we cannot have the basic things to make this thing work. I think the fact that as most of us are in here perhaps five to six months a year in this sitting, we should have things like a gymnasium here, we should have a swimming pool, we should have a steam bath, a masseur.

An hon. member: How about a masseuse?

Mr. Sargent: The masseuse would be out. But if we are known as the best club in Ontario, let us have all the things that go with it and spend your money more wisely than—

An hon. member: Is this your policy?

Mr. Sargent: It could be intelligent policy on the part of the government if they wanted to give the individual member a break, because he sure is not getting it now.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, under this vote does the Minister wish to discuss this abattoir at Guelph any further, under this vote?

Mr. Chairman: In connection with the new building or—

Mr. Spence: The new building.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I suggest you hold that until the last vote.

Mr. Spence: Right!

Mr. Chairman, under this vote, I agree with what the member for Woodbine has said, I find these accounts very hard to total, they seem to be all over the work book here.

However, the total salary increases for the whole department over the last year are $1,870,850, but the main office salary budget is about one-quarter of last year due to reorganization. In spite of this, there is a 50 per cent increase in the required budget for travelling expenses. How is it that this quarter of the number of people should be trying to do 50 per cent more travelling?

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): They cannot travel on nothing.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether I just understand that question fully or not. As you know, these votes have been changed around considerably from last year. I think the member was asking about the travelling expenses; basically, that is what you are asking.

Mr. Spence: Under the main office, Mr. Chairman—due to the reorganization of the Minister's department—there will be fewer civil servants employed, but the cost is 50

per cent more for transportation with fewer civil servants in his department.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I do not believe that there are fewer civil servants, but under our reorganization of this, there are more people included in this head office vote. I think that is the main reason for it.

Mr. Bryden: But there is less in terms of salaries. Mr. Chairman, last year it was vote 1801 and the salaries for the main office were just over $1 million with travelling expenses at $11,000; this year the vote is 1901 and salaries are shown as $295,000—about a third of last year—while the travelling expenses are about $16,000.

It is probably the case that most of those people who got the $1 million in salaries last year did not do any travelling. I do not know, but it does seem rather curious.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am told that our personnel people will be doing considerably more travelling this year. We are, in our reorganization, attempting to put more responsibility in our outside regions, such as Port Arthur, McFarlane Lake and Kempville, and there is going to be considerable reorganization in that area. I think that would account for a fair share of the extra travelling expense.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in this vote, there is an amount of $207,000 for production of a coordinated exhibition in the Ontario government building—

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member would wait one moment; we will see if there is anything under any other section previous to this.

Mr. Sargent: Okay sir.

Mr. Chairman: Administration, personnel planning and then the exhibitions and information branch is at the bottom of the list. Is there something before that particular branch?

Mr. Sargent: What about the building programme for Owen Sound, as far as the Ontario Provincial Police; is that on this vote?

Mr. Chairman: What was the question please?

Mr. Sargent: For years now, we have had the—

Hon. Mr. Connell: That is in vote 1907.

Mr. Chairman: Is it for new construction? If so, it could be discussed under the last vote, anything under vote 1901, the exhibitions and information branch?

Mr. Sargent: This amount of $207,000 for displays for exhibitions: I imagine that these are things you would have to go along with, because the government is the first to be asked to cooperate and to finance these shows, but every one of them that I have seen, and at the CNE particularly, possibly every government department has a booth there with lavish attendants and money spent on them, and never once has there been any thought given to giving a truly representative picture of the government of Ontario.

It is always selling the Tory line, and I am getting sick and tired of going to these exhibits and seeing the story of the Minister there and of what a great job he is doing in his department, and the real snow job of trying to kid the people of this province that he is the big daddy of the government here.

I think if you want to do a fair job, you want to spend our money, the taxpayers' money, on showing these departments in exhibits across the province, that you should show government as it really is. They are not all Tories that run this show; there are Liberals and NDP here, but they are always pushing the Tory line. I think it is wrong to take the people's money and push a public relations programme for the government.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under vote two, last year the estimate budget for exhibits was $297,000. This year it is down somewhat to about $207,000. What does this pay for?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Actually, our problem in the exhibition is more or less the coordination of the exhibits. We make no exhibits of our own, but we help coordinate the various departments that wish to exhibit. If there are any physical changes to be made—I do not mean of the exhibits themselves, but those changes that are underneath the floor and this type of thing—we are the ones responsible, and this $207,000 is for the four exhibitions, it is not just for the Canadian National Exhibition.

Vote 1901 agreed to.

On vote 1902:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can tell the House if any change in his responsibility has been effected since last

year, where he is required to give an appraisal on behalf of the Minister who looks after the conservation authorities before these properties are purchased.

This was discussed last year and it was brought to the Minister's attention that there had been some complaints of delay. I believe he undertook at that time to look into it more carefully to see if his department could not provide the appraisals that might be needed more rapidly.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if this was from the standpoint of a purchase, if it would come under the capital under vote 1905. This vote is leased premises only.

Mr. Nixon: I think it comes under the real estate branch.

Mr. Chairman: It is under the real estate branch under vote 1905. There are two branches, one in capital and the other in leased premises only.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, now that the point has been brought up, I will be very brief. I think I replied rather fully to the hon. member's question last year. I pointed out very clearly that in spite of the fact that we are accused of being behind many months on many properties, I think we had four properties, only one of which could be considered late. I outlined this very clearly in last year's estimates. We have no particular problems or complaints this year at all. I think that we are operating pretty much the same as we were before.

Mr. Nixon: I am glad to hear that, because the conservation authorities did come to us in the committee, as you know, and they complained along these lines.

There is also some indication—if the Minister would not mind discussing it under this vote—real estate branch—that the Minister's people concerned with these evaluations were sometimes asked to change these evaluations as the requirements for the conservation authority would change.

There was one matter brought to the Minister's attention, I believe, based on a question from the leader of the NDP that indicated that the evaluator was brought back and told that the value was too high and that he had better take another look at it.

It seems to me that if we are going to establish a basis of common trust when the government deals with the private citizen through expropriation or any other way, there has to be some sort of arm's length evaluation so that the evalutors are not trying to get it as cheaply as possible for the government who is representing the taxpayer. The government also represents the owner of the land, and I was very much offended that the suggestion had been made that these government-appointed evaluators were brought in a second time to reduce their evaluation on certain parcels of land.

Surely, if they are going to establish this basis of trust that is the way our expropriation authority must develop if it is going to be accepted across the province. We have to have evaluators who are professional people and are not under the direction of any government department or any person in the department.

Does the Minister believe that evaluators hired by the government have a responsibility to bring in a price that is advantageous to the government that wishes to purchase under these circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I cannot recall anything specific in that line where our people asked evaluators to come back and re-evaluate. I think this is what you mean, but I cannot recall anything specific in that line.

As I think I mentioned last year, you could bring in 25 evaluators and come up with 25 different evaluations, but this is a very complex job—evaluating a property. I cannot tell you exactly how our people operate, but they will call in a valuator, I believe, and usually that valuator has to work within certain yardsticks, I believe. I cannot tell you what yardsticks they use.

Mr. Nixon: Not financial yardsticks.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Not financial yardsticks, but for the intent of the land, what it is to be used for. There are so many areas. They look up the neighbouring lands. But a valuator might have a wrong impression altogether when he goes in their originally as to what this property is valued at. We often see it where people will come in, one with a $50,000 value and another with $100,000 value. How they arrive at that we cannot determine, but if there are five valuations at around $50,000, and one at $100,000, I would think the one at $100,000 must be out some way or other.

I cannot be any more specific than that. I do not know of the particulars you are mentioning, but certainly as far as our own department valuating these properties for conservation purposes, we are just called in

there, not to valuate it, but to give an idea what we think the property is worth. Whether The Department of Energy and Resources Management accept our values or not, it is very much of a guideline. We give them the valuation, but what they do with it after that is not our particular interest.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, under this vote we have an amount of $4.5 million for rentals and leased properties. I imagine this is for rental of office buildings across the province, like liquor licence boards—no liquor stores there—buildings such as Economics and Development, Ontario Northland, things like that. Rental of buildings.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Not Ontario Northland. Just the government buildings.

Mr. Chairman: Just the government buildings.

Mr. Sargent: Like Municipal Affairs? Ontario development corporation—like that—all these offices? It is for—

Hon. Mr. Connell: Administrative offices!

Mr. Sargent: I take it, Mr. Chairman, the policy is eventually to bring all these outlying offices into the Queen's Park complex eventually. Is that your plan, or are you going to continually always have these offices outlying around the city here?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am rapidly coming to the conclusion that we will never get them all back to the Queen's Park area.

Mr. Sargent: Well, this is government policy I imagine. Does the Minister see any reason why these buildings could not be located in Peterborough, Barrie, North Bay, across the province, to decentralize these buildings all being in Toronto? Do you see any merit in that?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Many of our buildings are located in the outlying areas. I think we have more rental properties outside of Toronto than we have in. We have 69 properties in Toronto and 420 outside the city of Toronto.

Mr. Sargent: The policy is to rent not to purchase. Why do you rent, why do you not purchase?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, each particular building has to stand on its own two feet. Usually we are leasing where we need office accommodation. We are actually leasing quite a few buildings, as I explained earlier, for the OPP. But it is usually assessed as to whether it is better that we build or whether we lease. Particularly during these last two or three years of very high construction costs, we have entered into quite a number of leases.

Mr. Sargent: Then why did you buy the OMSIP building?

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member if he will at this time, stay with the rentals under vote 1902.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about this. Why did you not rent the OMSIP building?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We had the chance to purchase it and we needed pretty well the whole building. I do not know whether that is a clear enough reason for you or not.

Mr. Sargent: It does not answer my question. I think that is a very foolish reason. Your policy is to lease on account of the high prices of land values and buildings, but this particular building, owned by Mr. McNamara, you figured was a better deal. He probably needed some money at the time. I do not know what the deal was, but you decided to buy that building and you say that your policy is to rent. So why would you buy?

Hon. Mr. Connell: On that particular building, we might have the figures here. We got a building for less than the actual cost. I think we had an excellent buy. We had to get space very quickly.

Mr. Sargent: How much did you pay for it?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I have not got the figures here right now, but we might be able to get them. It seems to me it was $2.8 million or $3.5 million. I understood at the time—

Mr. Sargent: What was the footage of the building, do you know that?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I think it was about 120,000 square feet. I cannot give you that figure offhand. We have been all through those figures months ago, I have not got them here right now. But that was an excellent buy at the time and the OMSIP were in need of a lot of square feet. We were given only one month to get it and I think we made an excellent deal for the government at that time.

Mr. Sargent: The building has 120,000 square feet?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would not stake my life on that.

Mr. Sargent: You could have rented the thing for around half a million dollars a year.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am only giving you this through memory.

Mr. Sargent: You paid $3.5 million for the building. Who set the price?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It was a negotiated price.

Mr. Sargent: A negotiated price. Was any outside realtor called in on the deal to give you a yardstick for valuation on that? Who was on the negotiating team of this deal?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We bought it from Gunnar Realty and it was done directly by our own people.

Mr. Sopha: Did the Labines consent to—

Hon. Mr. Connell: You know the names better than I do.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, we have established the fact that the policy of this government is to lease where they can and there was no chance you could lease that building, you had to buy it?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We buy where we can and we build where we—

Mr. Sargent: You had to buy the building, you could not get it by lease?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We did not have to buy the building. I suppose maybe we could have negotiated—

Mr. Sargent: But you said your policy was to lease.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I said that we got an excellent buy on that building. We bought the building for less than what it cost to build it.

Mr. Sargent: Let me ask you, how many more buildings of this stature have you bought then, outside this one?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: How many other types of buildings like this have you bought for office staff for our departments?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, we bought 801 Bay Street about eight years ago.

Mr. Sargent: But your current policy now is to lease, and so you bought the building.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would not say that that was strictly policy. It depends on the situation, as to whether it is considered good business to build or good business to buy. But at the present time, in these high building costs, I think it is better that we be putting our money into educational buildings and hospital buildings than it is into office buildings.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under this heading in the estimates there is $4.435 million for leases. Two years ago there was $2 million. Last year was $4.15 million. Now, with what the Minister has said in regard to this Queen's Park complex, will there be space in those buildings, or will any departments move their offices into these buildings before the end of next year? It looks to me as if some of the buildings are coming along very fast. The Frost building, is it being used by the different departments?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, it is pretty much Treasury people in the Frost building. We will be giving up quite a number of leases. I think the timetabling for the new complex is about June and July, for the one building, and about January 1, 1968 for the Ferguson block. There will be quite a number of leases given up at that time throughout the city, and I think I can give you a few of them if you want them.

Mr. Sopha: I wanted to ask the hon. Minister about controls. I ask him sincerely, would he tell me what controls are exercised over Ministers of the Crown in respect of the furbishing and refurbishing of their offices? What protection is given to the public purse in respect of that?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We try to decorate these buildings, or various Ministers' offices or any office pretty much on a standardized basis throughout the whole office accommodation. There are some differences, but basically we try to standardize them. I might add that it is not always easy, but this is what we strive for.

Mr. Sopha: Let us descend onto one illustration. Did the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) recently move into quarters on the third floor?

Mr. Chairman: May I ask the member if at the present time he agreed with the other members of the House that we were not

going to discuss this under the main vote, under vote 1901. I pointed out at the time it really should have come under vote 1904—

Mr. Sopha: This is the proper place for it.

Mr. Chairman: No, we are dealing with leased premises in vote 1902 now.

Mr. Sopha: I am not talking about leased premises at all.

Mr. Chairman: This is the vote they are talking about, vote 1902, and we passed that vote.

Mr. Sopha: Passed what vote?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1901.

Mr. Sopha: Well, many of these are rented accommodation, they are downtown somewhere.

Mr. Chairman: Oh no, you are talking about government offices.

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: And these offices about which we are talking, as I understand it, would be the leased premises before us, vote 1902, at the present time.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, in which the Minister is located. I am asking him what controls are exercised. We know, the eye tells us, that some of these Ministers' offices are furnished in a lavish state which defies description to a person with limited vocabulary. Some of them are just out of this world in the furbishing of their offices. What protection have we for the public purse against this wasteful expenditure of money to palliate the narcissism of these advisors to the Lieutenant-Governor? What protection do we have?

Let me ask another specific question. When a Minister goes to another department, does that Minister have a vested interest in the furniture? Can he take the furniture to another office with him? In other words, does the furniture in his office attach to the person in the sense that it is immovable, he has a lien on it, and he takes it with him. Because we know of an illustration where a Minister recently shifted to another department and took the very expensive Louis XIV furniture with him and sent his successor back some early Lanark—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): So nobody lost.

Mr. Sopha: —that had been used by Sir Oliver Mowat. Now could we hear from the Minister? I want to continue this. I hoped the Prime Minister was going to intervene to tell us whether he had an election pledge to the 117 people he expects to elect, along with the leader of the Liberal Party, the leader of the New Democratic Party, as to what they might expect in the next Parliament.

I would like to hear about the Ministers, and I would like the people of Ontario to know about the narcissism of them. Bob Macaulay, when he was here—his was furnished in a surrealistic, avant garde, Jean Paul Sartre fashion.

We hear this about the Minister of Highways: Here is a young man who has made good from an obscure little town in eastern Ontario named Almonte and the best judgment is that you have spent $100,000 to palliate his taste for splendour up on the third floor. I think we are entitled to hear about it.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this is a complete falsehood and the member knows not what he is talking about.

Mr. Sargent: How much did you spend?

Mr. Sopha: How much did you spend to make you feel you have the most highways in North America? How much did you spend?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: The only thing that was bought for me were two cushions for the couch and they did not cost $100,000.

Mr. Sargent: How much have you got to spend?

Mr. Bryden: You mean they were not good cushions?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, certainly as I mentioned earlier, we try to keep things as standardized as we can.

Mr. Sargent: They are pretty standard back our way.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Actually, I did not get a chance to reply earlier about the Liberal offices, but the Liberals have more square feet per member than any other of the parties. And if you have not enough space in there it is because you have too many bus boys running around there doing the work for you, taking up the members' space.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, nonsense, no group has enough.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the Minister, I do not want to open up that vote again.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, we have exactly about 38 inches of space per member down there. What gives you the right to a better office than I have?

Mr. Chairman: I ruled the Minister out of order on the same point and I ask the member for Grey North to resume his seat please.

Mr. Sopha: The Conservative members up on the third floor are in there like cattle. It is not a case of pointing to ourselves and saying that we are badly off.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, we have been ruled out of order to discuss that subject. We were discussing Ministers' offices. And I have said that we like to keep them standardized as much as we can.

Mr. Sopha: They are not standard any more than any suite in the King Edward is standard. They are not standard. I know this is very embarrassing; I will make one final footnote. The used of the word "standard" is a complete distortion to the ordinary folk in the street of this province, and I wish they could come in here. I wish they would have tours through these lavish accommodations that Ministers of the Crown enjoy in this province. And I wish we had some note of the vast amount of public funds that are expended to make them feel that they are superior people. Indeed, as somebody properly pointed out, to be a Minister of the Crown in Ontario you must not be satisfied with one office, you have to have two.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): You cannot be a piker.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, my friend, the member for Grey South says you cannot be a piker. If you are in the higher echelon you have to have two offices; you have to have one downtown or uptown and you have to have one handy to the Legislature.

Mr. Sargent: Plus a limousine.

Mr. Sopha: I am not talking about that. They have given me a ride in them the odd time. But they have to have two offices. Now, who has the two? The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree) has two. The Minister of Highways has two. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) used to have two.

Hon. Mr. Connell: The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs has one office.

Mr. Sopha: The what?

Hon. Mr. Connell: The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs has one office.

Mr. Sopha: I met him at his request down in the lower floor, down here at the east end of the building, on the main floor. Did he move in there permanently?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): That is his only office.

Mr. Sopha: At that time he had one somewhere else.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. Sopha: I am glad to hear that and it is what I expect of him. He is a very intelligent, rational human being; he would be satisfied with one, but some of the others are not. Let us talk about the Minister of Highways, how many has he?

Hon. Mr. Connell: The Minister of Highways has two offices and if you would be interested in the policy in regard to Cabinet Ministers' offices, those members who have an extra office up here are those who are quite some distance from the buildings. Those people in the Treasury building or in the east block and in 801 Bay have no second office in here.

Mr. Sargent: Well, that is your fault.

Hon. Mr. Connell: And if I might get back to this standardized—

Mr. Chairman: I would ask members to stay with the leased premises before us.

Mr. Sopha: How many has the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis)?

Hon. Mr. Connell: He has two offices.

Mr. Sopha: How many has the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner)?

Hon. Mr. Connell: He has one office.

Mr. Sopha: He has one. Are you in the top drawer if you have two?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No. I said if you were outside this building you were entitled to a second office, but a number of the Ministers have not requested that; the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Provincial Treasurer being two of them. But it is only right that if a Minister has to spend—you are using the argument that you are here as a private member for six months. A Minister is here for 12

months and I think it is only right that when he is sitting in this building he has some place to go to work, or if he spends three or four hours in Cabinet. He at least has some place to go to place a telephone call; he likes a little privacy too.

Mr. Bryden: He does not need an office about as big as the space for 15 private members.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I will not argue with you on that point; that is a difference that some of the Cabinet Ministers and I have ourselves.

But if I might get back to this standardization of offices—I do not like being interrupted; I do not interrupt anyone else in this House, and I would like to finish just one sentence, and that is that these offices are not extravagantly furnished. I think it is a great tribute to our decorators and our designers that they can not only furnish a building at a very reasonable price, but make it look very elaborate.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent East.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, the Minister made comments in regard to leased properties of the Ontario Provincial Police offices in the province of Ontario. I see in the work book an outline of two Ontario Provincial Police leased properties. Could the Minister tell me what is paid for these leases per year? What is the length of these leases? Why is it that you build Ontario Provincial Police offices in one area, similar to these, and in the other area you build your own; you buy the property and then build the building?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Actually, I can give you any specific lease that you want as to the price and the duration. The Treasury board gave its approval to go out and lease—I think we have about 18 or 20 detachment buildings for which we can go out and arrange leases, and more than likely with someone who would build them for us because it is hard to find suitable OPP accommodation in any present building, but when it comes to the headquarters of the OPP, any headquarters building, we build them with our own design.

If there is any specific lease that you want to know the amount of, I will attempt to give it to you.

Mr. Spence: I would appreciate knowing what is paid for the leased property of the Ontario Provincial Police in Glencoe, and for what period of time the lease extends?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is leased for $4,320 a year and it expires on October 11, 1970.

Mr. Spence: A five-year lease.

Mr. Sargent: Getting back to the OMSIP building, when that building was purchased, could you furnish the House with the mechanics of the mortgage that was on the building, when it was bought and the amount of money that changed hands. The Minister said that it was the Gunnar real estate that handled the transaction.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am sorry for the member for Grey North. I have given that information to the House two or three times and I have not got it here today.

Vote 1902 agreed to.

On vote 1903:

Mr. Sopha: Is this the one on which the parking lot in Sudbury—that favourite project of the Minister and myself—comes up?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I do not think so, but maybe it is a good place.

Mr. Sopha: There is a parking lot behind the court house in Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Vote 1907 is the proper vote.

Mr. Chairman: Is this new construction?

Mr. Sopha: New construction!

Mr. Chairman: Or anticipated construction?

Mr. Sopha: It is anticipated that some day it will become a parking lot.

Mr. Chairman: It is under vote 1907, sir. We are now on vote 1903.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, does this vote cover the night cleaning staff? Are their salaries in this vote?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes.

Mr. Spence: I would like to know why the night cleaning staff—the ladies—receive less per hour than the men.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member excuse me? There are three things before that particular part which would be the services branch, the last item under vote 1903, about which the member for Kent East is now speaking—accounts branch, legal branch, purchasing branch. The services branch is the item about which the member is speaking

now. Is there anything previous to that under vote 1903?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, under this vote, there is an amount of $1,705,000 for communications service; that is, rental of equipment. Would the Minister qualify what this is, please?

Mr. Chairman: That is also under the same section—the services branch.

The member for Kent East first, then the member for Grey North.

Mr. Spence: With regard to the cleaning staff—I believe I asked this question earlier in the session. I understand that the ladies receive less per hour than the men on the cleaning staff, and we have a civil rights bill in the province and as I understand it—equal pay for equal work. Would the Minister enlighten me as to whether this is the case or not?

Hon. Mr. Connell: You are quite correct; you did ask that question earlier, and there is a difference. Of course, these rates are settled by the civil service commission and their unions, but actually the work is not the same that the men do. The men do have to do considerable heavy work, although it is all called cleaning. The men have to do ladder work and some of the heavier mopping and heavy scrubbing and waxing of floors. The ladies are not asked to do that. I might compare it by saying that you, being a farmer like myself, we call everything we do in the barn the chores, but although we do not mind having our wives do the milking, we do not ask them to clean out the stables. I think that is a fair comparison that you and I would understand.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want a breakdown of the communications under the services branch—$1.7 million.

Hon. Mr. Connell: The communications service is to provide for the payment of telephone services for all departments of the Ontario government in the Parliament buildings, and also for service in the branch office buildings, court house registry offices in northern Ontario, together with the payment of foreign exchange lines for all departments.

Mr. Sargent: In other words, telephone is costing the government about $1.7 million.

Hon. Mr. Connell: That is right.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on that vote?

Mr. Spence: In regard to the flower beds along the walks in the parks—I brought this up last year, and I mentioned it in my opening remarks—has the Minister given any consideration to replacing the flower beds along the walk through the park in front of the Parliament buildings? They added greatly to the appearance of the Legislature. I know the park does not belong to the government, but I wonder if the Minister had made any approach to the city of Toronto with regard to the flower beds, and does he have any plans for any flower beds this year?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I could not agree more with the hon. member in the statements that he has made. We have made moves to get that property under our own control. The city is quite agreeable, but there is, I believe, a 999 year lease on it from the University of Toronto. I am quite hopeful that we can get together and get that property under our control.

This has only come about recently, by the way, that we have been able to arrange this, and our people are out there now working at arranging flower beds. They will not be as good as we had hoped during this Centennial year, but I am sure you will see a great improvement there in the next two or three weeks.

Mr. Spence: I would like to ask the Minister another question. I am informed that even the property that this building stands on does not belong to the province of Ontario. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Connell: The member for Bracondale, I believe, brought that up last year—or words to that effect. I would have to go to him for advice on that, but as far as I know, we are here to stay.

Vote 1903 agreed to.

On vote 1904:

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): On vote 1904, under the architectural and engineering division, I was checking the list of capital works and it is broken down into approved working drawings, preliminary plans, and so on. Would the Minister please tell me what additional court facilities are being constructed in the city hall for which you are preparing preliminary plans?

Mr. Chairman: I think if the member would be agreeable, it would all come under vote 1907.

Mr. Ben: Under vote 1907?

Mr. Chairman: Under our capital grants.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister a question? On the first floor there are two rooms being renovated, or changes being made. Could you inform me what those rooms are for? We hear rumours. I would like to know what are your plans.

Hon. Mr. Connell: The Department of Tourism and Information have asked us to provide space for them. It is to display a history of Confederation, in those two rooms.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1904 carried?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister what the policy of the department is on architectural matters? I presume you farm out at least some of your architectural work, especially when you have a large project in view. Or do you do it all within your own department?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, we do commission quite extensively in the architectural field. We have very capable architects on our own staff, but they are more confined to our own buildings or possibly Lands and Forests, police buildings, highways garages, but wherever we are building a teachers' college or a hospital or any building that is other than the average type, we commission outside architects. This varies, but I would say it is at least 50 per cent and it could go as high as 80 per cent of our architectural work is actually commissioned outside.

Mr. Chairman: This section of course is dealing only with the administration and the maintenance of the Ontario government buildings. The regular vote dealing with architects and the engineering division, could be discussed under new construction, vote 1907.

Mr. Bryden: I had the impression that this dealt—

Mr. Chairman: We could deal with it under the last vote.

Mr. Bryden: This vote just relates to government buildings?

Mr. Chairman: That is right.

Mr. Bryden: Actually in existence.

Mr. Chairman: That is right.

Mr. Bryden: I am out of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): Under this vote, maintenance of statues out front?

Mr. Chairman: Ontario government buildings, maintenance and repairs. It would probably come under this.

Mr. Harris: I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that every time I step into my motor car on the front drive and head east, out towards University Avenue, my view is blocked from the traffic that is coming north, by that statue on your right as you drive out.

I believe it is the one that was erected in 1935 to those people that fell in the Northwest, back in 1885. I think you know the one I mean. Personally, I say it is a real traffic hazard, in the interests of safety, serious consideration should be given to moving that to another spot, not too far from where it is.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I agree with the member for Beaches and I know the monument to which he is referring. We have not been able to do anything because it is not on our property, but I can assure you that with our getting control of the front of the government buildings, we will either be having that monument moved, or we have several designs of changing the front of the Parliament buildings as such, and in those changes, I imagine cars will disappear from the front of the buildings.

I am not sure which way it will move, but I understand the problem.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I was quite interested in that question and answer, because there is no doubt that the roadway immediately in front of this old building has become quite a traffic hazard.

Do I understand the Minister correctly to say that there will be no more traffic at all, once his plans have been completed for that?

Hon. Mr. Connell: This is our thinking. We have not finalized our thinking and we have not even attempted to advance it with the money that we are spending in our Queen's Park extension. We have not even had the nerve, I might say, to present it to Treasury board, but we have rather definite ideas of changing the front of the buildings here.

Certainly, as far as I am concerned, and the thinking of our department is concerned, there will be no cars in front of this building, or no traffic.

Mr. Nixon: I am glad to hear that and I would say to the hon. Minister that if he gets his nerve up some time in the future, I, for one, would appreciate it if they would dig a hole down through the ground there in front, so that we could get down to the subway station without having to cross Queen's Park Crescent.

It is really difficult to drive safely in the Queen's Park Crescent area, as has just been pointed out, and it is also very difficult to walk safely, because, although the Minister has taken pains to point out to me personally how I can cross that street down there without being run over, I still tell him it is quite a difficult procedure.

A good many people do come to these buildings here and if we could have access directly from the building, or immediately outside the building into the subway, it would be a great convenience.

I know that in his present plans there are a number of tunnels linking the new buildings, and I suppose if you wanted to go the long way around, you would be able to get to the subway without going into the weather. This, of course, is not a very good solution, because we just have not got the time, nor energy, to walk the three quarters of a mile that that would involve. I would just say to him that if he has the extensive plans for the improvement of the front of the building, I see no reason at all why we could not have access to the subway on this side of Queen's Park Crescent.

Hon. Mr. Connell: We would have to take it up with the TTC, I would imagine, but I think you will find this underground tunnel will not be three quarters of a mile. I think it will—particularly if the weather is bad—be used extensively.

Mr. Nixon: You go from Frost to Whitney to here.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, but if you start at that end, it is not too bad.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to revert, for a moment, to the point that the leader of the Opposition first referred to, that is the question of the driveway right in front of the building. I raised this with the Minister last year. I do not think he made any comment on my comments at that time, but I would like to raise the matter with him again.

He has said that the department has long-term plans to change the whole nature of the front of this building, with a view ultimately to eliminating traffic altogether. That is fine. That sounds like a good idea. But I take it from what he said, that it is a fairly long range plan he has in mind and, in the meantime, we are going to have that drive in front of the building.

It is a mystery to me, Mr. Chairman, that there has not already been an accident of some consequence out there because there are two conflicting uses to which it is being put. It is being treated and, I think quite rightly, as a parking area for members and visitors to the building.

There is also an increasing number of people who treat it as a by-pass and they come hooting right across there, I have seen them going 30-35-40 miles an hour right through there—where pedestrians are out on the pavement, and where cars parked facing south are trying to back out.

Motorists do this coming from Grosvenor Street across to the Crescent going south, and also the reverse. I am sure that they save themselves all of 35 seconds by cutting across there, rather than either going down at the bottom of the circle, or up to the street here to the north of the building.

I am sure they must save at least 35 seconds, but, of course, we know there are always motorists who attach great importance to 35 seconds, even if it could mean a loss of life or limb to somebody else.

I am not competent in such matters, but I do not see why it should not be possible to put some sort of a barrier across the drive that would still make it possible to use this as a parking area—which is all that it is suitable for at the present time—and prevent it from being used as a thoroughfare as some motorists are treating it.

In fact, I myself was once hauled up out there by a policeman because I had pulled over to what he alleged was the wrong side of the road, in order to turn my car in so that I could get parked facing south.

Even a policeman of the city of Toronto, who was using it as a by-pass on his motorcycle, apparently assumed that this was a regular street and was not a parking area. How he expected I was going to get my car in to park south without pulling out the full distance, I do not know, but this is the sort of situation that exists there now.

I think that the department should do something about it pending their more comprehensive plans for changing the front of the building.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, with regard to this new front that is put on this building for our Centennial year, as the Minister knows, there are thousands of students visiting this Legislature all during the session and I expect, at the end of the school year, there will be many others visit this Legislature.

Has the Minister any plans for any other exhibits in regard to our Centennial year around this building? We see the portrait of George Brown and Sir John A. Macdonald but outside of that, the only thing is the new front that was put on the building. Are there any other plans for exhibits.

Mr. Chairman: Would it be agreeable to the member to bring this up under vote 1907. When the work is done it will come under vote 1907.

Is 1904 carried?

Mr. Bryden: The Minister was going to comment, I think, on the point I made.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, I agree with the member. In fact, I use that street myself every night crossing there, rightly or wrongly —but it seems to be the path of least resistance actually.

We have got the buses off there during this last year and I think it has improved the situation quite extensively. I think if you will give us a little time—because I think the government is enthused about the idea of making some changes there—but it is just a question of timing.

With the support we seem to be getting here in the House this afternoon, it will certainly strengthen my back up a bit to request it.

Vote 1904 agreed to.

On vote 1905:

Mr. Sopha: I was going to ask about this business a couple of years ago when he wrote and very kindly furnished me with a copy of a letter written to the Metro mayor about making a pedestrian crosswalk out here. Of course, other than an acknowledgment from the Metro mayor nothing ever happened. I wonder whether any progress is being made in that? There was one fatality to a member some years ago.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, he was from Hamilton too. But apparently Metro will not allow a crosswalk that close to a stop light.

Mr. Sopha: Well, who is boss in this province, Metro or this place?

Hon. Mr. Connell: As far as city streets are concerned, I would be inclined to think we would be guided by their rules and regulations.

Mr. Sopha: Is the Minister really serious about that?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, I am.

Mr. Sopha: All you need do is tell the Minister of Municipal Affairs that—

Hon. Mr. Connell: You are asking for a crosswalk within 150 feet of a stop light, are you not?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes?

Mr. Sopha: Well, what is wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Is that good planning?

Mr. Sopha: Well, even if it was a push button crosswalk. I have had to wait five to ten minutes down there for a break in traffic in order to get across to go to the subway. What would be wrong with a push button light?

I have an easier way, you just tell the Minister of Municipal Affairs that the next time the Metro mayor wants a wheelbarrow full of money, tell him the crosswalk first.

Votes 1905 and 1906 agreed to.

On vote 1907:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, this is the one we have been waiting for for some time because you have instructed us on two or three items that this would be the proper place. I am particularly interested in the Minister's answers to the questions that were raised in the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information concerning our Centennial centre. It was made abundantly clear at that time that the responsibility for the specific answers to the construction of the museum of science and technology would be forthcoming at the time of these estimates.

Perhaps we should get some of the specific information that the Minister has available now before making some more general remarks.

Specifically, we are quite concerned at the postponement of the completion date, and we would like the Minister's assurance of when this museum will be open for use by the public as a Centennial centre. We are further concerned at the growing costs which are associated with the expansion of the

original plan in part, they are also associated with increases in costs with delay, and they are also associated with a gross error in the first predictions that I suppose came from the Minister's department back in 1963 and 1964.

He may have been misled by the original idea put forward by the Prime Minister of Ontario, but surely this Minister was responsible for the original estimate of what the costs would be for a building that has since grown from its original estimate of $5 million to something in excess of $30 million.

I would like the Minister to give us the information on the completion date and on the gross cost for the completed structure ready for use by the public of Ontario, and some explanation in detail of why the establishment of the costs has been so difficult over the past three years.

Hon. Mr. Connell: That is rather a large order that you have given me. I would preface my remarks by saying that we are a service department and we try to carry out those services asked for by other departments. As far as this Centennial centre is concerned, this is one of the reasons I would say that in this blue book that I refer to the back section, not in connection with the Centennial but in connection with us providing good estimates.

This back section of our book is giving us an opportunity of planning a year and two years ahead, which is the important thing in any building, because I think any of us know, if we are going to build a house or a barn or a building we have to know what is going to be in it before we can start giving an estimate of costs.

Mr. Bryden: Is the Minister saying that there was not adequate planning of the Centennial centre?

Hon. Mr. Connell: The decision was made back in—and I cannot give you the date exactly, 1963 or 1962—that we would build a Centennial centre. This was about the time that the federal government came along and said that they would approve of—it was $2.5 million on our project, I forget what yardsticks we were going by—so it was decided that we would have a Centennial centre.

This is the trouble that my department is in on many occasions, people ask us to put a price on the building and we do not know what we are building yet.

Because somebody decides we are going to have a building, you have to do some planning and some sketch drawings, and some working drawings before you can estimate what it costs. This is one of the original faults with this building, somebody—and I do not know who he is, it certainly was not our department—said it was going to be a $5 million building—

Mr. Bryden: You never get to make the big, glossy announcement; you merely get the headaches.

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, I agree.

Mr. Nixon: The headaches are here now.

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, I agree with you on that, to an extent. But if I can, as far as this building is concerned, I do not know whether I can give you all the answers. One of the things you are asking is about the completion date on this building.

There are three sections to this building, A, B and C, and I think it is C which is the first one which will be finished by this fall. The B section will be completed in the fall of 1968.

I do not know why everyone seems to be playing around with figures as far as this building is concerned. The contract we have on that building is, I believe $21.7 million. That is our contract on the building and that, of course, is without any of the furniture or architects' fees, but the actual contract we have with Pigott is for $21.7 million.

The ideas which kept developing for this building are some of the main reasons for the cost developing. It is just as simple as that. It was not that it was poor planning, but it was because it was excellent planning—exceptionally good planning.

I would like to take the members of this House out and tour that site, and I think that five years from now, even the members on the other side of the House will be proud of our Centennial project. What difference does it make if it is opened on July 1, 1967 or not? How important is this? The important thing is that we are building a Centennial project. Whether it is finished in 1967, 1968 or 1969—I venture to say that this project will not be finished for 25 years. It will be added to and added to. I would say that this is a 25-year project, not a project in which the only important thing is to have it finished by July 1, 1967. That is the only importance that members opposite are putting on this Centennial project.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We are deeply concerned with the

cost, and I do not want the Minister to get away from that.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I can tell you this, that most museums cost $55 to $65 a square foot, and I think this building is in the region of $35 a square foot. We are getting excellent value from Moriyama the architect and our own architects, and from the contractors on this job. You will find out that this job will cost $20 to $25 a square foot less than any of the prominent museums in the United States—

Mr. Nixon: Or Japan?

Hon. Mr. Connell: —or in our own country that you can go to.

Now are there any other questions?

Mr. Nixon: There certainly are. I am particularly interested in the Minister's comments, because he has said that wing A of this particular structure should be open this year, and that is fine. We will have something, perhaps some ribbon to cut in Centennial year. I am interested to hear that that is possible, because this is the first time that it has been stated clearly that a part of the museum will be opened in Centennial year.

The Minister is not concerned that Ontario does not have a Centennial project that is available during 1967. All of us agree that we will be proud of this museum when it is completed, but surely it is our responsibility as members of the Legislature to find out about these costs, because the original estimate made by the Minister—and he now protests that he had no idea what was involved —was very seriously in error. He now tells us that his architects, his old architects and those who have been placed in control of this situation by some other Minister, have given him a cost in excess of $30 which he now feels is an excellent cost, and that may well be. I would like to know what the cost per square foot was on his original estimate by his so-called "old" architects.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I do not know what you mean by "old" architects.

Mr. Nixon: You used the terms—I suppose you mean the ones that work for you.

Hon. Mr. Connell: There is only one architect. Originally we commissioned three firms of architects, but we realized at that time that the time was so short—Moriyama had 15 months to plan a building which he should have had 30 months on. This was one of the original problems. He had to do in 15 months what he should have taken 30 months to do, and we found out that it was most difficult for three separate architectural firms to work together on this. So the other two most graciously removed themselves and Moriyama took on the complete job. There were so many decisions that had to—

Mr. Sopha: If they had read Ayn Rand's *The Fountainhead* they would have known that the three of them could not work together.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well—

Mr. Sopha: She pointed that out 15 years ago.

Hon. Mr. Connell: In most cases, we have had very great success with architectural firms working together, but this is where we have enough time to plan. This was a project that had to be proceeded with by trying to comply with members to get it ready by July 1, 1967.

Mr. Nixon: We are certainly interested in the Minister's comments and he is now talking about the architect who enjoys an international reputation in this regard. I wonder if he would tell us what fees are needed to acquire the services of this man. We understand that one of the things that this Minister, or some other responsible Minister did, was to provide the architect with the funds to take himself and his wife around the world—even though the time was very seriously limited—and go to his homeland Japan in order to see what is done there, and to see what is done in Australia and in the United States.

Is it not so that this happened? I would like to know what the costs of this particular trip were, and I would also like to know how his estimate of the cost per square foot of the museum changed upon his return.

An hon. member: Those are good questions.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I think I mentioned the other day in the House that architects are paid basically 6 per cent on the average type building. If it is an unusual type building, such as a health laboratory or something other than the four square walls and partition types of buildings, they are paid 7 per cent; on the other buildings they are paid 6 per cent.

As far as Moriyama is concerned, certainly you do not sit in your living room if you want to learn all the things. I think you have to travel. I give the man credit, and as far as I have any knowledge, he paid for his trip

out of his 7 per cent commission. Now, if it is otherwise, I do not know about it.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, that is barely satisfactory, because there is the implication there that the Minister is not sure of this. I know that we would be very anxious to have the specific figures that have been paid to Mr. Moriyama so far, and what his requirements are.

I am not for a moment questioning the man's ability, nor the ability of the architects that were associated with the structure before. I am questioning, however, the responsibility of this Minister who had already announced—at least the government announced with the advice of the Minister—that the cost of this building would be something approaching $5 million. It has never been made clear why the cost per foot went up so tremendously when the architect was changed, or when the plans were changed by the Minister, or the other Ministers who advise him.

We are talking about some of these changes in plans, and it is obvious that if the building is going to be bigger, it is going to cost more.

I want to know who made the decision that was then communicated just a few months ago to the Minister, that we would make the far-reaching changes, but which ended up, really with the dismissal of the director of the project, because the changes involved doing away with a library, storage facilities and so on. This is where the problem that the Minister has been attempting to cope with, comes from. The fact that there has been no stability in planning, and that there has been no stability in the original cost, and that he still cannot tell us—

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, I object to this questioning of stability in planning. There has been great stability in planning. There has not been change in the square foot cost, but there have been tremendous changes in the amount of square feet that are involved. This is where the changes have come from, not in the changes in square foot cost, but in the amount of square feet that we have had to pay for. That is where the basic increase is accounted for.

Mr. Sopha: Is that as a result of the insistence of the Minister of Education?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I do not know that I would want to call it the "insistence" of the Minister of Education, but on his advice and the advice of a great many people as to what was needed in this to make it a unique technological centre for this province. There was a lot of planning going into it. I get the impression all along that the people on that side of the House are not in favour of good planning. Get on with the thing! Do not bother planning! This is the impression I get.

I hope that I am wrong in that, but there always seems to be an urgency to these things, and as far as I am concerned, as long as I am Minister of Public Works, any building is going to be properly planned.

Now, as far as the square foot costs are concerned, I will go through this. Maybe you will be interested. I do not know whether you would be interested in the facts or not, but on August 31, 1964, the project was announced by the Prime Minister: "Site to be on land at Don Mills Road at Eglinton Avenue East in North York. Raymond Moriyama appointed associate architect. Portion of the budget allotted to public works is $2.5 million." It was considered to be approximately 100,000 square feet.

Now, the $2.5 million was actually a $5 million building with the $2.5 million coming from the—

Mr. Sargent: Why did it go to Toronto—

Hon. Mr. Connell: Because the federal government in Ottawa insisted that it be in the capital of the province of Ontario. That is the reason we built it there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I tried to have it in the city of Hamilton, but the federal government insisted that it be—

Mr. Sargent: How could they insist?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, they could have withheld the $2.5 million for one thing, and it looked like a large amount at that time, in the overall total.

On September 9, 1964, the Centennial staff, Mr. Moriyama and The Department of Public Works meet to discuss programming and requirements in detail. Requirements to be finalized by December 1.

September 14, 1964. Moriyama and The Department of Public Works inspect site with Metro conservation officials and learn that extensive flood control measures are required on the site and that the presence of 27 kv hydro line and the valley and very high pressure oil pipelines will complicate the siting of buildings. Also there is a lifetime tenancy on a portion of the property which will have to be purchased.

December 16, 1964. The Department of Public Works advised by Centennial chairman that he had received approval for building project to be $7.8 million, approximately 260,000 square feet.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Wait a minute. $7.8 million and 260,000—

Hon. Mr. Connell: I do not think these figures are too important. What I am trying to get at is the number of square feet. This is the important thing.

Mr. Singer: Per square feet. This relates to the number, does it not in the total price?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Remember this is only two or three months after the project is even conceived, the idea that we were going to have a Centennial project.

Mr. Singer: But surely we can trust the Prime Minister. When he said it was $5 million and it would be completed on July 1, that meant something.

Hon. Mr. Connell: If you do not want to understand it, that is okay with me, but I am just trying to tell you the facts. I know they are not very interesting, because they destroy a lot of the myths that you are trying to build up about this project.

Department of Public Works point out that adding cost of exterior services, landscaping, parking areas and roads—this is what we are pointing out at this time—furniture, architects' fees and overhead will bring price up to approximately $10.5 million.

Mr. Sargent: Up double!

Hon. Mr. Connell: This is our inward workings of planning a building. This is not what we go out putting in the papers and that type of thing.

Mr. Singer: How many square feet will you get out of $10.5 million?

Hon. Mr. Connell: 260,000 square feet, as I mentioned earlier. Exclusive of exhibits. Put that in your notes too.

Estimated cost not including Department of Public Works overhead is now $9,750,000, but that is excluding Department of Public Works overhead. Put that in.

December 21, 1964, Mr. Moriyama received initial requirements from the Centennial staff. December 21, 1964. That is three months after it has been announced, he has got the initial requirements of what we need.

Mr. Bryden: That is where the weakness was.

Mr. Sopha: Ten million dollars and we do not know where we are going.

Hon. Mr. Connell: February 19, 1965, Public Works estimate based on Moriyama's one by forty foot scale, three hand sketches, $11.55 million. This is after he has found out at this time with all the requirements added in, and Moriyama working on it and various departments deciding what they want in here, it has come up to 350,000 square feet at this time.

Mr. Sopha: Has he been around the world yet?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Not including—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Are you interested, do you want to hear the Minister? Let us be fair to the Minister if you want to hear the report he has before him.

Mr. Sopha: He is very touchy.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am trying to give you the points. I am not touchy, I am trying to give you the points, but you are always trying to throw something else. You are not interested in the facts, this is the trouble. You are interested in making good speeches around the House but you are not interested—

Mr. Sopha: You are revealing a state of colossal failure.

Hon. Mr. Connell: —in the facts.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman!

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has the floor. If you will listen—

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister answer a question?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I think you could ask me some questions after I get through.

Mr. Sargent: What can you tell us about—

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has suggested that you wait until the completion of his remarks.

Mr. Sargent: It was not even in the budget to start with.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has suggested that you wait until he completes his report.

Hon. Mr. Connell: April 23, further announcement by the Prime Minister that estimated cost is now $14 million, including $3

million for exhibits which makes The Department of Public Works' share $11 million.

August 11, 1965. Department of Public Works estimate based on more complete working drawings, and this is what I say, you have got to get into planning these things before you know what it actually costs—

Mr. Nixon: What was that last date? I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman: August 11, 1965.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Connell: —$18.6 million. Late August, 1965, Cabinet approved of an increase of $3 million over the $14 million previously announced, giving a total approved cost of $17 million, of which The Department of Public Works—well of course this is our—

Mr. Singer: How many square feet then?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is still 360,000 square feet, as far as I know.

February 23, 1966, Department of Public Works estimates a probable tender price on day tenders close to $20.27 million.

Mr. Sopha: Right through the sound barrier then.

Hon. Mr. Connell: February 23, low tender is Pigott Construction where basic tender price is $21.703 million. Our people were not very far out on their estimate.

Mr. Singer: How many square feet then?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is 360,000 square feet to the best of my knowledge; 418,000 square feet.

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me. The Minister has indicated it is 418,000 square feet at that time.

Mr. Singer: Oh, 418,000!

Hon. Mr. Connell: Estimated total cost of the project is approximately $28 million, not including Department of Public Works overhead, but including the $3 million for exhibits, of which the following approximate amounts are recoverable. Federal grant, $2.5 million. Ontario Hydro—I am not sure whether these figures are correct, now, this is some months old.

Mr. Sargent: They probably are not.

Mr. Sopha: Well why would you give your figures—

Hon. Mr. Connell: The federal sales tax, $900,000.

Mr. Sargent: What a way to run a business. Go broke in a week.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I have it in my figures that Ontario Hydro contribution is $953,000, I am not too sure on that figure.

Mr. Nixon: Well, do you think it is more? Mr. Chairman, just before we leave that point, the Minister is not sure of that figure.

Hon. Mr. Connell: These notes are actually a year and a half old, and so it seemed to me there was some consultation. I would have to check that out with the Minister of—

Mr. Nixon: Consultation that indicated they would take a larger part, perhaps?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, it was just a question of whether they were in there or not.

Mr. Nixon: They may not be in there at all now?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No. I am not sure of that.

Mr. Sargent: It is only $20 million more; it does not matter.

Hon. Mr. Connell: The square foot cost. If you people are serious in your views, this is the part that you should be interested in.

Mr. Bryden: We should be interested in the total cost, surely.

Hon. Mr. Connell: The Department of Public Works has continually stressed to Centennial officials the necessity of keeping within the budget framework and have pointed out that while our preliminary estimates prior to receipt of requirements were based on $30 per square foot, information obtained by Moriyama in visiting similar museums in other countries and the difficult topography of the site indicated that $45 to $60 per square foot would be a more realistic figure. The actual square foot cost on the basis of tenders received is approximately $38.60.

Any office building will cost you $25 to $28 per square foot. The estimated time for completion of the project is between 30 and 36 months.

Mr. Singer: Could the Minister say how he gets $38 per square foot? He has 418,000 square feet and $21,703,000 in the contract price. That is something more than $50 a square foot, not $38.

Hon. Mr. Connell: What did the hon. member work the 418 into?

Mr. Singer: The contract price, the Minister said, was $21,703,000 and he said there were 418,000 square feet.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes.

Mr. Singer: Now if my rough and ready calculation is any good, that is something in excess of $50 a square foot, not $38.

Hon. Mr. Connell: This is the only actual cost of the building, it does not include those services. The estimated cost—

Mr. Singer: Did not the Minister say, and I am not trying to confuse him, that the contract was $21,703,000?

Hon. Mr. Connell: For the actual building.

Mr. Singer: For the actual building. And the actual building had 418,000 square feet.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes.

Mr. Singer: Now divide 418 into $21.703 million and you come up with something more than $50 a square foot.

Mr. Sargent: You said $35.

Mr. Singer: It was $38.

Hon. Mr. Connell: The estimated total cost of the project is approximately $28 million, not including Department of Public Works overhead, but including $3 million for exhibits.

Mr. Singer: No, no, but the Minister stated, if I heard him correctly that he ended up with a $38 per square foot cost, which he thought was just great. But to back that up he said he had 418,000 square feet and a tender price of $21,703,000, which is the tender accepted, which is over $50. Now I want to know which is right. Was it $38 a square foot or over $50 a square foot?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, I am not very good at arithmetic right here.

Mr. Sopha: Do you have a slide rule in that department at all?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am not sure about that; I cannot give you that offhand.

Mr. Sopha: That is painfully obvious.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, while the Minister is studying his figures, it would seem to me that there was adequate notice that this matter was going to come up. Indeed, I would think that anyone could have deduced that it was going to come up and surely the Minister should be better prepared than he is, but if he is not prepared to give the information that has been asked for by the leader of the Opposition, and information that other members no doubt will wish to ask for, I would suggest that we leave this matter in abeyance.

Hon. Mr. Connell: The only part that I am in error—I just cannot get this divided out, this $38.60 per square foot. I am giving you the actual contract price and what the overall cost of this building is as far as we are concerned. Maybe the 418,000 is not exactly right. As I say, the report that I have is a year and a half old now, but I had always thought that this $35 to $40 per square foot was the actual square foot cost and if I am in error I will stand corrected. But I am giving the totals of the cost of this building, which I am sure of.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if, when the Minister is getting the information to verify whether it is 418,000 square feet, there are any other questions under this vote?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, just before that happens, I would like to suggest that figures prepared 18 months ago are not really satisfactory. There are undoubtedly other matters under this vote. I would suggest that we go ahead with them for the balance of the time available this afternoon. The Minister can then come back tomorrow with up to date figures which he is able to explain.

There appear to be discrepancies in his figures that he is not able to explain at the moment. I think he should come in here properly prepared on this matter, since it is difficult to discuss it when we are in doubt as to the actual facts. I believe the government should hold this phase of the vote until tomorrow afternoon when the Minister can come back with the figures.

Mr. Chairman: If it is agreeable to the member and others present, I suggest that when the Minister is getting this information from his officials that we proceed with any other questions on this vote.

Mr. Nixon: I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, and I have said it frequently before, that surely when we are discussing this type of business, when the Minister has to consult with his officials without them being able to give us the information themselves, it

would be far better if we were located in a more informal committee where those people who are officials in the department could speak for themselves.

The Minister in a case like this suffers undue embarrassment because he has to speak for his officials. And surely some better way of dealing with this sort of estimate must be brought in before we deal with estimates again in this Legislature. It is a matter of grave concern. But since we are going to leave this so that the departmental officials can find the answers for us, I would like to bring to your attention, sir, the matter that was raised by the member for Kent East last night in the provision of the abattoir facilities in the Guelph reformatory.

It was indicated by the member, who has done considerable research on this matter, that the abattoir was to be established there to come under the very high requirements of federal inspection for meat slaughtering. And it appears that after construction was well under way it was necessary for the government, through this department, to reconsider their position and actually rebuild the whole structure with other architectural advice that was more competent.

Here is another case where, if the information available to us is correct and we have every reason to believe that it is correct and that we stated it in a very simple way as far as the House is concerned, in a straightforward way, there is evidence here of very serious mismanagement on the part of the department that we are now considering at the present time. This is surely another area where the Minister should be prepared and give us the story on the development of the abattoir at the industrial farm at Guelph.

Was there this serious and far-reaching change of plans midway in construction? Was the plan of a type that will not permit the abattoir to come up to federal inspection standards even now? And is there, in fact, a serious loss of public funds in the changes that had to be made midway in the construction?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I do not know whether the leader of the Opposition was in the House when I carried on at much greater length that I like to in explaining the history of the abattoir. I explained it very carefully and in very great detail. And there have been no tremendous loss in any changes that were made.

The basic change was in the scale, the set of scales which was enlarged. And in the disposal area there had to be some changes because the information that we had been given originally was not so; this was not available in the way that our department was told originally.

Mr. Nixon: What is the correct information; where would you get that?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would expect it would come through the department at Guelph, as to how we were to get rid of this disposable waste. But it did not work that way and we had to make some changes.

Mr. Sargent: That is still the government.

Mr. Nixon: Did the water resources commission step in and require these changes then?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Oh no, not the water resources commission at all, but I think they had counted on somebody coming in there on a daily basis to take this away and it was not found to be practical in the end.

Mr. Nixon: Surely we can do it on a question and answer basis with less formality. Was it the information then from The Department of Reform Institutions that was incorrect and misleading as far as your plan was concerned?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would not want to blame any other department.

Mr. Nixon: We do, we want to know who made the error.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Our information was that it would have someone available to pick it up each day. The Ontario rendering plants —you know it as well as I do; you pass it every day—is the type of firm that we thought would be able to pick that up, but apparently this was not found to be practical. There either was not enough waste or for some reason or other, we could not be able to contract for someone to pick this up on a daily basis.

Mr. Nixon: Was it the superintendent of the industrial farm who gave you the incorrect information in the first place?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would imagine our information would have come from The Department of Reform Institutions but I cannot say who the individual is.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the Minister can now tell me if the plant as it is presently

constructed comes up to federal standards for meat inspection?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Exceedingly so. I think we have gone overboard. Any government institution we build, we have to overbuild to make sure we fit in with every federal government and our own regulations.

Mr. Nixon: Right!

I was wondering then what the overrun on the original estimate was with the changes that had to be accommodated in the construction?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I mentioned that figure earlier. I think it was only about $9,000 difference.

Mr. Nixon: It was just nine?

Hon. Mr. Connell: About that, yes. With the exception of the changes. The contract price is only about $9,000 difference.

Mr. Nixon: What I really would like to know is what you originally planned the installation would cost and what it finally cost, that is including the changes.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Our original estimate was $825,000; tenders were called early in 1964 and the low figure came in at $837,000, which is about $12,000-odd higher. We had to change the scale itself, which was an additional cost of $1,420. We are still, of course, working on the inedible waste rendering system. I am not sure whether we have an estimate on that or not.

Mr. Nixon: Is it not completed yet?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is still in service. Then there is a change in the system itself—the rail system vs. the cradle system which amounted to $5,229.

Mr. Nixon: What is your final estimate of the completed plant at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, that would be $837,000 plus $1,420 plus $5,229. I am not sure that we have an estimate on the inedible waste section. No, I cannot give you an estimate on the inedible waste section.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, as the Minister knows, I think, this contract was let in 1964. It was originally announced in 1963, and, as I understand his remarks when he explained this earlier, they made the change to go along with the federal regulations. We also had certain changes because of the bad meat affair in Ontario. But as I understand it, those were all taken care of before this contract was let.

I went in good faith with the Minister two or three weeks ago to visit the plant. I made observations at that time that I thought there were certain parts of the building that were not needed, and I think it was the Minister and the architect at that time who said there was considerable improvement made over the original contract. They were still knocking out doors, as a matter of fact, when we were there. But it irked me when I got home the following day that I had a letter saying they had pulled the wool both over the Minister's and my eyes with what was going on there. I would like, sir, just a little more detailed discussion. What I am concerned with, as I said, is that I went out there with good intentions of looking into this. Then we got reports from some officials at work there, either by phone or by anonymous letter that the Minister and I have been fooled. I resent this type of thing very much, because I went with the good intentions of trying to come up with an answer to a very difficult situation and a very necessary thing for that particular institution.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, it is news to me that the wool was pulled over our eyes. I have not heard anything about that until this moment. Here again, I say we are a service department trying to provide what a department needs and we just happened to get into a very difficult period during the design of this building when regulations were coming in from both levels of government, which added greatly to the cost. A mistake was made. I very seldom criticize any of the people who are working for us but I am not too proud of the architects on this job because I do not think they sought advice just where perhaps they should have at times.

This one single scale part caused great difficulties; it caused some changes in the design of the floor layout. And I think it was very evident to you and me when we were there that day that we have to provide this holding pen, which probably would not be used even once a year; but nevertheless it is in the regulations; and unless the inmates go on a sit-down it probably will not be used. But there are the regulations we have to live up to. We have to provide 3,200 square feet for something that might happen only once a year, if ever.

So if the hon. member thinks there is anything else wrong up there—we had a contract to administer which, to be quite frank, has

not been an easy one as far as this abattoir is concerned. But we have done it to the best of our ability. We think we have good value for our money here for those services we had to provide. It is up to the occupying department to make sure they get good use out of it at this time.

Mr. Worton: Is the Minister giving us the figures of the equipment that was changed and also the additional work that his permanent staff is doing in this regard, such as changing the water softeners and things like that, which they were doing the day we were there? It would seem to me that this would be far in excess of the figures that the Minister has used.

Hon. Mr. Connell: These are the most up-to-date figures that I have. If there are things which have taken place within the last two or three weeks—

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, this building was started in 1964 and they have been building on it ever since and making changes. Is that not right?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I did not get the first part of the member's statement.

Mr. Spence: I say this new abattoir was started in 1964 and it was pretty well completed. I understand there had to be a tremendous amount of that abattoir torn out because it was not satisfactory to The Department of Reform Institutions. I am informed that it has cost $200,000 extra for the changes that have been made. So, if the Minister says I am misinformed, all right; but I was informed that this has been taking place ever since 1964. There have been many changes taking place and according to the Minister there are still changes taking place. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I covered this rather fully in my earlier statement. The one part is an addition—it was not an expensive addition—but they did have to put a roof over the set of scales, which was not included in the original request. I am not sure what the labour was as far as changing the scales was concerned, but the difference in the price of the scales itself was $1,.420. There would be some labour in changing that. And then we have the disposal plant but I do not know whether we have anyone here with an estimate on that or not. This is not a large item and certainly anyone using the $200,000 figure is away out.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, the senseless bungling of this whole Centennial fiasco, the bad planning, staff resigning—we are told the Minister did not tell the architect we had a budget of $5 million, $10 million—

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I thought it had been—

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about architects.

Mr. Bryden: —agreed the Centennial matter would be left in abeyance until other matters had been disposed of.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. As it has been suggested earlier, I say to the member for Grey North, we would hold over the Centennial discussion until we have finished other matters under this vote.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, sir, we were talking about the Centennial but what I am concerned about is the fact that we have homes, schools, public buildings, jails, courthouses, under this vote, to be built all across the province, we have an amount of $500,000 here for architects; salaries $461,000. I think, Mr. Chairman, the time is long overdue for this government to appoint or to have the architects they have on staff—for which we are paying $500,000 per year now—give us standardized homes, standardized schools, standardized education, hospitals—

Mr. Bryden: Standardized members of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What standard are you to use?

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about the people of Ontario who need to have cut these big tributes of millions of dollars, Mr. Chairman, which we are paying to architects in this province year after year, the millions of dollars that the architects have made through the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) in hospitals throughout this province. If we had a standard form of hospital, education, homes, we could save the people of this province many, many millions of dollars per year.

I think it is a shocking thing that this Department of Public Works could start a project at $5 million, and climb to $28 million, not telling the men they have a budget of $5 or $10 million. When people cannot get homes in this province, and the architects doing business with the province have the right to write their own blank cheques—they can write their own cheques in these deals,

and I think it is important that the Minister tell the House the fee that Moriyama was charging the government for this job.

Mr. Bryden: Well, this is on the Centennial—

Mr. Sargent: Who cares? It is public business I am talking about.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if we are having an orderly discussion, I think we should follow the procedure agreed upon.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the members that it was decided that we would deal with—

Mr. Sargent: We do not have enough information here. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister this: We have salaries for architects at $461,000 a year. Is there any reason why these people who are probably accredited people—they have probably passed all the education milestones to get to be architects—why could they not build things like an abattoir or a school or a hospital or a public building? Why could they not make these plans and save us the gravy that is paid all the time to architects? Why cannot you set up a programme like this?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It has been the policy of our government to commission at least 50 per cent of the work to outside architects. You mention the salary of $461,000, that is not all architects. It is the people in the architectural branch. They are not all architects.

Mr. Sargent: How many architects do you have?

Hon. Mr. Connell: There are about ten or 12 architects, but there are about 90 odd—97 I think—in that particular branch.

Mr. Sargent: What is the function of an architect in your department? Why do you have to bring in outside architects when you have your own people?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, if we wanted to enlarge our staff by another 100—if we are doing 50 per cent of the work—I do not know if this is good business or not. We have not thought it was good business.

Mr. Sargent: Do you not think you would be in money in the end result?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We might be, but we have not—

Mr. Sargent: Do you not know?

Hon. Mr. Connell: If we get a person on the permanent staff and you decide you want to cut down our budget some year, we have to let some of that staff go. I would much prefer to keep a continuous flow of work—through the type of work our people are doing—and bring in the outside architects to use the imagination and the type of things I think you were asking for here a year ago.

Mr. Sargent: Are you suggesting then that your architects do not have imagination?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, I did not say that.

Mr. Sargent: Have you ever tried to have them do a public building for you—your own people?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, they have done many of them.

Mr. Sargent: What is the fee you pay the outside architects?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I mentioned that earlier. Six per cent on the ordinary standard buildings, seven per cent on the more difficult, complicated buildings.

Mr. Sargent: Do they get six per cent of the fixtures too or just the building itself?

Hon. Mr. Connell: The contract price.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman on architectural policy. That is the subject I opened up a while ago under another vote.

Mr. Chairman: Is that on the same point?

Mr. Singer: No, I want to get back to the abattoir.

Mr. Bryden: Well, why do you not keep your own members under control? I was waiting. I wanted to deal with architectural policy and was waiting for you fellows to finish up the abattoir, but apparently you do not know which way you are going.

Mr. Chairman, I am in no hurry but I do have questions to ask on that.

Mr. Chairman: Let the Chairman accept the responsibility under the circumstances. I should have found out whether he was going to stay on that same particular subject.

The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I was listening to this talk about the abattoir and I am not sure that I have it clear in my mind yet.

The Minister was very concerned about something having gone wrong there, but in the prices that he quoted to us the story does not seem to emerge too clearly at all.

Your estimate, as I understood it, was some $825,000 and your contract was just a few thousand dollars higher than that.

Hon. Mr. Connell: It was four years earlier, I point out also.

Mr. Singer: Yes, and your contract was just a few thousand dollars higher than that $825,000 was it not?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Which really has no relevance at all.

Mr. Singer: All right then. Now that was the amount of money you paid to the contractor. The contractor has come and gone, has he?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I believe the contractor has—

Mr. Singer: Has gone.

Hon. Mr. Connell: We are doing the—

Mr. Singer: This, I suppose, is where the concern lies. When did the contractor go off the job?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I do not know the exact date at all.

Mr. Singer: Was it a day ago, a week ago, a month ago?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We were there a month ago and the contractor was off the job at that time.

Mr. Singer: Yes. Did you say a month ago?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I do not know—a month or two months.

Mr. Singer: Could it have been a year ago?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, no. I was recalling—I do not know what it was—a month ago.

Mr. Singer: All right. Now then, to what extent has your department moved in and taken over work, and when did they move in? Were they there while the contractor was there?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I cannot tell you the exact dates, the exact timing on it, but it was decided that the scales had to be changed. We undertook to do that work ourselves because it was not in the original contract. We also agreed—the request was brought in to have a roof put over the scale area. It is a roof possibly 20 by 20—I am only guessing at that—to cover up the scale area.

I have also mentioned about the inedible waste area that I have no facts or figures here, but it is not a major consideration. And the dressing system on the line—dressing, changing from a cradle system to a line system—this was put in with the idea that it was necessary to train these inmates to be expert in the field of killing, they had to have that type of equipment. Apparently this cradle system does not present the right type of equipment. They had to have the line equipment to give that extra training that they would get if they moved into Canada Packers, or Essex—this type.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the contractor has been gone over six months. Would the Minister say that is wrong?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would say within the last three months. I really—

Mr. Singer: All right. In any event, the contractor has gone for a considerable period of time and I would think that the date the contractor left should be available in the Minister's records. Could the Minister get that for us? Surely there must be some sort of record keeping in your department which would indicate the day the contractor left the job. Would that not be there?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We can get that, yes.

Mr. Singer: I think that is important, because what I want to find out is the extent to which your department has gone in and done additional work for which apparently there are no figures. Because we are really talking in the air.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, I can give you very definite figures. I have not got them here—this particular note is several weeks old—but I will get you those figures and I will have accurate figures. I will also obtain the estimate or the accurate figures of the inedible waste area.

Mr. Singer: Yes. I think that we should have, Mr. Chairman, a complete breakdown of all of the time that has been charged by this department to the job since the job started apart from the money paid the contractor. All of the cost of materials. That will give us some idea of what the building has actually cost because on these figures the

Minister gave me cause for concern. The Minister was unduly worried about an increase of apparently $10,000.

Now in nearly a million dollar job, a $10,000 overrun is not that serious, but it would seem to me that the figure of $200,000 suggested by my colleague from Kent East and my colleague from Wellington South makes much more sense. I think the only way we can intelligently begin to discuss this, is to get a full and complete memorandum, not what the Minister read us—a full and complete memorandum of costing.

There must be, somewhere in your department, to satisfy the provincial auditor and the Provincial Treasurer, a complete charge-out of your costing, how many hours, how many men, how much material—

Hon. Mr. Connell: I can assure you, as I said earlier, five minutes ago, I will get you all that, but I have not got it here at this moment.

Mr. Singer: The other point is this. Will we have it while these estimates are still being discussed? It is going to serve very little purpose if we get figures that we cannot later discuss.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am sure that I can have them for you tomorrow.

Mr. Singer: All right!

Mr. Chairman: On the abattoir? The member for Wellington-Dufferin.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Chairman, I think all hon. members know—and particularly members of the government know—that I have been greatly interested in this abattoir for many years on behalf of the farmers that have used this market in Wellington, Dufferin, Perth, Halton, Wentworth and Waterloo, who use this market for livestock—

Mr. Nixon: The drovers too.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that where the activated sludge is?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Root: If you want to get into the activated sludge process, I will tell you that it is one of the most efficient methods of treating sewage that I know of.

Mr. Bryden: Would you tell us sometime the locations where the method is in operation?

Mr. Root: Mr. Chairman, I will take the hon. member down and give him an introduction to activated sludge some day, if he would like to see the process.

Mr. Chairman, what I wanted to say was that on behalf of the farmers in that area, I pressed the government to reconstruct the abattoir when the old abattoir was becoming inefficient and costly to operate. This is not only an abattoir, this is a training institution, and perhaps the costs are higher because it is filling two purposes. I want to say this—that the farm people appreciate the fact that this abattoir has been built and another buyer put on the market. On too many occasions there is not enough competition in the market and this abattoir does provide another competitive buyer in the market.

There are many public-spirited citizens who realize the value of this abattoir as a training institution. Young men who, for various causes, are confined to this institution have the opportunity to learn a trade and when they come out they are better equipped to find employment. There is a great need for meat cutters, I am told, and for people who can get the training that they will receive in this institution.

So I want to say this: The people whom I have the honour to represent have nothing but commendation since the abattoir was opened. I will say that I had questions asked about the delay in the opening of the abattoir, but now that the abattoir is open I think everybody is happy. Some changes may have to be made. I have built buildings on my own farm and I have had to make changes as I went along. If these changes improve the efficiency of the abattoir, make it a sounder operation, I am all for it, I know the people whom I have the honour to represent and, I think, most of the hon. members here, appreciate the fact that the government has built this abattoir, put another buyer in the market, and provided a training institution that will provide high quality products for the various provincial institutions which will use meat products from this plant.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion on—

Mr. Spence: How many cattle and hogs are slaughtered at this reformatory a week? Is it in operation now?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, it is in operation now.

Mr. Spence: Could the Minister tell us how many cattle and hogs are slaughtered?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I have no idea, we have nothing to do with the operation of it.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, the Minister will recall that the man told us there were 50 head of cattle. A week or so ago they had not gotten any hogs in, so it is doing 50 head a week.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further under this particular subject?

Mr. Sargent: Under this vote, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: No, on this subject, the subject of abattoirs. Now, under the subject of the architects and engineers, the member for Woodbine, please.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I had started to ask some questions at the wrong point in the estimates. I would now like to follow up for a moment or two.

As the Minister has explained, the department contracts out a good deal of its architectural work. I differ from the member for Grey North. I do not criticize the department for that. I think it is inevitable and even desirable, but what I am interested in knowing is the policy the department uses in contracting out. I will try to break that question down into specifics.

First of all, what are the circumstances under which it decides to commission an outside architect rather than having the work done within its own department?

Hon. Mr. Connell: People have to programme their own work and my chief architect makes the decision as to whether we should go to an outside architectural firm, or whether we can handle it ourselves.

Mr. Bryden: Would it follow, Mr. Chairman, that any really major construction job—construction of a new building running into costs of millions of dollars—would almost necessarily be commissioned outside, in other words that your own staff would not be large enough to handle it?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, our own staff would be completely capable and completely qualified to handle it, in fact—I hesitate to say this—but I think they might be better than some of the outside architects, because they know all the basic government requirements. Ordinarily, an architect building for an individual, perhaps, does not need to live up to quite all the regulations that we as a government department have to live up to. Our own architectural staff have to check out all these plans very carefully—even those that the outside firms do; but we would be completely capable of handling any size building within our own department.

Mr. Bryden: When you do farm it out, would it be because your own staff is too busy, or are there situations where you believe that an outside man might have a fresh approach that would be desirable for the situation? You said the chief architect makes the decisions, which makes sense, but what are the circumstances under which he would contract out and those under which he would do it himself or have his own staff do it?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I do not know how much plainer I could give it, it just all depends on the programming in our own department as to whether we go outside. I think it is always nice to have fresh ideas, particularly of the aesthetic approach to these buildings. I think it is nice to bring in a fresh approach and I think it is good business as far as the government is concerned to commission outside architects for a great percentage of our work. I cannot tell you the exact percentages at any one time but it runs anywhere from 50 to 75 or 80 per cent that we commission outside; it is much simpler to have one architectural firm on a large building than having it dealing with a dozen small buildings with outside firms.

Mr. Bryden: The Minister has undoubtedly answered this question in past years but I have forgotten the answer. How did he handle the complex to the east of us here, was that commissioned out or—

Hon. Mr. Connell: It was commissioned out. We had four of the largest and most outstanding architectural firms in the city of Toronto. We got them together and they formed a separate firm for this particular project. Our staff actually did a lot of the early design in that and throughout several other designs which these people completely agreed with when they came into the picture. But they were four of the largest architectural firms in the city of Toronto that joined up on this particular job.

Mr. Bryden: When the decision is made to contract out or whatever the proper term is, how is the selection of the architectural firm made? Is this at the discretion and judgment of your chief architect or do you follow any sort of principle?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Basically, in a professional area, it is in his discretion, and certainly he, I think, sir, suggested those four architectural firms. I find, as Minister, in commissioning architects, that you cannot bring —not to use any particular area—but you cannot bring a Windsor firm into the city of Toronto and you cannot take a Toronto firm into—

Mr. Bryden: Owen Sound?

Hon. Mr. Connell: —the town of Sudbury or the city of Sudbury.

Mr. Sargent: Why not? Does everything have to stay in Toronto? That is an awful statement for the Minister to make. Why can a Windsor firm not come up here and do some work up here, or an Ottawa firm or a North Bay firm, or an Owen Sound firm? What an awful statement to make.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, I think everyone else understood the statement. Perhaps the member did not, but I think everyone else in the House understood it.

Mr. Chairman: Is the member for Woodbine finished?

Mr. Bryden: I had not finished but I have no objection if the hon. member for Grey North wishes to intervene.

Mr. Chairman: Is it on the same subject?

Mr. Sargent: I hate to interrupt but I would like to ask, how much money a year —in dollars—would you save if you used your own architects in Ontario? The Minister said 50 per cent of the contracts are let out. Has the Minister ever figured out in dollars how much he would have saved at six per cent in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, I have not figured that out.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, to pursue the matter of the architectural policy, I think the hon. Minister has explained the policy of the department as fully as is possible. I can appreciate the fact this is an area where one cannot give hard and fast answers. Situations determine what is done and I agree with that.

I may say that I do not agree at all with the policy of extreme standardization which seems to have been implicit in the remarks of the hon. member for Grey North. It used to be alleged, quite erroneously, that socialists believed in standardization to the ultimate. This has always been an erroneous view, but it will be noticed, Mr. Chairman, it was not a socialist or a supporter of the NDP who brought forward the concept of standardization of everything in the building line, and even beyond that in Ontario here. I may say that I am quite opposed to that policy. I believe there are areas where standardization can create great economies and where it is useful.

Mr. Nixon: That is precisely what the member was talking about.

Mr. Bryden: I also believe there are areas where aesthetic values are important. And one thing I deplore is the standardization of ugliness which Canadian architecture has revealed, at any rate in this part of the country, ever since World War II or even before. In Toronto, the architectural style is what one could call "soap box 1950". You have small soap boxes, or you may have some that are 55 storeys high, but they are all on the lines of the soap box. That is the basic architectural conception and I think that is most regrettable. I was very disappointed, I always have been very disappointed, Mr. Chairman, in our own provincial complex to the east of here, because it is just a further multiplication of the soap box style.

Mr. Nixon: That was not how you described them last year.

Mr. Bryden: Well, no, I was talking about the Eaton project last year, where that description is applicable too. Over the last century there have been a few examples of distinguished architecture in Toronto and there is one recent one, which we all know as the Toronto city hall. I expressed regret last year that the provincial government did not complement the bold conception of the city hall by a similarly bold conception up here at Wellesley and Bay. As I say, I was disappointed. However, I am not going to belabour the point.

I want to make one further mention on the question of architecture, Mr. Chairman. Here I do have to make reference to the Centennial centre, but only in terms of its architecture. I have seen the sketches of the building, or buildings. I have been at the site within the last month and I have seen what is being constructed there. Talking now only about the architecture—and on a more appropriate occasion I will have comments that the Minister may like less about other phases of the matter—but in terms of the architecture I, as an amateur but as a citizen, a person who likes to see beautiful things,

am quite impressed by the architecture of that complex. I think it is a wonderful design. When I think of the terrible disabilities under which the architect must have laboured, I would like to credit him. I think this will be a credit to the province of Ontario, not only as a building that performs a function, but also as a building that is beautiful and, to some degree, expresses the aspirations of the people of Ontario at this particular stage in their history.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that it is the only building built or sponsored by the government of Ontario that I have seen that I would put in that category. I am not saying it is the only building in that category, but it is the only one I have seen. All the rest of them fit perfectly into the soap box 1950 style.

Mr. Nixon: How about the Frost building?

Mr. Bryden: The Frost building is a curved soap box instead of a straight one. That is about the only difference. It is somewhat better than the others, at least it fits into its environment but, by and large, the government has contributed nothing to architectural development in the city of Toronto or the province of Ontario which, heaven knows, sorely needs some new conceptions. It is a pity it has not, in view of the amount of money we have spent. However, I will give the Minister credit for the one contribution I know of that he has made.

I think architecture should be an expression of the finest ideals and aspirations of the period, not the meanest concepts. Unfortunately, our approach, intensified by the provincial government, has always been to express the meanest concepts of our society, namely the maximization of revenue per square foot of floor space. That is all most of our architecture ever represents. I would hope that when we have other major construction work to do in the future, the government would indeed shop around for some of the more imaginative architects who would do better by us than has been done up until now.

I think that The Department of Public Works, in its architectural branch, should essentially regard itself as coordinating and supervising. I am not now talking about small, utilitarian buildings, but in any major projects the department should be looking for artists. We know that artistic inspiration is a rare thing and it is going to take a lot of shopping around. The department did it in the case of the Centennial centre and I am glad. It does not appear to me that it has found very many artists in relation to any other projects it has undertaken.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister does not want to reply to what has just been said, I was wondering if his department had any responsibility for the pavilion at Expo, or was that constructed by some other architect?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Actually, the budget came out of The Department of Economics and Development. We did have the supervision of the contract.

Mr. Nixon: There has certainly been a lot of praise from experts and lay people as far as the design and the exhibit itself is concerned. I read, somewhere, that there was a plan to make use of the building following this fall, when the fair perhaps will be dismantled. Does the Minister know anything about any plan that might be made to dismantle it and bring it back to Ontario, perhaps as an exhibition at the CNE?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Originally I believe it was designed—and we would have to check with the Minister of Economics and Development on this for sure—but it was designed primarily as a temporary building. We have already had people down there examining the possibility of bringing this building back, or those exhibits, this type of thing. Just what the final plans have been, I am not able to report at this time, because I do not believe they are finalized.

Mr. Bryden: Move it up to Owen Sound.

Mr. Sargent: That is all right.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume these estimates, which will be followed by the estimates of The Department of Municipal

Affairs and then the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests, Education and University Affairs.

We will leave The Department of Education estimates until next week and I think we should be ready to deal with my own department, the provincial auditor or the Lieutenant-Governor. In fact, there is a relatively short list of estimates left, and in order to accommodate the wishes of various people I think we should be ready to take them. We will give the House what notice we can. I would suggest that we be ready to deal with any of the remaining estimates in the immediate future.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:50 o'clock, p.m.

No. 92

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Presenting reports, Mr. Welch 3231

Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading 3231

Questions to Mr. Dymond re the Ontario medical association, Mr. Trotter 3232

Question to Mr. Randall re the Ontario housing corporation, Mr. MacDonald 3232

Questions to Mr. Bales re the Jetco and Jet Metal firms, Mr. MacDonald 3232

Question to Mr. Connell re the Queen's Park complex, Mr. Bryden 3233

Questions to Mr. Simonett re the Ontario Hydro strike, Mr. Smith 3233

Estimates, Department of Public Works, Mr. Connell, concluded 3234

On notice of motion No. 22, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Olde, Mr. MacDonald 3258

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Spooner, agreed to 3266

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1967

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, St. Jerome's separate school, Downsview; in the west gallery, St. Jane Frances separate school, Toronto; in both galleries, St. Vincent de Paul separate school, Toronto.

I would ask the member for Lambton East to introduce special guests from his riding.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton East): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to introduce to you the Forest pee wee hockey team. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery. Their manager is Captain J. Clark of the Ipperwash army camp, and the coach, Mr. Stan Ulritch. They are sponsored by the Forest legion auxiliary.

Their season's record 1966-67: They played 56 games, won 52, lost three and tied one. The championships they have won: (a) OMHAC title two years in a row; (b) North American silver stick, "A" class; (c) Leamington international tournament; (d) Ayr tournament; (e) Mitchell tournament; (f) Watford silver stick; (g) London ACA tournament and (h) Lambton-Michigan title. Their high points: goals scored, 453; goals against 90. One player scored 137 goals. Four players scored over 100 points each; eight players scored 20 or more goals. One player was awarded a trophy as the most outstanding player in the North American silver stick championship, from 85 teams.

The defeated teams included large cities like Sarnia, Woodstock, London, Detroit, Lindsay, Wallaceburg and many others. They were unbeaten by any "C" club in the last two years. This team has no imports. Of 18 players, 14 live in the town of Forest, four live in the rural area immediately surrounding Forest. In other words, Mr. Speaker, they swept everything before them and today they are here as the Ontario champions.

Mr. Speaker: I would also like to welcome under the Speaker's gallery, west side, Oak Park junior high school students and their teacher.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the following reports:

1. The 66th annual report of the Ontario northland transportation commission for the year ended December 31, 1966.

2. The 46th annual report of the public service superannuation board for the year ended March 31, 1966.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE GAME AND FISH ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to introduce a new system for acquisition of public hunting and fishing rights on privately owned lands.

This new system is based on agreements between the Crown and the land owners. The agreement will provide that the hunting and fishing rights are turned over to the Crown and administered by the Crown for the use of the public.

The administration of such rights may include stream improvements, protective measures, stocking programmes, fencing, erection of signs and such other management programmes as may be deemed agreeable with the owners.

It is anticipated that private land owners who would otherwise be reluctant to permit public hunting and fishing on their land or sell their land outright, will be prepared to enter into this new type of agreement, which has been in operation in New York state, and that areas which might otherwise be closed to

the public can be made available for public use.

Through the agreement, the owners will be compensated for giving up these rights. From a public point of view the new proposals should be less costly than complete acquisition of the lands, thereby making more hunting and fishing available at less public outlay. A public investment on the private lands will be protected through registration of the agreement.

In addition, provisions will be made to clarify the wearing of back patches.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the Minister—would this apply to all areas of Ontario as soon as it is enacted?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health, of which he has already had notice.

In view of the announcement by the Ontario medical association that it was preparing a strike plan, has the government made any plans to provide medical services in the event the Ontario medical association carries out its threat?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, since this report so far has only appeared in the newspapers, I am quite sure the hon. member would want me to await notification officially from the profession before undertaking planning of this nature.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would allow a supplementary question?

Is it not obvious, whether you have had official notice or not, that they may carry out this threat at some time, either now or in the future? Do you need official notice?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is not obvious to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), and I will put it on the record for him.

In view of the statements reported to have been made by Mr. Justice Parker to Dr. Shulman—when Dr. Shulman requested an adjournment so that he could have the benefit of counsel at the hearing—does the Prime Minister not think it advisable in the interests of a fair and impartial inquiry that he should speak with the commissioner about the conduct of the inquiry?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions, my first to the Minister of Economics and Development.

Has the housing corporation made any inquiries regarding the possibility of the unfinished apartment building—and I think I perhaps wrongly identified this, and I hope I have not misled the Minister—on Bayview just north of Pottery Road, being made available for housing, in view of the present shortage in Metro?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. member is referring to the unfinished building which is located in the borough of East York and overlooking the Bayview extension?

Mr. MacDonald: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The construction of this building commenced late in 1959 and work ceased in mid 1960. Although the concrete roof was poured, it was never weatherproofed. Furthermore, I am advised that no windows were installed. The building has therefore been exposed to the elements for some seven years, which has undoubtedly resulted in substantial structural deterioration.

In view of these conditions, I am sure the hon. member will appreciate there is little possibility of the structure now being in a condition which would justify its completion by the Ontario housing corporation. I might also say I have talked to a few builders in the last year or so and they are of the opinion that the whole structure will have to be torn down. It cannot be finished as it sits right now. There are no services in that area—that is one of the problems.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to have this expert commentary.

My second question is to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker.

With regard to the Jet Metal and Jetco firms, 36-38 Milvan Drive, Weston, where a strike is now in progress:

(1) Were these firms granted permission for overtime work beyond the statutory limitation?

(2) How many cases of accidents, loss of fingers, feet, or other bodily injuries took place from January, 1965, through to the present date?

(3) Has the government intervened with regard to safety regulations being violated

through the assignment of deaf mutes to work with machinery such as punch presses?

(4) Is The Department of Labour assisting in any way at present to bring the parties together with a view to settling the strike?

Hon. D. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the questions raised by the hon. member for York South I would advise as follows.

In reference to the first part of the question—both companies are in possession of permits granted under section 5 of the hours of work regulations authorizing overtime work to the extent of 100 hours per employee for the year 1967.

The answer to the second part is: our records indicate that there were the following accidents involving employees of Jet Metal since January, 1965: An eye injury caused by using an air blast device to clean a punch press—a magnetic cleaning device is now used; a hand fracture; a shoulder muscle strain.

Our records show that there were the following accidents involving employees of Jetco since January 1965: Three hand injuries; three back injuries—one caused by slipping, one caused by lifting a bundle of wire and one caused by bending; a hip injury caused by slipping.

I might add that there have been four inspections of Jet Metal and seven inspections of Jetco since January, 1965, by the industrial safety branch.

To the third part of the question, the answer is that an officer of the union that is on strike enquired this week of a senior official of the department as to whether there is a prohibition against the employment of deaf mutes. He was advised that there is no such prohibition.

The fourth part of the question: This is a case of the steel workers' union seeking to obtain a first agreement with these companies. A conciliation officer was unable to bring the parties to a settlement. Because it was a first agreement he recommended that a conciliation board be appointed. The board, which consisted of Mr. Peter Podger, chairman; Mr. Drummond Wren, the union nominee, and Mr. E. L. Stringer, the company nominee, dealt with the matter and its report was mailed to the parties on April 24, 1967. The chairman and the union nominee made recommendations in respect of the issues in dispute. The company nominee declined to join with them in advancing these recommendations. As of today the department has taken no further steps in the dispute but it is watching the situation, and obviously its services will be available to the parties as soon as these services can be helpful in resolving the dispute.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the Minister a supplementary question on the third point: I am informed by official spokesmen of the union that the safety inspectors had instructed that deaf mutes not be put on punch presses. They were removed briefly and put back. Is the Minister in a position to verify this contention?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to do so at the present time but I will make further enquiries in reference to the point you have raised. Perhaps I could have a memo from the hon. member and we will take it up.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Now that Ontario has moved out of the carriage age what alterations does The Department of Public Works plan to make at the east and west entrances of this building to prevent recurrence of unfortunate mishaps resulting in injuries to persons?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the hon. member for Woodbine that we are making plans to fill in the open area, to enclose the steps with either a grill or stonework.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has not come into the House as yet, perhaps I could give my question as notice.

Insofar as the Attorney General's offer to take over the policing of those municipalities with under ten men, is concerned:

1. Does the Attorney General anticipate having enough personnel to do this?

2. Does the Attorney General plan to offer any job security to the municipal police officers who are replaced by such a system?

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management in three parts:

1. How many Hydro construction workers are on strike at the present time?

2. How many other construction workers are affected by the strike?

3. What steps is the government taking to negotiate the settlement?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is: approximately 2,500.

To the second part: It is correct to state that numbers of other construction workers are affected by the strike by reason of picket lines. The number has varied from day to day. No count has been taken in this respect and it is not possible to give a figure.

The answer to the third part of the question is that negotiations are still under the auspices of Mr. William Dickie, director of conciliation services for The Department of Labour.

In this dispute, the role of The Department of Labour is the same as that between any other employer and unions faced with a similar problem. Accordingly, the dispute has gone through the normal conciliation process.

Following the conclusion of that process the department has convened a number of meetings to deal with oustanding issues, some of which have been resolved.

Last week, as the strike began, The Department of Labour held further meetings with the parties. These meetings concluded on the basis that the parties would review their respective positions. Meanwhile, that department is remaining in close touch with the situation and is seeking to find means to bring about a resolution of the dispute through the normal channels of free collective bargaining.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I rise on a matter of personal privilege which you will understand, sir, has caused me some stress.

On April 27, the Canadian Press filed a story to the effect that, at a Toronto riding association meeting the previous evening, I had stated that: "To send a child to the Orillia Ontario hospital school was like a sentence of death."

I not only wish to totally disclaim such a statement, but I also wish to express my grave concern as to how such a story could have been printed. The story was subsequently used by several Ontario dailies, by the radio and television media and was, quite naturally, followed by a bitter editorial in the *Orillia Packet and Times* of May 5, and several agitated letters to the editor from parents who have children in the Ontario hospital school.

Try as I might, it has been impossible for me over the last week to pin down the source of the story. After endless inquiries, Canadian Press says that the story came from a duplicate of a Toronto *Telegram* story filed on the night of April 26. The Toronto *Telegram* did not use the story the next day, and cannot find any such duplicate, nor can they find a record of sending a reporter to cover any political meeting at which I spoke on that evening.

This is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, since I addressed no political meeting on the night of April 26 in Metropolitan Toronto or elsewhere in Ontario. In fact, on that date I was attending a small coffee party in my riding to which the press, of course, were not invited and during the course of which no reference was made to the subject matter of the story.

I am determined to find out how such a thing could occur, since I refuse to believe the possibility of fabrication, albeit I am presently defeated by all the investigations thus far, and they have been extensive.

I wish merely to emphasize that, although on occasion I have been a fierce critic of The Department of Health and of its facilities for retarded children in Ontario, I have never uttered anything even approximating that which was attributed to me in the news story, the source for which cannot be discovered.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

(Concluded)

On vote 1907:

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, I want to correct one statement I made yesterday in the House which was in error. It is in connection with Mr. Moriyama's trips to various museums and how that cost was paid for. I think I made the statement yesterday that that cost was included in his fees, but I have a statement here which is contrary.

When Mr. Moriyama was appointed associate architect for this project, it was agreed by the Centennial staff in Public Works that the time required by the Centennial staff to prepare the list of building requirements could be used to advantage by Mr. Moriyama in conducting research into similar institutions already in existence in the United States, Europe and Asia.

An itinerary was prepared in conjunction with Mr. Mariyama and the Centennial staff and the cities and buildings to be visited were as follows: London, England, the South Kensington museum of science and technology; Copenhagen, Denmark, the Louisiana art museum; Lausanne, Switzerland, the Swiss buildings; Munich, Germany, the Deutsch science museum; Milan, Italy, the Leonardo da Vinci; Tokyo, Japan, the science foundation museum; San Francisco, science museum and Los Angeles, the science museum.

The Department of Public Works paid Mr. Moriyama's expenses, but no payment was made for his time in connection with his visits to the above-mentioned cities and buildings. We did not pay for his expenses incurred at stopovers he made which were not on his itinerary. The amount paid to Mr. Moriyama for his trip was $2,471.14.

In addition to the above, Mr. Moriyama visited the Chicago and Mexico city museums of science and technology with the approval of The Department of Public Works. His expenses, which were paid by the department, were $691.25.

Information submitted by Mr. Moriyama on his return from these trips stressed a probable square foot cost for the building only, of between $45 and $60 per square foot. It contains valuable data on the best features of the buildings he visited. Even more important, there is a list of inadequate facilities at the buildings visited which should be avoided in our planning. Mr. Moriyama has stated that the research he conducted during these trips was extremely valuable to him, and that without this knowledge he would have been unable to develop the design sketches within two months of receiving the requirements.

The amounts paid to Mr. Moriyama for the expenses on these trips are over and above the seven per cent fee. The total amount paid Mr. Moriyama for travelling expenses was $4,325.75.

Yesterday I ran into a knot on my square foot cost of this building. I guess the basic trouble is that our people have several ways of calculating. When they are talking about the square feet in a building, sometimes they are talking about gross square feet, sometimes net usable and sometimes cubic feet. I have the figures here; they are changed somewhat from the figure I gave yesterday but it comes out at $39.80 a square foot. I will say that the normal method used by the architectural profession to compare building costs is to divide the building costs by the floor area. The building cost is determined by deducting from the contract amount all site development costs, which normally are variable at each site.

Accordingly, the costs of site development work, such as flood control, water and sewer mains, road and parking lots, landscaping, and so on, were deducted from the contract amount. Similarly an allowance for special auditorium equipment which is not a building cost, was deducted.

A further deduction was made for the refund of federal sales tax, which will be obtained on the project.

The area of 418,200 square feet was for the total shown on the original sketch plan. Additional area was found to be necessary during the preparation of tendering drawings, mainly to house air conditioning and electrical equipment. The actual floor area of the building is now under construction, and totals 461,000 square feet.

The actual square-foot cost of the buildings only, is computed as follows: The contract amount, $21,703,310, less site development costs of $2.3 million, auditorium equipment of $250,000 and recoverable federal sales tax of $800,000; the net building cost would total $18,353,310. Dividing this by 461,000 square feet, leaves a square-foot value of $39.80 per square foot.

Considering the special requirements of museum type buildings—for example, air conditioning with special humidity control, high ceilings and extensive piping and electrical services for the exhibits—the cost is considered to be reasonable, particularly in comparison with square-foot prices quoted by other museum authorities.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I am glad of the clarification that the Minister has been able to provide today. There are one or two questions arising from it.

Mr. Moriyama, after his researches in different countries around the world, predicted that he would be able to design a building somewhere in the range of $45 to $60 per square foot, but in fact has done considerably better than that and that is a good thing.

I am concerned about the fee we are paying to the architect. The Minister has explained that he was selected because of his special knowledge in this field and, of course, he has improved that special knowledge by his researches. But would his seven per cent be calculated on the full tender price, or the reduced tender price of $18 million plus? Whatever the basis of the calculation, what was the fee paid, or is the fee payable?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Because of the complexity of the project, the basic fee to be paid to Mr. Moriyama was established at seven per cent of the contract price. Based on a contract price of $21,703,310, Mr. Moriyama's fee will be $1,519,231.70, out of which he must pay the engineers that he has engaged for the project—which could be 50 per cent or better—and, of course, his own staff and all those consultants which he would have to engage personally.

However, in order to establish the ultimate load of the electrical services and sanitary and storm drains, water lines, boilers, and other mechanical equipment, it was necessary to engage Moriyama to prepare a master plan for the total museum as visualized over a 25 year period. He was paid for this work on a per diem rate basis, in accordance with standard rates. The amount paid to him was approximately $8,000.

Mr. Nixon: Would you tell us what those standard rates were, before you go on?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is $125 a day for Moriyama and $100 a day and down for the lesser men in his group.

This amount will be deducted from Mr. Moriyama's seven per cent fee proportionately, as contracts are awarded for each stage of construction. Should construction not proceed beyond the present contract, he will have been adequately compensated for preparing the master plan.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated yesterday that there had been some architectural work carried on before the employment of Mr. Moriyama. I wonder if he would be in a position to tell us what the costs of that part of the planning aspect would be?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Apparently project planning did very minor planning and our own people came up with some designs, but very little was done prior to Moriyama coming in.

Mr. Nixon: And I believe there was an indication that there had been some other outside architectural companies employed that had been superseded by Mr. Moriyama, finally?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Not superseded. Actually, knowing this was going to be a large project, we had, as we had done on quite a number of occasions, asked three architectural firms to work together on this. But it was found—with the need for speed, or whatever you call it—we found that it was going to be difficult for these three firms to set up the necessary office and work together, so they most graciously withdrew from the project. It gave Mr. Moriyama more flexibility and more chances to make decisions than he would have if he was dividing those decisions up amongst a number of people.

Mr. Nixon: There were no fees associated with their services before they were replaced?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No.

Mr. Nixon: I have on the order paper, Mr. Chairman, a series of questions associated with the Centennial centre. It has been on for some time and I thought, perhaps, this would be an opportunity to get what information is available from this Minister.

The first question—I will not bother reading it all to him—asks for an estimate of the total cost of the construction and furnishing of this building so that it would be ready for public use.

Is the Minister in a position to give us an estimate of this total cost?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I can give you a breakdown of the cost of the total building, as far as Public Works is concerned.

Mr. Nixon: This does not include anything that goes in it?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No. I am just responsible for the Public Works end of it and this is our cost.

The total cost to be paid by The Department of Public Works for the construction of this project is estimated at $25 million, made up as follows:

1. Construction contracts—(a) The Evans Contracting Company, fill projects, $376,260; and the Pigott Construction Company, $21,703,310.

2. Furniture and furnishings—and this is only blinds or curtains or flooring, this type of thing, nothing to do with the exhibits — $200,000.

3. Laboratory and workshop equipment, $100,000.

4. Architect's fees, DPW supervision, inspection and testing, building permit, insurance, relocation of services, blueprinting, travel expenses, and so on—$2.1 million.

Mr. Nixon: Just before you leave that, could you break that down any further and tell us what you will have to pay for the architect's fees in total?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I gave that figure earlier. It is $1,519,000.

Mr. Nixon: And that includes the extra $125 per day.

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, that is the seven per cent on the contract price. The $8,000 odd I gave you was over and above—but to be taken away, if and when the additional plans are gone ahead with.

Allowance for contingencies, $520,430, coming to a total of $25 million.

Other costs on the project, such as the supply and installation of the exhibits, and so on, are the responsibility of The Department of Tourism and Information. The above figures deal with estimated capital costs to The Department of Public Works of planning, constructing and equipping the building and provision of outside services and work, such as painting and landscaping.

I might mention also that this $25 million figure is before recoveries, which are estimated at the federal grant of $2.5 million, and the federal sales tax of $800,000.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the Centennial centre itself, as the Minister pointed out, is undoubtedly going to be a source of pride in the long run to the citizens of Ontario. We, of course, are exercising our responsibility in questioning the Minister closely as to the sums that are voted by the Legislature in support of the Centennial project.

The Minister made light yesterday of our criticism that the project is going to be late. I do not think that this is an earth-shaking criticism myself, nevertheless, the project was begun many years ago as a means whereby the celebration of our Centennial would have some point and focus in the province.

I would say that the original plan that was put before the public by the Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Robarts) had considerable merit. It was going to make use of the federal funds, match them with provincial funds and institute a $5 million museum in the capital of our province for the use of all our citizens. There is no doubt in my mind that such an institution—which would have been an excellent way to mark our Centennial—could have been ready for this year and been in use by now and in the years that lie ahead.

There is also no doubt in my mind that the construction of this particular project would not have been completed for many years. As funds became available, we would have been able to add to it in expanding its facilities in such a way that they would keep up with the times and accommodate the growing numbers of people concerned. But from what we are able to gather, the Minister's colleagues—the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), aided and abetted by the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis)—evidently were powerful enough to impose on the government their grandiose views of a $30 million plus museum, which is going to be late. It has suffered severe administrative problems, involving the dismissal of many of the authorities who had been brought to this province from across the world to direct it, and the difficulties of organizing and administering the building during its construction phase.

Surely the original plan was a good one, and one that we were prepared to accept as a reasonable project for the province at a time when we had many things pressing on us for the use of our tax dollars and for the general celebration of our Centennial.

I do not know that the two Ministers concerned—and I do not mean the Minister of Public Works—did a good service to the province and to the government in imposing this tremendous expansion on the basic plan. There is no doubt in my mind that this museum will be one of excellence. Surely, for that sum of money it should be one of the outstanding museums in the world, and we will be told on occasions in the future that it is an outstanding museum. I would agree that it will be and it certainly should be, but the mixup in the plans—that are administered, unfortunately, by this Minister who has to come to us to answer for the difficulties that have made the presentation of his estimates so rather difficult and erratic—in this connection, can be traced to others of his colleagues in the Cabinet.

We are, all of us, proud of what this province is able to do at Expo. The Minister said himself that we will be proud of this museum and I trust that he is correct. My own view is that public funds have not been properly managed in the provision of this project for our province. It is going to be late; it is tremendously expensive and this is because of the lack of planning that the Minister himself has pointed out.

There is no doubt in my mind that it is needlessly expensive and that it is using public funds in excess of what normally would have been required, if the planning aspect had been carried out in a way that we would have hoped. We have delved into this as carefully as we could in this Legislature, from the Minister of Public Works and his colleagues

who have among them, shared the responsibility for the project.

I can say that we, from the position of the Opposition, have not been satisfied with the plans of the government. We are disappointed that the project will not be ready for our Centennial year, but our chief concern is with the lack of planning that has culminated in the tremendous expansion of the costs associated with our Centennial project in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a brief comment about that, and I will never speak lightly of the Opposition at any time. If it is interpreted that way, perhaps it is the way that I present it, but great emphasis has been put on the opening of this centre this year which, to my way of thinking, would have been nice but it is not the most important aspect of this building.

Mr. Nixon: It could have been done; you did not start soon enough.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I agree with you, we did not start soon enough and I am the first one to—

Mr. Nixon: You did not start soon enough for a $30 million museum, but you did start soon enough for your original plan which then—

Hon. Mr. Connell: I went to great lengths last year in this House—not in connection with this building, but any building—to explain how it takes five years from the time the idea is conceived until the building is opened. This applies to almost any price of building up to the $3 million to $5 million range. If it holds true for this range, it holds doubly true when you go over that amount. As I have said on many occasions, as long as I am Minister of Public Works, a building is going to be well planned, rather than thrown together just with the idea that it has to be open in a certain time. I will say no more on that point; I think we are both quite clear on it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for St. George.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I know that the Minister is aware of the great fears that a certain proposal aroused in the minds of some of us last year, respecting an addition to Osgoode hall. I see in the blue book that he has prepared and distributed, that it is still on. I wonder if he could tell us if there have been any new developments, or perhaps any alternative proposals.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member would defer his question to permit others to speak on this Centennial issue.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Right!

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Chairman, I think I reread some of this during my own estimates, but in view of some of the statements made by the leader of the Opposition, I would like to repeat what the Prime Minister said in his statement of August 31, 1964, about the conception of the centre, the cost and the progression of its construction:

> I wish to stress the point that the Centennial project as conceived for completion for July 1, 1967, will be only the first phase of an overall scheme which will take many years to achieve. What we are doing now is planning for 1967 and the future. We are planting a seed from which will grow an undertaking of international significance.

Further on, he says:

> It was never intended that the money made available by the province under this agreement would constitute the extent of Ontario's participation in the Centennial year.

Let me quote again concerning the question of site, and so on:

> By July 1, 1967 it is proposed that the central core of the project will be completed. This will be the seed from which an institution of international significance will grow.

A little further on, the Prime Minister says:

> While the government has initially budgeted for an expenditure of $5 million by 1967, this figure represents only the cost to be assumed by the Ontario and federal governments under the terms of the federal government's proposal.

Let me say again, as I explained, that there were some changes in our original plan. We decided that, instead of completing the first phase by 1967, because of educational and other requirements and advantages, it would be better to be completed with phases 2 and 3—if I might put it that way—the next two buildings, so that when the planning continued it was planned to have those three as an entity.

The construction is phased over a period of years, as all members are aware. One building, I believe, may be completed this year and the other two, next year.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): That is just a reception building?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, if I could finish this statement without interruption—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Let the man finish his statement.

Mr. Bryden: Could we have a clarification on that point, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: The member wants to know if he can submit a question on it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: When I have finished the sentence I might answer his question if he will listen to my statement.

As I say, the plan was changed, and the announcement of August when the cost of the structure was estimated at $17 million, we indicated that we had changed these plans. I am delighted to hear the cost this afternoon, because as I have stated, the cost of artifacts still remains an estimated $3 million. The figure which the Minister of Public Works has given us, with the reduction of $800,000 for federal sales tax and the $2.5 million federal grant, brings his cost to $21.7 million, and our cost to $3 million, which now makes the project for the first three phases $24.7 million, not $40 million as I noticed the member for Downsview was quoted as saying in a speech the other night.

Mr. Nixon: Are you including the dam on the Don River?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, all hon. members know that Metro conservation authority restaged their programme and built a dam on the Don River in 1967 instead of 1970 when it was originally planned. There is no additional cost to the centre. It is simply that they built that dam now and they will build another dam later, I presume.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, just on the point that I wanted to ask the Minister about when he referred to the three buildings in the first stage. He referred to the number one building—if we can call it that—as if it could have been completed as a project in itself. As I understood the explanations given to me when I was out there looking at the site, building number one is not a self contained entity in any sense of the word. It is merely a reception area where people come in and are sorted out and then are moved in to see the exhibits in buildings two and three. That was all I was objecting to in the Minister's statement: it was quite misleading to suggest that building number one could be completed by itself.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The point that I was trying to make, Mr. Chairman—and perhaps I did not make it clear—was that we were going to be building one display building first, then a second display building in subsequent years, and the third and fourth and so on; this is quite true. Had we done that, I am quite sure that the building would be complete by now because we would not have taken as much time to complete the planning. The contract for that one building could have been called, but there was never a single building planned as a separate entity. As we got into the planning we saw, particularly from the educational aspect, that we were going to have to change the total use of the first building from what was originally thought of, to a combination of display and reception facilities. I hope that makes it clear.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to seem niggardly, or unduly parsimonious about these things but I did want to make a reflection about Mr. Moriyama's round-the-world tour. I want to do it in the light of the dictum laid down by the Prime Minister of this province about trips outside continental North America by members of this Legislature. I apprehend the rule of law laid down by the first citizen it is that no member of the Legislature is permitted to go outside continental North America in the public business.

The Prime Minister, no doubt, is not saying by that rule that learning cannot be accumulated elsewhere in the world. He would not go to that extent. But he is saying that by laying down the rule he does not feel that the value to the public weal of Ontario to be gleaned by the trip is sufficient to justify the cost. To put it in the light of an illustration, the member for St. George was bound—and he is a young man that gets determined about things—that the company law committee was going to go to the United Kingdom to study corporate law reform there, which after all is the Delphic oracle—the source—of the law of this nation; but he ran up against the Prime Minister.

You see, that is very illustrative. The Prime Minister said, "No trips by any member of the Legislature outside continental North America, so find your law at home", and we managed to come out with a very respectable

looking report on corporate law that future generations will use and judge according to its merit.

Now to turn to the architect. I do not imagine Mr. Moriyama, whom I do not know at all, but I do not imagine he has many customers like us. He does not get $21 million gilt-edge guarantee customers like the province of Ontario; so when we got into the market place to hire an architect to build a museum we might expect that we can hire an architect for $1,519,000 and change, who knows something about museums.

To return to my profession, if a client goes into a lawyer's office and hires a lawyer to take a case involving income tax, he does not have to start to buy the income tax lexicography, he does not have to buy him a library on income tax. He does not have to send him to Ottawa to consult the authorities. The moment the man accepts the retainer it is understood between them that the lawyer knows something about the law of income tax. I refuse to believe, because my commonsense tells me to be incredulous and sceptical about it, that Mr. Moriyama could not find his $4,500 Pan American, TWA, SAS first class diner's club in the $1,519,000, and that would still leave him a tidy amount.

He does not have to come to this government and the Treasury board and say, "In addition to the $1.5 million, give me another $4,500 to make my world junket"; except that when he comes he finds people of junketing predisposition. The champion junketers—some of them have the overnight bag at the ready; and they know where to call to get the plane tickets to get going.

Did the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) not put the bite on the public purse two years ago for a couple of thousand dollars to go off to Australia to a law taffy pull—a meeting of the lawyers? Oh yes, oh yes. Any day of the week you will see the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) swinging through the southern underbelly of Europe, or he will turn up in Berlin, Copenhagen or some place else. And there are other seasoned travellers over there.

I hate to point the finger of scorn at the most unassuming, unaffected Minister of them all who has nothing about his kindly personality that shows any degree of affection at all. This is the most unaffected Minister in the House.

Mr. Nixon: He drives his own car.

Mr. Sopha: I wonder about the Treasury board as the guardians of the public purse. What are they doing for the people of Ontario?

Mr. Letherby: They are robbing them.

Mr. Sopha: When my friend says that they are robbing them one can understand that he has chosen not to run in the next election. The member for Simcoe East is it?

Mr. Nixon: They gave him a ticket to Coldwater.

Mr. Sopha: All right. I am going to leave that now and turn to the other, larger question. There is nothing that can be added to the able presentation of the leader of this party save to express my personal scepticism. I suppose that when the pyramids were finished in the desert, anyone who scoffed at the majestic structure that had been erected in that age, in that environment, and in the context of the absolute power of those pharaohs, would be looked upon as something of a Jeremiah, if not completely irrational.

I have my scepticism whether Ontario in the context of 1967 can afford $30 million for this project. It would be a different thing if Ontario did not have a museum, but Ontario has an exceptionally fine one which I am told is by no means taxed to capacity. I am told the Royal Ontario museum, as far as a strong country boy from Simcoe can pitch an apple from here, has a lot of unused capacity about it. Now we are told that we can justify $30 million for the creation of another one, but the moment you raise that, the experts turn on you and say "Well, it is not exactly a museum, it has a different concept, it has different purposes." Certainly the purpose has changed because in the public accounts committee, I can tell the leader of this party that it became pretty apparent that the purposes and concept changed when the Minister of Education got his glommy hands into it. He demonstrated that he has a certain intellectual outlook that nobody is going to spend money in this province the way he spends it. If money is going to be spent, the Minister of Education, the young superman of a billion dollars, is going to show them how to spend it. He transformed that concept and the costs began to skyrocket after his intervention and the inclusion of his ideas.

Well, I have some doubt. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, you noticed in the context of these times, cannot find enough money in the province to make a grant to the elderly people of the province without attaching it to the realty and then collecting it. But an-

other department can start out to spend $30 million. There is some dichotomy, some anomaly that is difficult to apprehend and to justify in the context of the times.

So at the risk of some future historian looking back and saying, "Well, how could anyone have spoken out against this magnificent building that we have in the Don Valley here?" I can only say that looking around me in Ontario right now and seeing the needs in specific areas, driving over the streets in Sudbury that bear a great similarity to the earliest carriage trails for the last half of the 18th century, when I am conscious of those, my consciousness tells me that this museum, as fine as it might be, is not going to be much of an attraction to people from Upsala, Foleyet, Moonbeam, Armstrong, Ignace, Kapuskasing. A good many of them will not get to see it until they reach their adult years. But it will no doubt be a great monument for the government of the province. Demonstrable that the grossest incompetence has been applied to this project and I do not blame the Minister of Public Works, he is almost guiltless of it. As he says, he is a service department. He is a servant of the government. He has to sit here and listen to what the Opposition has to say, but we know who the malefactors are. The Treasury board, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), the "Duke of Kent West" and a few others—they are the ones who are the chief culprits. They are the ones who ought to have exercised a greater degree of responsible supervision.

Moriyama's trip, that has gone. But somebody told me the other day that, in this country, government building and public works accounts for 50 per cent of the building—50 per cent of the total. I heard someone say that building by government—federal and provincial governments, municipal governments—accounts for over half the building.

Mr. Bryden: That is nonsense; who ever told the member that?

Mr. Sopha: That may be. I heard someone say that. It might be very revealing to look up and see what proportion they do account for. However, their involvement in construction in the public field is not insignificant.

But because government is in it, government does not have to be a mark—and it is revealed in here that the government has been the mark. In the final result it is the people who pay.

As far as I am concerned, I feel free in the northern part of this province to repeat the things that I have said here in the forthcoming election campaign. I can only hope they generate a measure of agreement, to the extent that it will assist along the road when we cut down that 78 that we have had to face here in the last four years.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I have a comment I would like to make—I could comment quite extensively—that when you are up in that north country, I hope you use the correct figures and not something that you pick out of the air.

Mr. Sopha: What other figure?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, I gave you the figures here—$25 million less the two and a half—

Mr. Sopha: Was I wrong when I said he was getting $1,519,000?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, that figure was correct.

Mr. Sopha: Was I wrong when I said he spent $4,500 on the round-the-world trip? Was I wrong when I said it cost $21 million?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I have not actually heard you use the figure of $40 million.

Mr. Sopha: No, you never did.

Hon. Mr. Connell: No. But I have heard that figure from the Opposition side. That is the figure I am referring to. I hope the member is more accurate on it.

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am one of the members—and I am not sure it is a very large number of the Legislature—who has actually taken a look at what is going on out at the site of the Centennial centre and also in the ancillary workshop area where they are planning and developing their displays. I proposed—I guess it was a couple of months ago—that the public accounts committee should look into the public spending on this project. It seemed to me that a necessary first step was to actually go and see what was going on.

The committee agreed to look into this matter and agreed that we should take a trip out there. As I recall it, only three members of the committee took the trouble to go and see what was actually happening. The three members consisted of the chairman—who, of course, is always present at meetings of the committee, I cannot remember him ever being absent—the chairman, and myself and

the member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter). We three went out there and slugged through the mud to see what was going on. I may say we got some very interesting information.

I considered it useful information. It gave me a somewhat different picture of this project than I had previously had. Having given some study to it, I now feel inclined to make some comments about the project. I have not made any previously, but I feel inclined to make some now.

I would say, first of all, that I have seen the models and mockups—whatever you may call them—of the display theme as it is to be developed, and it strikes me as very good. I do not pretend to be an expert on such matters, but I was quite impressed by the plans, as they were explained to us, for the displays that are to go into those buildings.

I was also quite impressed, Mr. Chairman —I made reference to this yesterday—with the group of buildings, insofar as one could make a judgment from sketches and construction that was in quite an elementary stage when we saw it. It strikes me that the buildings are a fine group of buildings. They are well adapted to the display conception that has now evolved. Maybe the display conception has been adapted to the buildings, or perhaps there has been a mutual adaptation, I do not know, but I am quite impressed with the project as I see it. I am not going to criticize the finished job, certainly not at this stage.

The cost has been, I think, a cause of concern to quite a number of members. It now appears that it will be about $30 million—we do not need to quibble about the precise amount, but it will be about $30 million—of which the federal government, I would take it, will put up about $3.3 million by way of grant or rebate of sales tax. So the net cost to the province of Ontario will be between $26 million and $27 million.

To put this in its proper perspective, I think we should bear in mind that that is not all cost in one year. It is spread over at least two and probably somewhat more than two years. Furthermore the bulk of it is capital cost which could legitimately be charged over a period of time.

I put all these factors in their proper context because I do not think it is necessary or desirable to go in for the exaggeration that has been apparent in some statements I have seen on this project over the past number of months.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I think that we should analyze the procedure which the government has followed in relation to this whole project, whatever merit the project may have. It is typical of this government and an outstanding example of the way they do business.

What did we have to begin with? We had an announcement. The leader of the Opposition said a while ago that he wished the government had stayed to the original plan. Frankly, I do not know what he is talking about, when he says "the original plan." I do not think the government had any plan whatever. They just made an announcement.

They made an announcement that got a lot of headlines in the press.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: They had to have plans for an announcement.

Mr. Bryden: That is about all they have—plans to make an announcement. We see it year after year in housing—announcement after announcement. There are never any plans behind those announcements, except a plan to deceive the people. That is typical of their method of operation. They make announcements without the vaguest idea of what they are going to do or how they are going to do it.

Surely that was obvious here from the original announcement from the Prime Minister, part of which was read to us again this afternoon by the Minister of Tourism and Information. It is quite clear they had no idea what they were doing. I may say, the plan for the exhibit—which I said, a moment ago, in my opinion is a good plan—has been developed within the last few months. The whole conception of what was going to go in there is a product of the last few months. This project was announced back in August of 1964 and it was not until a few months ago that anybody had any real idea in his head, to the point where he could put it down in a model, as to what was going to be in there.

This is the way this government goes about doing business. I think that, in the main in this case, we have come off rather fortunately. Some very good people have been called in to pull the government's chestnuts out of the fire. They were in a complete bog. They staggered, scrambled and sprawled like a drunken centipede.

An hon. member: Sprawled?

Mr. Bryden: That is right, they sprawled all over the place.

They had an idea, or they said they had an idea, but whenever anybody tried to find

out what the idea was, it suddenly had changed and there really has not been an overall view of what was going to be in that project, except within the last few months.

I am not blaming The Department of Public Works for this. As the Minister has emphasized time and again, his department is a service department. When the government wants certain things done, they do them, to the best of their ability. I can sympathize with him. It must be extremely difficult to carry out the government's directives when the government itself does not know what it wants, and that has been precisely the case on this project, until very recently. Nobody anywhere in the government has had the slightest idea of what they wanted, except that they wanted to get headlines in the newspapers. As I said in an interjection yesterday, the Minister of Public Works never gets to make the announcements that get the big headlines; he merely gets to pull the pieces together later when the other fellows who may get the big headlines have gone off on their trips to various exotic places throughout the world.

As a matter of fact, I feel that the Minister of Public Works and his department should be complimented on having created some order out of the total chaos that existed in this project for at least the first year or two of the public relations campaign that was conducted about it. As I said, I think something very worthwhile is going to come out of it. I think, nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, that we should note that this way of doing business makes for extremely poor budget control. In fact it makes a mockery of the whole concept of budget control.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): There is no control.

Mr. Bryden: How can you control expenditures when you have a government that does not know what it wants except in the vaguest generalities and therefore naturally cannot have any idea of what its ruminations are going to cost. It merely ruminates and then has various people try to translate those ruminations into realities and put cost figures on it. There is no doubt that the cost is far beyond anything the government envisaged. The cost as of 1968—when I imagine the whole of the $25 million for construction will have been paid out—is away beyond anything they envisaged. That partly is because of an unanticipated increase in construction costs, but mainly it is because of poor planning. There just was no planning in the deal at all. In a day when people are getting most alarmed about their taxes, I think they are entitled to expect better performance from the government than this.

The government, when it embarks on a project, should know what it is going to do. Before it gives the okay, it should have at least preliminary work and preliminary costing done so that it will have some idea of what it is going to cost. It should not just go into the deal blindly, as this government did in this particular case, and unfortunately as it does in case after case. I think the history of this project is an eloquent example of the incompetence of the government in its inability to plan adequately so that there can be proper budget control and proper control of costs.

It is also unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that the government would be so willing to spend money on this project, desirable as it may be, when on the other hand it is unwilling apparently to spend anything to speak of on the Royal Ontario museum, another excellent museum in this city. I tend to regret the vendetta that appears to crop up from time to time between the directors of the two museums, the Royal Ontario and the Centennial centre. I do not think that those two museums are competitors. I think rather they are complementary projects. At the same time, I can understand the exasperation of the director of the Royal Ontario museum when he sees money spent as if it were going out of style, on the Centennial centre, while he is starving for funds. He cannot do the most elementary things. He has to carry on in quarters that are quite inadequate, a substantial part of which are completely obsolete. The disparity between the two projects must be most galling to the man who has to carry on as the director of the poor-relation institution.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, I should not go on about the Royal Ontario museum. That will be a matter we can discuss under some other estimates, but I wanted to make those few preliminary remarks about it at any rate, to indicate the apparent lack of any sort of determination of priorities by the government. They got started on a Centennial centre. They got a bear by the tail and they had to follow along. They did not really know where they were going for a long time. Fortunately there were competent people around who bailed them out.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Chairman, this is all out of order.

Mr. Bryden: What is out of order? What are you talking about?

Mr. White: The discussion is completely out of order on this vote.

Mr. Bryden: The only persistent out-of-order procedure in this House arises from the phony points of order raised by the hon. member for London South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Certainly the most persistent anyway.

Mr. Bryden: I have never known him to raise a point of order that actualy was in order, but certainly there is nothing out of order in what I have just said.

Mr. White: Are your remarks now in order?

Mr. Bryden: However, Mr. Chairman, I will not pursue the matter any further. I think my point has now been made.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a few comments about this, on this vote, on the Centennial centre. I think that the hon. member who just preceded me—the first part of his remarks were quite admirable and if he had stuck with these he would have been on sound ground—

Mr. Bryden: You only want to hear compliments.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —until he ventured further into areas, of course, which he knows nothing about and on which he is purely speculating, and speculating in the manner in which he usually speculates, which is wrong.

Mr. Bryden: I have studied the matter quite carefully.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I too, Mr. Chairman, have been out there and have seen this project, and I think that the sad part about this debate is that the hon. member for Sudbury and the hon. leader of the Opposition—who of course having shot their bolts seem to have departed from here now—have completely missed the vision of this project.

First of all, he seems to refer to it as a museum; and it of course it not a museum. It is a science centre, a centre of technology that is going to portray how science and technology are affecting our way of life in a visual and moving way. It is quite different from the Royal Ontario museum and it is something that I think we will be proud of.

Mr. MacDonald: This is out of order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Now, listen, if this is out of order, the hon. members have ranged around everything including why select committees cannot go to Europe and so forth.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the criticism against this centre, I think, will be shown to be false when the centre is finished. The main point of criticism seems to have been that it is not going to be opened this year, and really I do not think that this is an important consideration. The main consideration is that this is a Centennial project that is worthy of this province and of the people of this province, and is worthy of our children who are going to use it in the years to come. It is a fitting centre that will commemorate our 100th birthday as a country, and this is the important thing. This is what this centre will be.

I will conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that I would think that the friends of the leader of the Opposition—his federal friends who seem to be going around the province with him these days—must feel very dismayed and perhaps a little embarrassed if he speaks as he does in here, considering that I am told that the national Centennial project of this country will not be opened until 1968 and that the cost of it has doubled, although it, unlike our centre has not even increased in size. So that, when you look at some of these things, even if we cannot open ours this year, we are in good company.

Mr. MacDonald: You mean the Liberals are as incompetent as the Tories?

Mr. Bryden: They are both pretty incompetent.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity, as the member for Woodbine said, of visiting this site. I tried to go over some of the accounts on the accounts committee and had an opportunity to question some of the individuals who have been involved in this project. As a result of what I have seen and heard, I can understand the confusion of the Minister when he was attempting to answer the costs of this Centennial project. I think at one time in his speech the other day, when we were on the estimates, it was $38 a square foot. Another time it was $50 a square foot and he came in today and told us that there were different ways of estimating the cost.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I mentioned $50 yesterday.

Mr. Trotter: Yes, he said $50 and another time $38, and he explained today that there

are different ways of estimating the cost. I think there was gross footage, net usable square footage and then the cubic area. I think there were three different ways of doing it.

My impression is—and I think it seems to be obvious from the schemozzle that this whole matter has been in—is that there was no overall plan. They more or less stumbled to what they have at the present time. The difficulty and the shocking part of it is, that, when you do go and ask for an answer today, you still cannot really have the books placed before you.

This involves not just the building itself, but the purchase of the artifacts. This may not come under The Department of Public Works. Certainly it is part of the whole cost of this project. When you see items that are costing around $2 million, you wonder what it is being spent on and what the plan is for the future.

There has been little or no foresight in this matter at all. It is not that I, for one, am opposed to the project. I think it is an excellent idea. I think it is an excellent project to have and to preserve and improve over the years ahead. One of the things that this country has lacked is, probably, that we have not done enough of this type of thing in the past.

No matter how important it is—no matter how useful it can be, and, I am sure, will be —there should be some plan ahead. There should be a budget. In the beginning there certainly was no budget—or if there was, it was extremely hazy, because I have never seen yet a proper accounting of this project, whether it be just for the building itself, or especially the artifacts, or what they are planning to purchase in the immediate future.

I am told this building is going to have to be changed over the years, as science progresses. You are going to have to make changes. In some cases, the authorities will get into this particular point—that we are going to have to make changes, maybe every five years or so. I am not worried about the changes for the next five years. I would like to know exactly what they plan to build and what they plan to put in it.

We at one time hoped it would be opened in 1967 and it is talk that these buildings will be opened in 1968. I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that we will be lucky if this Centennial project is opened in 1969. In fact, I will be pleased, but I will be very surprised, if it is opened before the year 1970.

I know they have hopes for 1969, but what I saw there on that particular occasion—and I admit the weather conditions were bad—was a sea of mud. The day I was there, they had not even started the third building. For the work that had to be done a very speedy project was to take place if this Centennial project is opened in the year 1970—approximately three years late.

Obviously there was no planning, no budgeting, and very poor organization in the whole affair. This type of work gives people the impression that governments do not know what they are doing, particularly when they are spending the public's money. In this particular Centennial project the government was like Christopher Columbus—he did not know where he was going when he left, he did not know where he had been when he got there, and he did not know where he was when he got back and he did it all on other people's money. Well this is exactly—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): That comes from that story about Pearson and Diefenbaker.

Mr. Trotter: This is exactly the whole organization, the budgeting and the accounting in this particular planning of the Centennial project that this administration has had. I do not know if it is quite sure where it is going at the present time.

I admit that they have an outstanding individual in Mr. O'Day, who has now taken charge of collecting the artifacts to fill this project. But even Mr. O'Day knows little or nothing about what this is going to cost. I asked, and he is not worried about that, at the present time. I think the government has to be worried—it has to know what is going to be spent and what is going to be done.

So, in concluding these remarks, I would ask the Minister this question—does he know what it costs to rent the premises now rented where the artifacts are being kept? Could he tell me what it costs, what the rent is?

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, while the Minister is looking for that, I made the statement a few minutes ago I was told, I heard someone say—that construction by public bodies accounts for 50 per cent of the total construction in Canada and there were scoffers, there were some groans and disbelief.

I now consult the *"Canada Year Book,* 1966". On page 701 one observes the total of construction for that year is something like $10 billion. The column referring to institutional construction, highway construction

and electrical power construction, demonstrates that construction by public bodies in Canada accounts for more than 50 per cent of the total.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, we could not get it from any greater authority than the member for Sudbury and that book.

In answer to the member for Parkdale, the rent is $13,700 a year and there are 12,050 square feet.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 1 of vote 1907 carried?

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Wait a minute. If we are finished with the science centre, can we get back to the equally important matter of Osgoode hall?

I asked the Minister a question a little while ago in my ignorance, believing that the science centre matter was finished.

Have there been any developments in regard to the rather inane proposal published a year ago respecting a tower on the west lawn of Osgoode hall?

Hon. Mr. Connell: There have been certain plans prepared by a committee outside Public Works, but including departmental people, which included a tower on the west lawn of Osgoode hall. This plan was not found to receive complete agreement. I think I might state—modestly, of course—that they are now studying a suggestion that I made originally, that they go to the south side of Queen Street, where we are going to tear down what is known as the Brigden building, alongside 145 Queen Street, and study that area intensively as far as an addition to Osgoode hall is concerned.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Excellent!

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, in the spring of 1959, an article appeared in the Windsor *Star* about the fact that the province was going to erect a building in Windsor. In June of that year, an election was held and, in one of the ridings there, there was a man from Windsor who had been a former member occupying the office the Minister now holds. He was in a little trouble and it appeared that he was going to have a hard time getting back here, and the people here wanted to help him.

I just want to find out whether or not, after having made the announcement and after having seen the artist's drawing of the building, which appeared to be a beautiful thing, and after having purchased property to put it on, a month and a half after that this gentleman ran for election; and something occurred, of course. He was defeated and we did not hear any more about the building.

I do not know whether this is common practice or not. I know that there are people today over there who are a little wobbly. The election will be coming along—early, I hope—and there might be things that you might want to do to help these men. The only thing that I am asking for is that for goodness' sake, if you make any promises—and I know that the Minister is one man who, if he makes promises, keeps them—but there are many others who do not. This has been proven by the things that I have said here. But if promises are made for the purpose of helping to keep people in office on the other side of the House, the very least that can be done is to keep those promises.

The building has not been built. I want to ascertain if there are architectural plans for the building. If there are, where are they? If they are around, bring them out. If you have them, how much did they cost? Is the building going to be built and, if so, when? The property is still there and it is still idle. I noticed an article in the Windsor *Star* in 1965. The hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Thrasher) was approached by one of the reporters of the *Star* and was asked what had actually happened to the proposed public building that the government was going to build on the purchased site. The member for Windsor-Sandwich told the editor: "We are happy to report that we are working quietly on this case, and I want you to know that we are going to build this building or my name is not Ivan."

There has been no start on this building at all. I was rather amused, when in August, 1961, the Minister made a tour of the province—

Hon. Mr. Connell: That was the only time I was ever out of Ontario.

Mr. Reaume: You were not out of Ontario; you were in Windsor. This is the problem with the government. You think we are out of Ontario, and that is the very point.

Well, in August 1961—I got a lot of fun out of this, I think it is quite a joke—the Minister while making a tour of Windsor, thought that this beautiful park we have there which was purchased for the purpose of putting a building on it, would be an ideal spot in which to put dinosaurs and prehistoric monuments. After the Minister had gone, I wrote him a letter and told him what the people

were speaking about and what they really thought of his plan. The only ones I could find—not people—were the dogs who would have been very happy if the Minister had gone through with the plan.

Mr. MacDonald: They spoke to you.

Mr. Reaume: As a matter of fact, they did not speak to me. It was in that area that I am speaking of, and this is how I know that the dogs were so happy about it all. The hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich later planted a tree there, and I observed what happened.

To get back to the building, if there were no intention of building that building at any time, I want to ask why it was ever announced in the first place. If there are no plans for it, then please tell the people of Windsor at this time whether or not there is any intention of building it. I do not approve, and I do not think that the Minister does either, of governments and parties in power taking advantage of the opportunities that they have on the eve of an election, of making an announcement in this area or that, just for the purpose of helping a member—a Minister of the Crown or whoever it happens to be—just for the purpose of trying to bolster that man, to stop the people from kicking him out.

But in this instance, it is perfectly evident, it was perfectly obvious that there was not anything that could stop this man from going and he went. Of course, it followed again, as it always does, the very same pattern, I am equally sure that the people of the province are getting sick and tired of this man too. Does it make any difference—and the only reason I am speaking about it is because it had to do with the former Minister of Public Works. It is getting to be the theme—the plan. Run as a Tory, win or lose, you will win. Lose, and you are appointed to a job. It was not long after the Minister of the Crown was beaten at the polls, that he was appointed a member of the S. W. May board, which has the important function of the operation of the buses on the streets of the area from which I come.

Mr. Chairman: Is this pertaining to this vote?

Mr. Reaume: This is pertaining to this vote, yes, very much so.

The only thing I want to ask is this: What qualification did this person have for being appointed on that board? It is always related to the policy of your people over there, that where you pick out a riding, any place in the province, you announce a building.

Mr. Chairman: Could I ask the member to keep on the vote?

Mr. Reaume: I am right on that vote; I am talking about building—why, can you not read. What I want to find out is this—and I think it is a fair question—I want to find out if the government ever had any intention of building this building in the first place. That is on that vote. I want to find out if you have any architectural plans for the building and if you have, may I have a copy of them?

The third question: If you intend building the building, would you give me a cost of what the building would have cost in the year that you had it in mind, which was 1959, and what the cost would be now, approximately?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, I really believe this building was announced along with a number of provincial buildings back in 1954. The first announcement came out about some provincial buildings.

Mr. Reaume: No, it was announced in May 1959.

Hon. Mr. Connell: The member has told me his thread of the story, I will tell him my thread of the story; this is very brief.

Mr. Reaume: But I think we ought to keep it straight.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Originally it was announced—and I remember it well—that there were going to be a number of provincial buildings built. Actually, I think there has been only one provincial building built in the province. It was found after detailed study that the idea of a provincial building sounded very well in theory but has not worked out too well in practice.

Mr. Reaume: After he got beaten, they found out.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Back in 1959, which was very early in my Ministry of Public Works, if I did announce a provincial building—if you say I did, I must have announced it up there; I know there has been considerable talk, I well remember the purchase of the property. I cannot recall the timing exactly but it was also announced that the travel and publicity centre was the first half of the provincial building. I well remember that part, that the travel and publicity building there was a very fine building; it gets away from that standardization that someone was talking about—the

member for Grey North, yesterday. This is anything but a standardized building.

That was the first half. We have checked into it very carefully and we were criticized this afternoon for not planning; we have checked it over more carefully. I was a bit embarrassed that we were not going ahead with that building but we could find no need for it. The health people were the people who wanted space the worst. The health lab right down in the centre of Windsor, beside the beautiful city hall and the other good buildings, was no place for the health lab as far as I and some other people were concerned. About the only building that we could find that people could conceivably go in there was a small welfare office; I believe the Ontario savings bank was one of the few other tenants who were considered to go in there.

We have no plans to extend that building at this time and we never did have any architecturally drawn plans. When it was originally announced by my predecessor, it was thought that there would be enough buildings, but after study by our department it was found that there was not enough space to build on that desirable land. Since that time, we have found that out and we have a deal on with the city whereby they have made a park out of it and made a very beautiful little area of it.

I know the member is referring to the dinosaurs. That was an amusing incident back in 1961 when I visited the dinosaur park out in Calgary, I believe it was; but I was interested about a week after you were speaking about that five or six years ago, to notice that Imperial Oil carried a full picture between periods of the hockey game. Imperial Oil did not think it was too bad, but you and I decided it was a poor idea.

I do not know whether that answers the member's question fully or not, but we have no plans to present at the moment to build an addition to the travel and publicity centre at the provincial building in Windsor.

Mr. Reaume: Then you might write to your hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich and inform him of that because he has made a statement to the press that this building will be built—and he is talking, I presume, for the people in power—"or his name isn't Ivan".

Hon. Mr. Connell: I think the statement said that he would be pressuring to have it built, I think that was the statement.

Mr. Reaume: Oh no!

Hon. Mr. Connell: As you read it first?

Mr. Reaume: Drop him a line then, and inform him of that.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister how much rent must the department pay for accommodations in the city before it considers it economically feasible to put up a provincial public building?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is quite a number of years since we have gone into those figures, but we could find only enough possible rents for about a floor and a half. If you are going to go into that high-priced land—and that was comparatively high-priced eight years ago—it is not economically feasible to put a two-storey building on an area where most of the buildings are going up four and five storeys. We are certainly not building buildings to rent out space to other people, that is not our business.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the Minister still did not answer the question I asked.

Hon. Mr. Connell: If you want the totals, I cannot give you that answer. I cannot give you the total this moment, I can give it to you when we add it up—the number of rental properties that we have in Windsor. I do not know how many square feet it will add up to at this time, but I can give you a full statement on that.

Mr. Newman: I will appreciate that. You have given me that in other years. But there must be some point at which it becomes economically feasible, possible, and worth your while to put up a public building in the community. All I am asking is for you to tell me the point at which you can come along and say that it is proper to be putting up a public building. After all, I think you are using approximately ten or 12 different locations in the community for Ontario government offices. I know some of them cannot properly go into a public provincial building, but there must be some stage at which it is better for you to be putting up a building than renting facilities and renting accommodation throughout the community.

Mr. Reaume: As a matter of fact, I know of one office alone that you are renting that causes the people of Windsor to go a distance of eight miles at least—at the easterly end of Windsor—going to the very opposite end, where there is a department of government renting a store that forces a person to drive at least eight miles in a town the size of

Windsor. It is away out of the uptown area, a place that is hard to find and inconvenient. And I think that the question being asked now is pertinent. At what point do we have to arrive, when it will be proper that the province will build a building, because your offices are now scattered all over the place.

Mr. Sopha: To etch the problem in its best terms, is the federal government wrong in its contrasting attitude? In the opinion of the Minister, is the federal government wrong in the policy it adopts of coming into a community and housing most of its branch offices under one roof?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am not saying they are wrong but it has not been our policy to establish provincial buildings. It is just as simple as that.

Mr. Sopha: There are two things about it. The federal building in any community is usually a very imposing and architecturally quite a respectable-looking building. I do not know if I should phrase it that way, but it is a definite advantage to a community to have a federal building of very substantial construction. I am thinking of one of the main corners of Sudbury where they have, as a matter of convenience perhaps to themselves—certainly as a matter of convenience to the public—their offices which can be readily located by any person. Merely by asking the location of the federal building he can find his way to them—post office, RCMP, customs, immigration, district taxation office, to name some of them.

But to illustrate by means of my community, there is no such structure known as the provincial government building. Education is out in the LaSalle shopping centre. Lands and Forests are partly in the west end of town and partly six or seven miles down the highway. Social and Family Services is up in the Woolworth building right in the main corner of town and must be paying a tremendous rent; they are right on the busiest corner of town. Transport is up in the part of the town they call the Donovan. What else is there? I will tell you where it is. They are spread all over the place.

Mr. Reaume: Labour?

Mr. Sopha: No. The workmen's compensation board is in another building down on the main street and there is no rhyme or reason to it. I would venture to say, and perhaps be criticized at home, that as far as this little Queen's Park complex that they refer to outside the city is concerned, it was a mistake to locate it where it is—it is too far away for the convenience of the public. Nobody doing business with the provincial government wants to have to get in a car and journey six or eight miles down the highway to search out officials of the provincial government. Yet, strangely enough, the Minister of Public Works had a large block of land centrally located where The Department of Lands and Forests ranger station was and it remains undeveloped. Apparently there were no plans to utilize it for the erection of a public building, but he is content to go on and pay these very gross rents.

I had a very galling experience happen to me, which left me quite irascible. There was an individual I ran into a couple of months ago—I met him once. On the second occasion that I met him, he came up to me and said, "Do you know anybody that has a lease from the government of Ontario? I represent a company that will buy government leases. We will put up $1 million, $2 million, $3 million, $5 million. We have unlimited funds to put out in the purchase of government leases."

I thought that was a very galling thing to happen to a member—as if I would know, or be concerned about, who might have a government lease. This very impudent individual came up and impinged himself upon me, that I might give him some information that would enable him to enhance his private profit.

It is also illustrative, of course, of the fact that the source of the funds—whether it was Swiss money, or Belgian money, or Italian money coming from abroad, that looked upon the government as a good mark. It is another illustration that the government of Ontario could be relied upon to have long term leases. You see, the money would not be available unless those leases were on a long term basis. So at least the loan sharks, and those that put out money at usurious rates of interest, look upon the government of Ontario as being good collateral, very good collateral. I did ask this louse at what rates of interest they put it out and he said, "oh, it varies—seven, eight, nine." You see his spirit of public benevolence; the money was going to be made available at these very high rates of interest on the collateral of government leases.

That Treasury board over there—that collection of geniuses that sits on the Treasury board—have they ever sat down and knocked their heads together to determine whether it might save the people of Ontario a dollar

some stray Tuesday if they decided to put up public buildings and stop paying rent? We do not know. We will never hear. How do we know what goes on in the Treasury board? They never give any sign and they appear to be departing from the principle more and more all the time.

The other thing, of course, is the convenience of the public. I would say the government, being the monolith it is today—that the public has the right to find the government of Ontario in a central location. They have the right to expect that the community will have what is known as the provincial building.

"Where is the provincial building?" asks the stranger, when he comes into town. When he is told where it is, he can expect to find most, if not all, of them there—Education, public welfare—my apologies to my friend from Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis)—Social and Family Services, Health, workmen's compensation board, Transport, and so on, instead of having to get the most complex directions in order to find his way. Who knows, he might want to call on more than one of them. He might want to call on a couple.

The Treasury board, you know—somebody should reveal to them that the government is becoming a monolithic structure. There is plenty of literature extant on that where writers—the political scientists, the political philosophers—will tell you that government has become monolithic in the second half of the twentieth century and it is going to get bigger. It is going to get bigger still, as government is looked upon by the people as being the vehicle to eradicate social dislocation, to even things up, to distribute the wealth equitably. Governments were always going to become more pervasive in that, but the idea never seems to creep into that Treasury board, so that direction can be given to this service department to provide some plans to cope with reality.

You know, if you go outside the governnent offices, things are happening outside that are observable. It is about time that we began to straighten out our affairs, consonant with what is happening out in the street, and exhibit to the people that we have a consciousness of the place of government in the modern society. A good place is to take the principle enunciated by this Minister that typifies those buildings over to the east of us here—the Frost, Whitney and Hepburn buildings. These are said to have been built in order to bring everything back to Queen's Park—that is what we were told.

If that principle is valid for Queen's Park and the city of Toronto, it is valid for Sudbury and Port Arthur and Windsor and Sarnia and London and Cornwall and Ottawa and Kingston, and every other centre in the province.

Government is not only here—the Treasury board might feel informed for that fact to grab them—government is not only here, it is out in the province also. I would think, in the enlightened age of 1967, that the day would have been passed for the member for Essex North to have to stand in the House and accuse the government of using the building of a public building as a means of political patronage. I would think that day would have passed by now. That was one of the machinations of the old political hack—the politician is gone, departed.

Now we act in enlightened fashion. We do not, any longer, think of the voters as being so rude and at such a mean level of education that they would allow themselves to be bribed by such a thing. I say to my friend from Essex North, the intent was plain. It was an election gimmick. How many times have we seen it in Sudbury? We could write a book on the building of the Sudbury-Timmins road—it has been promised in every election since 1943, and is not complete yet. The Minister of Municipal Affairs is an old hand at this type of thing. I am optimistic enough to believe that the day is not a decade distant when this government discovers that the electorate is too sophisticated to be taken in by this kind of thing again.

However, put that aside. We in the Opposition merely put our case on the basis that it is good, rational commonsense and economically sound that the province of Ontario should house its various agencies under one central roof.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply just briefly to the member for Sudbury. I think if I were giving him a chance as my legal counsel to prepare a case for my defence, I think he could do it just as eloquently as he has for his own side of the case.

The federal people, I realize, do have quite a number of buildings that are called federal buildings. They are usually very elaborate on the outside—very well constructed buildings, very expensive buildings, I would think, basically. But I think you will find, when you are talking about the provincial buildings, I

said earlier it is a good theory, to have all—I thought that myself.

When I heard the announcement back in 1954, I thought, "this is an excellent idea for Hamilton." Hamilton is one of the first cities to have a provincial building. But the longer you look into it—the more thoroughly you look into it—the more you see what poor planning it would be.

First of all, OPP are one of the first people that need buildings in every area. They are not going to be down in the centre of Hamilton. They are not going to be down in the centre of Sudbury. It is the poorest place for OPP. They want to get out on the highways.

Do you bring the Highways garages down to the centre of Hamilton, or the centre of Sudbury? The Department of Transport wants places out off the highway, some place where people can get into for these driving examination centres. So they are the next set of buildings that are not practical.

Take a bank. Take the bank in the city of Windsor. Do they want to be a block off the main street? They want to be right on the main street. They do not want to be in our provincial building, and you can go on and on down the line like that. A great portion of our government agencies do not want to be in one central building. Then of course you get into the question of leasing. Many of these properties are leased at a very favourable rate. It is all right to talk of locating them downtown for everyone's convenience, but sometimes it is just as inconvenient for people to get downtown as it is where a specific office might be. So wherever you put it, it is convenient for some and inconvenient for others.

If you want me to adopt a policy of going out and building eight or ten provincial buildings and emptying 429 or so properties that we lease throughout the province, if you want me to empty those buildings owned by good taxpayers in this province, and put them all into a few provincial buildings, where we only pay a modest amount of taxes, if this is good business, I am prepared for you people to keep selling it to me, but you have not sold it to me yet.

Mr. Reaume: Mr. Chairman, all that I was asking for in the first place—you were talking about the province's bank, their own bank. This bank by order of the people in power now, was upstairs in a building for a matter of years.

Mr. Newman: Twenty years!

Mr. Reaume: I do not know whether it is 20 years or not. But this government was here all that time. If anybody could ever think in such foggy terms as to put a bank upstairs—

Hon. Mr. Connell: We brought it down—

Mr. Reaume: Yes, because I came down and hollered about it. It took five years to bring it down. But all these years that bank was upstairs and people had to walk up and walk downstairs. Consequently I doubt if that bank at that time, being up on the upper floor of this place, ever made enough on interest rates or anything else, to pay the rent. It was not until the bank was finally brought down and put where it ought to have been in the very first place, on the ground floor, that the bank started doing business with the people of Windsor.

Nobody is going to put any words in our mouths at all. I am only asking this: Your government and you made the people of Windsor a pledge and a promise that you were going to build a building there. Those were not my words, they were yours. I always thought—and I have been here for a long time, and I am going to be back again. Make no mistake about that one. There is not enough money in your bags in London, around the hunt club or elsewhere to buy that place off, and I will prove it.

But the point I want to make is this: I always thought that when a Minister of the Crown made a public statement and this was one, that the government was duty bound to back up that statement of policy. No Minister of the Crown, I would think, ought to go off half-cocked here and there and all over the province, shooting off his mouth. I have heard many of them do it and you are not one of them, but I would think that, as honourable men and Ministers of the Crown, having made the people of the province in any area a very definite promise that you were going to do a certain thing, the very least that you could do is go and do it. There has been no proper information, even yet, as to why that building was ever planned any more than to add this, that after you announced it, and after that man was beaten—and he was well beaten—it was then that you finally found out that your original planning was wrong. It was not wrong in May, 1959, but after the ballots had been counted, the policy of building that building was entirely wrong.

Now, if you cannot build that building there, for whatever it was worth—if the word of the government is worth anything, and the promise was made by a responsible man of the Crown—then if you do not want to build it there, there are many needs in that area. If you want to, you can come to Windsor. I would be happy to escort you around and take you to all the outlying offices. You know it is not such a strange thing. All the brains of the province, and indeed all the brains of the people of the province, it is most obvious, are not confined to the heads of the people who occupy those benches. This is obvious every day.

It is not at all strange that people from other parts of the province, coming here in this area, and hearing these stories—these Amos 'n' Andy stories, buildings going up, one day $24 million, the next day $28 million, the Minister, who has gone out of the House, comes back with brand new figures, $25 million. Buildings are going up all the time and yet, for the people of Windsor, and not only Windsor, but in many other places who have been promised things, the promises are not kept.

My point is this, and only this: Your problem is whether or not you will build that building. That is your job. But my message is this, and the only thing that I am asking you for, and it applies to every member over there who has any power at all: For goodness' sake do not go out at any time of the year making promises when you know when those promises are being made that you have no intentions of keeping them, unless the man whom you are trying to bolster for political reasons in that area wins the election, then probably the building is built; but if he is beaten, then the whole thing is off. What a deal. If the government's word is worth anything at all, I think it is worth keeping those types of promises.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister: Why did you buy the property in the first place?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, Mr. Chairman, this has been explained 400 times in this House. You know the answer.

Mr. Bryden: Just 387, I counted.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Is there any use repeating it at this time?

Mr. Newman: Well you bought the property for a—

Hon. Mr. Connell: I went through this 15 or 20 minutes ago. We bought that property. Eight provincial buildings were announced in 1954. We found out the policy was wrong. We bought the property; it was in the process of being purchased when I became Minister of this department, and even at that time I had no way of knowing that it was not good business. But when you make a study and find out you had only a few square feet that could be used, is it good business to go ahead? You have been talking about improper planning all afternoon yet when we do do a little planning, you say it is no good.

Mr. Reaume: What do you mean, just a few square feet? Why, there is property all over Windsor upon which you could build it.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I mentioned originally that The Department of Health's laboratory, was the only important user of space, it was the only branch that needed any major amount of square feet. Would you recommend the health laboratory being beside your city hall and the tourist centre?

Mr. Reaume: Your head is full of cobwebs. That is not what I said at all.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am asking you if you would recommend a health laboratory going into that area?

Mr. Reaume: All I said was this: Why did you not find out first what you were going to put in the building before you announced that you were going to build it? You know what happened; why are you beating around the bush? I know what happened, and you know too.

Mr. Bryden: You do not want them to depart from their whole policy, do you?

Mr. Reaume: It is about time, is it not?

Mr. Newman: We know that it is strictly a matter of politics, but now that we have the property there, let us put it to use. Let us transfer some of these offices we have located throughout the city of Toronto. Why not have the OMSIP office for Ontario located in the city of Windsor? It is just as easy to mail the premiums to an office in the city of Windsor as it is to mail the premiums to an office in Toronto.

You can decentralize many of these operations. You can have OMSIP and OHSC located in there. You have a perfect piece of property there and you have all the skilled help you need. You have a new business

college in the community, the help is being trained, so why not put up that type of building, then you can also accommodate all the other government offices that are needed in the community, plus a provincial office for OMSIP and OHSC.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I shall not try to match petty politics with petty politics—

Mr. Reaume: You are a statesman, a real high class statesman!

Mr. MacDonald: I listen to the hypocrisy of a Liberal whose government promised national scholarships before the last election, and has repudiated the promise.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: I want to ask the Minister about the latter part of his blue book, "approved for preliminary plans." I notice that under The Department of Health the only reference is to a child psychiatric research institute at Byron—three new treatment cottages. I presume that is not the emotionally disturbed children's treatment centres that were announced in the Throne Speech; this is part of the CPRI in existence at the moment.

My question to the Minister is this: Has none of the seven treatment centres announced for emotionally disturbed children in the Throne Speech even reached the stage of preliminary planning?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I can enlighten the hon. member for York South. These are requests from The Department of Health. Our people are being asked to plan and we have not gone very extensively into these. Whether it fits into what the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) has stated in his estimates, or not, I am not prepared to say at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not a case of what the Minister states. The government stated in the Throne Speech that it was going to build seven treatment centres for emotionally disturbed children, and there is nothing in even the preliminary planning of your department for the building of even one of those seven treatment centres. Has the Minister any indication as to when he will receive the request to start the preliminary planning? On the basis of his time tabling, he points out it would take five years to build the institution.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am sorry we have no knowledge of it in our department, outside of being asked to plan for these three new treatment cottages at Byron. Where the seven are that you say the Minister of Health mentioned—we do not have them in our approval for preliminary plans.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I just make the comment and leave it there. I will not belabour the issue. Obviously the proposal in the Throne Speech was pre-election window dressing and we have not gotten even to the preliminary planning stage.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I rose earlier, if you recall, to ask about the items under "approved for preliminary plans," with reference to addition for court facilities for Osgoode hall. A new court house just opened in the city of Toronto and many functions were transferred to this new court house. May I ask what additional court facilities you are planning to put into Osgoode hall?

Hon. Mr. Connell: This question has already been asked and answered this afternoon. There were certain plans presented by an independent group, including some of our own Public Works people. These plans were not completely acceptable and we are studying the area south of Queen Street opposite Osgoode hall. There is a possibility of putting the extension to Osgoode hall there.

As far as I know the needs are just as great as, and possibly even greater than they were when this committee was set up a year or so ago.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I was not here when this question was raised by someone else, but it appeared to me that additional courtroom facilities were provided in the new court house. In other words, there are extra courtrooms for future expansion. What courtrooms are required for Osgoode hall that you contemplate building them in some other area? Would you please enlighten me in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am sorry to say that I cannot enlighten the member on that part, but it has been most urgent for—well, practically ever since I became Minister, sir, they have been crowded at Osgoode hall. Just what type of facilities they need, we have not been too closely associated with that, outside of my chief architect, together

with members of The Attorney General's Department and some of the judges at Osgoode hall. I am not conversant with the exact facilities they require, at all.

Mr. Ben: Is the hon. Minister informing this House that he issues a brochure to give the stage of construction of different projects —"approved for preliminary plans is an item for additional courtroom facilities"—but he does not know what these courtroom facilities are or what is needed?

Hon. Mr. Connell: This is the very thing that I have explained in this House at least a half dozen times. You have been critical of our lack of planning and this last section in the book is put in there so that we can find out what we need.

Mr. Ben: We are critical of your lack of knowledge of your own planning because you cannot tell us what these plans are.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I will not be able to make the member understand; I can see that.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, I note in the Minister's departmental report that there is a tendency—particularly in the last few years—to get away from purchasing and owning buildings to a system of leasing buildings. I want to draw from the Minister, if I can, just how his department decides whether it is better to build and own a building or to build according to specifications and then lease it from the person who constructed the edifice. How is this decided?

For instance, we were talking about provincial police detachment buildings. Take the one in Glencoe, which was discussed in the House. You have these figures in mind. This building, I think, is leased. Now did you have cost figures prepared so that you would know what that building would cost, and then decide to lease it because it would be more economical from a provincial point of view? I imagine that you must have arrived at it in that way. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, it is not as simple as that, a black and white answer that we can come up with in this area. Our detachment buildings—not the headquarters but our detachment buildings—were costing roughly in the $90,000 to $100,000 category under our own specifications, and those requirements which the OPP needed, and living up to all our own rules and regulations of labour, fire marshal and what I would sometimes refer to as expansion needs of any occupying department. In eastern Ontario we had a couple of presentations made to us from people who offered to put up detachment buildings for us, and we found at that time that these buildings were costing roughly in the neighbourhood of $55,000 to $65,000. Of course, Treasury board were questioning us as to why this could be done, why someone else could build them much cheaper than we could. And we began to wonder ourselves.

Mr. Oliver: I would think you would.

Hon. Mr. Connell: But when you look into it, as I say, usually if an occupying department thinks that they can get in sooner by accepting something less than they think is necessary, they will agree to it. The individual can build with far fewer restrictions on him than we can. We have to live up to all our own regulations, all the local building regulations.

Mr. Oliver: You would require surely that he live up to them too?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is amazing how an individual can do things that we cannot do. As I said in my opening remarks, we are not allowed the luxury of a mistake by our people.

We are not letting them just go ahead and build as they please, sir, but we are seeking people who will build these detachment buildings. Mind you, they are going to be built to acceptable standards by us, but on a five or ten year lease. We have come to the conclusion, and Treasury board agrees with us, that it is cheaper.

In this way we are given a bit of flexibility, because as you well know highways change, diversions change, traffic patterns change, and it is nice to have a bit of flexibility as far as the headquarters of police are concerned.

In these times of high costs during the last few years, and particularly where we had fairly long leases, we have had some very preferred leases that we have been working on with the option of renewal. During this very high building cost period in the last three or four years, we have reached the conclusion that it is cheaper in many areas to lease than it is to build.

Now I do not know if that answers the hon. member's question or not.

Mr. Oliver: Well not completely.

You will notice, if you will recall, in your own departmental report you show a picture of the OPP detachment building in

Glencoe. What I am trying to get at is that my hon. friend is not going to tell me this afternoon that that building, a one-storey, rather small building, would cost anywhere near $90,000. What I am trying to get at is that the department must have decided by their own valuation and their own analysis just what this building would have cost or else they would not be able to tell whether it was better to lease or not.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes; well we do not own this building.

Mr. Oliver: I know you do not own it.

Hon. Mr. Connell: We might have figures back in the department or the builder might have told us what it cost, but I think our leasing arrangemets, on a percentage basis, would probably give an idea of what we—

Mr. Oliver: You are paying, as I understand, $4,300 a year or something. Over a ten-year period that would be about $45,000. It looked very much as though that place could be built for $45,000.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would doubt it very much. I have been through that particular building.

Mr. Oliver: Well building costs must have gone up terrifically.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, on this same discussion, do you just contact contractors to ask them what they will build a certain building for according to certain specifications? Or do you advertise to find out who would build a building for you in that area?

We have Dutton detachment in that same area. Its building is owned and built by your department; in Glencoe it is leased.

They are very close together; I would like to hear the Minister explain why, in such a short distance, you would lease one Ontario Provincial Police building and in the next riding you would build it yourself.

Hon. Mr. Connell: As I tried to explain, during these periods of high costs, and with the approval of Treasury board, we have leased. I think the first two or three leases were about three years ago; I think we had four or five last year. We have approval to go out and lease 20.

I think you will quite agree that many of the OPP detachments are in buildings that are not desirable. It was difficult to find the capital to build 20 detachment buildings; it is much easier to go out and lease. I do not know how long ago the Dutton one was built. I imagine about two years ago.

Mr. Spence: Two or three years ago!

Hon. Mr. Connell: Two or three years ago; so we are just in this period where we are changing a bit.

Now whether we will stay with this policy for the next four years or not I do not know. This is something that you have to assess on a year by year basis.

The member asked how we find these people to build for us. I read that into the record yesterday. We usually make as many inquiries as we can. If we are leasing space, and we cannot find anything that is available, we advertise in the local paper stating that we need a certain number of square feet, not particularly the type of building but a certain number of square feet. In that way we find those people who either have space or are willing to build for us.

Mr. Oliver: I will just finish this point. When you say that you ask for a building containing so many square feet, the department knows from experience what it would cost to build such a building, meeting those specifications. Just as an example, on the Glencoe OPP detachment building I want to know what the department figured they would have had to put out to build that Glencoe detachment building. I cannot see but that you would have it because you would have to have a gauge of some kind.

Hon. Mr. Connell: As I mentioned, we were finding that most of our basic detachment buildings were costing in the neighbourhood of $90,000 to $100,000, depending on whether it was in southern Ontario or northern Ontario. That was for a basic, standardized design that we had. But we found, at least in the first two projects we came to, that if occupying departments thought they could get into new quarters sooner they were not quite so firm on their requirements. I am speaking more of square feet they needed. I do not think I can answer the member more clearly than that.

On the cost of that Glencoe building, the actual cost, if we were going in there to build a building at that time, which I guess is about three years ago, it would have cost us $95,000 to $100,000 to build a detachment that fitted in with our standards and the requirements of the OPP.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister inform me what the Dutton Ontario Provincial Police office cost his department?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I know at one time we could almost tell what the tenders were going to be with a detachment building. They always came in between $90,000 and $100,000; but a headquarters is usually around $290,000 to $300,000.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the Minister if in leasing arrangements he has a purchase option, an option to purchase the property after the lease expires?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Very seldom; I think there are one or two, as I recall. We have one in Ottawa.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I hope he does not follow the procedures of our friends to the south of us. I happened to notice that in one of the post office buildings in Cincinnati, it was a $6 million building, the leasing arrangements would have given the individuals who constructed the building $21 million in lease payments.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Over how many years?

Mr. Newman: Thirty years.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, before the conclusion of this vote I would just like to comment to the Minister on the building he is in charge of at Expo, our Ontario pavilion.

I think it compares very favourably with other buildings at that site, but there are two items that should be drawn to your attention, sir. A couple of members were there yesterday and this is one of the few buildings on the site that has a gravel walkway throughout a major portion of the building. It was raining all day yesterday. I think it would behoove your department to take a second look at that and possibly blacktop the walkways into that building.

Secondly, in the area where one eats, in the outdoors right near a canal, there is no protective device whatsoever and I would just be afraid that someone might go into that very deep canal. I think that would deserve some consideration.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would suggest that the member maybe contact The Department of Economics and Development. They have actually taken more responsibility down there than we have by quite a bit and are on the job there every day.

I know this is not on the vote, but an interesting thing has come to us this last week about the cleaning. Apparently our department called for bids, I believe among the regular cleaning establishments in the Montreal area, and they came in very high. Our own people were asked to look into it. My understanding is that doing the contract by our own method here they came in at about half the price. I think this has upset a lot of the cleaning establishments in Montreal that have been pretty firmly entrenched. I do not know whether I have all the details, but I think our own department is responsible for cleaning and contract cleaning, as we are coming to know it. I think they deserve a pat on the back for going into Montreal and upsetting the apple cart down there, and at a very favourable price to our government, by the way.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister what the price was to build the portable classroom at the western Ontario institute of technology? There has been a portable built there directly across the road from the main building, a very nice-looking portable too.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Built seven or eight years ago, you mean?

Mr. Newman: It is the old, old building. No, it is a brand new portable.

Hon. Mr. Connell: But built seven or eight years ago?

Mr. Newman: No, no. Completed this year.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I do not believe we did it.

Mr. Newman: Would it not come under your department?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well I do not know why it did not, but we are not aware of it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, it strikes me as strange that one year you are responsible for them and then apparently the next year you are not responsible for them. Who really is responsible for the construction of these buildings?

May I ask the hon. Minister the charges that were levied by the architects in the planning of the western Ontario institute of technology, while it was under your jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. Connell: What is the first part of the question?

Mr. Newman: The architectural charges, fees—because apparently in our discussions in the past you had two sets of architects working on the new plans for the institute of technology in the new location where it was going to go. Now, since that time, apparently, there is a board of governors that are responsible for the construction of the university.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, we paid no architectural fees.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, they were doing a lot of work for this department a year ago, so the Minister told me.

Hon. Mr. Connell: No. They had been appointed but I do not believe we had any requirements from The Department of Education, so I do not think we paid any fees to that combination of firms.

Mr. Newman: Then actually one year ago, while these people were working on this, they were not working for The Department of Public Works?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, I will check that more carefully, but I think I am correct on that; they were not paid any fees by our department.

Mr. Newman: Well if they were, Mr. Minister, will you provide me with the figures then?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes.

Mr. Newman: Thank you.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I just want some information in connection with the hospital at Palmerston. I was wondering if the Minister could tell me the total cost of the new hospital school at Palmerston and also the cost of the drainage in connection with it. I understand that the drainage was quite a problem on that site.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes. I am afraid we will have to get that information. We just have the cost of the laboratory and not of the hospital here, but I will get that information for you.

Mr. Gaunt: Okay!

Mr. Newman: May I ask the Minister what the target date is for the completion of the tourist reception centre at the Ambassador bridge?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I no longer give any target dates either before or afterwards, but the contract has been let and it will be pretty much up to the contractor now. I think you will be able to find out more from him than from myself as to the target date.

Mr. Newman: You have a very fine contractor. Lombardo and Sons Limited are the type that like to undertake a project and expeditiously complete the project. They are very, very fine contractors. You picked a good firm there.

May I ask the hon. Minister if this is going to be located on bridge property, or on the site where the portable reception centre—

Hon. Mr. Connell: I cannot be specific about the area. Are you aware of the property we had purchased, half a mile from the bridge?

Mr. Reaume: On the highway?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, on the main road. I have seen the property there, but I cannot—

Mr. Reaume: Funny thing, they do not know what they do until after it is done.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would say we did not pick the contractor; he had his pencil sharp when he did the job, as all our other contractors do.

Mr. Reaume: Where is he going to build it?

An hon. member: That is the point, where is he going to build it?

Mr. I. W. Thrasher (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Chairman, I could answer that question. It is about halfway from the Ambassador bridge to Huron Line on the right hand side.

Mr. Reaume: As you are going out?

Mr. Thrasher: Going out!

Vote 1907 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Public Works.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in this private members' hour, we will deal with resolution No. 22 standing in the name of Mr. Gaunt, as shown on page five on the order paper.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 22, by Mr. Gaunt.

RESOLUTION:

That the Ontario government take steps immediately to include chiropractors, optometrists, osteopaths, dentists and other paramedical groups under the Ontario medical services insurance plan.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Newman, resolution 22 standing in my name.

In the few minutes alloted to me this afternoon, I want to deal with a few anomalies and inconsistencies which have always existed in the health service field, insofar as those who practise in that field are concerned, but which, since the introduction of medicare provincially, and as of July 1, 1968, federally, have become more apparent and troublesome.

On December 6, 1966, the federal government amended its medicare bill, C-227 by adding to clause 4 thereof the following:

> In the application of this Act to a plan established by an Act of the Legislature of a province, any health services of a kind prescribed by the Minister to be required health services rendered by a person lawfully entitled to render such services in the place where they are so rendered, shall under such terms and conditions as may be specified by the Governor in Council and if the provincial law so provides, be deemed to be services rendered by a medical practitioner that are medically required.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Hon. Allan MacEachen, as reported in the Commons debates, page 10766 of December 6, 1966, in reference to the amendment said:

> The amendment will make it possible for the federal government, acting in concert with the provincial governments to include additional health provisions if lawfully empowered to operate in their own provinces, and these will be deemed to be medical practitioners. Accordingly their services will be regarded under the definition clause as an "insured service". So it does provide a way to bring in services of additional health professions at the decision of the federal government and if the provincial law so provides.

The Minister, when replying to a question as to whether such services as those of optometrists, chiropractors, physiotherapists, and others who are not generally recognized as medical practitioners, would be covered, the Minister's reply was:

> Yes, Mr. Chairman, the effect of the amendment is that the additional health services would be deemed to be carried out by medical practitioners, and the services will be insured services.

Perhaps it is fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that the definition attached to medical practitioner by the Minister was partly due—and I give credit to my friends opposite, the adherents to the political party opposite, in the person of the Hon. Davie Fulton, who is Canada's past Minister of Justice. Mr. Fulton presented, what could be termed, a very forceful and masterful legal argument on the meaning of the term "medical practitioner." He used dictionary definitions and other references and proved, beyond doubt, that the term referred to those practising in the healing arts.

I think that is rather significant and I think we should bear that in mind. One could say that it was a debate shrouded with irony —the debate to have medicare, or the paramedical groups, included under the terms of the medicare bill was led by none other than two medical doctors. Nonetheless, the bill was amended and the paramedical groups are now eligible for inclusion in the federal medicare bill.

The other important matter revolves around the question: "By what means will these various groups qualify under the various provincial plans?" The federal Minister, in reply to this question, on page 10765 of the debates of December 6, stated that it would be possible for one or any number of the provinces to admit any health services. Since that debate took place the federal Minister has called in the provincial health Ministers to discuss the details of the plan.

According to our Minister of Health in the province of Ontario (Mr. Dymond), the terms of reference for inclusion of the paramedical services have been changed. Instead of one province being able to admit any health services it deemed advisable and have those services covered by the federal bill, such action apparently depends on a concensus of the provinces.

This posture was taken, apparently, at the conference of the provincial health Ministers and was confirmed in correspondence which I have had with The Department of National Health and Welfare in respect to the federal government's position. The key now, of course, becomes the word "concensus." Will the concensus mean all of the provinces? Will it mean the majority of the provinces, sir, or will two or three of the provinces form the basis for concensus?

At the moment Ottawa does not know, so it is reasonable to assume the provinces do not know either. Presumably this will have to be worked out at another federal-provincial conference of health Ministers.

It is very difficult to know, or find out, what goes on at these federal-provincial conferences. However, in this instance, I think it is fair to assume that the provincial health Ministers bombarded the federal Minister and said, in effect: "Look here, under The British North America Act, health is a provincial responsibility. We do not want the federal government trying to legislate and dictate to us matters of health, which are matters entirely within our jurisdiction. We view this as a violation of our rights. As far as this amendment to include paramedical services is concerned, we want any inclusion to be based on a concensus of the provinces rather than by an edict from the federal government."

Apparently, in this instance, the federal government acceded to the demands of the provinces.

As to the matter of health being a provincial responsibility under The British North America Act, this is so. No one argues with that, I am sure. However, it seems to me that this matter must be resolved. It must be resolved to the satisfaction of the public who depend on and must have, from time to time, the services of, not only medical doctors, but of chiropractors, dentists, optometrists, and all of the other paramedical people.

It is obvious the medical doctors are going to fight tooth and nail to keep these other groups out. Shortly after the amendment was passed in the House of Commons, an article appeared in the *Globe and Mail*. In it, the president of the Canadian medical association, Dr. R. K. C. Thompson, of Edmonton, was quoted as saying that the executive committee of the Canadian medical association feels that the provincial associations will fight to keep everyone but doctors from practising under medicare. This narrow and bigoted attitude of the medical association sparked an editorial in the *Globe and Mail* on December 10, 1966, and I think it would serve the purpose of my argument if I were to read it into the record:

> The Canadian medical association is on shaky ground in its efforts to prevent all except physicians from practising under medicare. Dr. R. K. C. Thompson, president of the CMA said, in a statement last week, that it is the strong opinion of the Canadian medical association that benefits under medical care Acts and programmes should be limited to those services performed by, or under the direction of, a properly qualified physician.

The editorial goes on:

> Parliament earlier had given approval to an amendment which would make it possible for all kinds of nonmedical practitioners to get into the act. These would include dentists, optometrists, chiropractors, osteopaths, and so on. In fact, the bill as amended could cover any health services of a kind prescribed by the Minister to be required health services, rendered by a person lawfully entitled to render such services.
>
> It is true that this could be interpreted as opening the door to inclusion in the health plan of treatments that have more to do with faith than science. Obviously, every practitioner, of whatever occult persuasion, would like to jump on the medicare bandwagon. Every sensible man is with the doctors in wanting to prevent this from happening. But, for one thing, this is only enabling legislation that Parliament has approved.
>
> The federal medicare Act simply lays down the kinds of treatment that provinces will be permitted to provide if they want federal assistance. We must assume that the provincial government will have discretion in deciding the specific kinds of treatment they actually want in their provincial medicare insurance legislation. To call for separate legislation to cover nonmedical services, as the doctors have done, would be to delay again the provisions of needed services to the public. Almost half a century has passed since a national health plan was first proposed for Canada. How long will it take the new legislation dealing with paramedical services?
>
> Osteopaths and chiropractors are licensed practitioners under the laws of the land and they can provide useful services provided they treat patients within their areas of competence. Why should they not be included in the plan?

The case of the dentists—

And I am still quoting from the editorial:

> —and the optometrists is even more pertinent.
>
> Doctors do not fix teeth, so there is no question of their doing the job the dentists want to do. Nor do the doctors frequently refer patients to dentists or supervise their work. Yet it is now realized that dental health is essential to general health and well-being and dental care today is just as costly for many families as is medical care.
>
> As for the optometrists, they too carry out procedures that need not be performed by medical men and so provide a useful function. It is pointless to argue that such procedures should be carried out only by, or under the direction of, ophthalmologists because there are not nearly enough of them in the country to make this practical.
>
> There are areas of treatment in which physicians' services and the services of non-medical personnel overlap and the country's medicare legislation should not discriminate against professionals other than doctors. If the medical profession is sincere in its desire to act in the public interest concerning medical insurance legislation, it will not oppose the inclusion of services provided by professionals other than its own members. In fact, it should welcome the prospect that the legislation would help to bring about a workable definition of when such services should be properly used.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that puts it very emphatically and succinctly. We are now in a period of an acute shortage of medical practitioners throughout Canada. For instance, in the year 1910, there was one doctor to every 1,000 to 1,100 people. There were very few specialists and very few doctors in administrative positions.

In 1965 an altogether different situation faced us. There was one doctor for every 950 people. However, out of 20,000 doctors in Canada, almost 50 per cent are either specialists or engaged in administration. This means, in effect, that we have one general practitioner to roughly every 1,900 people. In the area in which I happen to live, the situation has reached crisis proportions. In the Wingham area, after the end of this month, we will have two doctors for approximately 15,000 people. There are many areas, I am sure, across the province where the same applies.

Never in our history has there been such a need for paramedical personnel as there is today. There are two things happening to the medical profession today. First, either doctors are seeing more patients than they should see to treat them properly and as a result, the quality of care is suffering; or, second, doctors are refusing to see more cases because they do not want to jeopardize their patients' interest and want to retain quality of care. Consequently, some people cannot get attention from them. It seems to me that our doctors should be allowed the maximum medical personnel if they are to perform their functions as they should and to the best advantage.

Psychiatrists could not begin to look after all the people they would be expected to look after if it were not for the able assistance of psychologists. And opthalmologists could not begin to look after all the people requiring their services in this country if it were not for the able assistance which the optometrists give, and so on. We could go on and on.

The exclusion of any or all of these groups is a selective action in favour of one profession. In order to have a well rounded plan, we should include the paramedical groups under our medical services insurance programme. At the present time in Ontario, we have a shortage of doctors—as I said before —which, in many cases, reaches crisis proportions. In the United States today, there is one doctor for every 750 people; in New Zealand, there is one doctor for every 700 people; in Russia, there is one doctor for every 550 people. Surely, one of the best ways of alleviating a shortage of doctors is by making use of people who have a great fund of specialized knowledge.

Yet what is happening in Ontario? Let us take, for instance, the chiropractic profession. Since the first chiropractors came to Ontario around 1908, the medical profession has stubbornly refused to recognize them as having a place in the health service field. Lately, however, the medical profession is now beginning to recognize the value of manipulation, as pointed out by Dr. W. B. Parsons in an editorial in the *Journal of the College of General Practice of Canada,* in the October, 1966 issue in which he said:

> When physicians discover the ease with which many conditions that previously they could not relieve, respond to manipulation, they almost feel cheated by their medical schools.

In the *Ontario Medical Review* of February, 1966, Dr. W. D. Thomas in his article, "The Attitude of the Family Doctor to Manipulation," wrote as follows:

> The average doctor in general practice confesses to complete lack of knowledge in the subject of manipulation. For many years it has been most embarrassing to find that one of our patients would drift off to lay manipulators where sometimes they experienced rather spectacular cures, much to the embarrassment of organized medicine.

The Toronto academy of medicine in its issue of September 14, 1966 heard a lecture by Dr. Ronald Barbor of England, on the subject of manipulation. After confirming that this method of treatment is not taught in medical schools, Dr. Barbor contended:

> Seventeen per cent of my patients require manipulation and it is a tragic fact that the average physician learns of manipulation after his patient has been helped by someone outside the medical profession. This naturally arouses resentment.

So we are now witnessing short courses being given to medical doctors in the art of manipulation. These courses are anywhere from two to five weeks in length and are supposed to cover all aspects of manipulation which require a qualified chiropractor four years to learn.

Parsons, writing in the *Canadian Medical Association Journal* of July, 1958 stated:

> The reason we—

That is, the medical doctors:

> —took up manipulation was an interest in backache with the early discovery that many patients who failed to respond to routine medical treatment went to a manipulator and received immediate relief.

Mr. Speaker, if I may interject at this point, this is where the rub really comes. A medical practitioner with very little or no formal training in what is loosely termed "spinal manipulation," is paid under OMSIP for manipulative services provided to his patient, whereas a chiropractor or an osteopath who has been formally trained for a minimum of four years and who is then licensed to practise his art and science in this province, is denied this recognition and his patients are made to suffer financially, as a result.

This situation warrants serious investigation, not only from the aspects of discrimination against chiropractors and osteopaths under OMSIP, but also from the fact that the public is, in many cases, being rendered inferior service by the medical profession.

However, at this stage, one is not concerned with the value of chiropractic vertebral manipulation. This has been clearly substantiated by Royal commissions and by medical investigators. The question is, does chiropractic or any of the other paramedical services perform a service of enough magnitude to warrant inclusion in a medicare plan? Clearly the answer is "yes."

The area of confidence insofar as the chiropractors are concerned is the spinal manipulation. The increasing incidence of spinal injuries in our industrial environment is a matter of concern and has been studied recently by the department of research and statistics of the American chiropractic association. The report stated that during the two-year period from July, 1954 to June, 1961, 35.5 per cent of all back injuries took place while the victim was at work. Further, the impact upon the nation's economy is estimated by the national safety council to be four times the direct cost. Applying this figure to the United States, it is calculated that back injuries cost America $1 billion annually. Applying it to the cost of back injuries reported by the Ontario workmen's compensation board in 1963, we find that the province's economy was damaged to the extent of $25,600,000. This figure serves to underline the important influence that spinal injury can exert upon the province's economy.

Being treatment for the purpose of returning the worker to his job as soon as possible and at the same time reducing time loss and production loss in industry, it seems wise to give some thought to improving present methods of treatment. In this connection a study was undertaken by the workmen's compensation board into low back pain in men receiving compensation. This report indicated failure of treatment in six of each ten cases, which points out that present-day methods of management of such patients are unsatisfactory.

It is significant to note that the chiropractic management of back injury cases was not included in this study.

However, on the basis of a study done in Florida, we can draw some comparison. This Florida survey demonstrates that back injury cared for under chiropractic management responds in less time and at less expense than when under orthodox medical care. Accordingly, it is reported in the survey that patients who were under chiropractic care were returned to their jobs in one third of the time required by those under orthodox medical care. Costs of the treatment under orthodox

medical care administered by general practitioners was 27.5 per cent more than costs of chiropractic care.

In cases attended by medical specialists, the costs were more than 200 per cent greater than chiropractic costs, yet under chiropractic care the patient was returned to work in an average of 2.5 days compared to 30 days under specialists' care.

Taking the workmen's compensation board of Ontario figure that it accepted 12,000 low-back claims in 1965, it is an easy matter to figure out the difference in terms of dollars and cents as far as treatment is concerned, with the chiropractic vs. the medical form of treatment. At a per diem rate of hospital care alone, based at $27 per day for a ward, this means a difference of $4,455,000 for hospital care alone, not to mention the cost of services performed by the two professions.

This takes into account the fact that approximately one half of the 12,000 low-back claims do not have an interruption of regular work. In other words, what I am using here is the 6,000 rather than the 12,000, because half of these people do not have their regular work interrupted.

Anyone who tries to throw up the smoke screen that to include these services in OMSIP would cost too much money, is not being realistic, because what may cost the province money in the first instance will save the province money in the second instance.

In summation then, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that the government will incur greater costs in the long run on behalf of the people of the province because they will be forced to consult specialists rather than paramedical people if we persist in excluding the paramedical people from coverage under OMSIP. I urge the government to accept these paramedical people under the OMSIP plan so that Ontario can go to the federal government and to the other provinces of Canada and say, "We view the paramedical services as being important and we therefore ask that they be covered by a federal contribution." In this way, Mr. Speaker, Ontario can contribute in a formidable way to establishing the consensus that seems at the moment to be required.

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): It is very difficult, of course, for anyone to disagree with the principle behind this resolution. Nevertheless, I feel it has not been too well thought out. In its present form, it strikes me more as an attempt to gain publicity than as a means of helping our government achieve its aims of total health service.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is pretty feeble.

Mr. Olde: Knowing my friend, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, as I do, I am sure he means well.

Mr. Gaunt: Of course I meant well.

Mr. MacDonald: There is that Victorian paternalism again.

Mr. Olde: I think everyone realizes, Mr. Speaker, that it is relatively simple to produce resolutions of this nature and that it is relatively simple also to substantiate a requirement for the need for these services. I believe too, Mr. Speaker, that our government and all the members on this side of the House are as conscious of the need for additional services as the members of the Opposition. In fact, as the Minister of Health indicated during his estimates, our government is giving the most careful consideration to the matters covered by this resolution as well as other aspects not mentioned in the proposal at all.

The measure before us makes no reference, for example, for the need to include the cost of drugs in OMSIP. Surely this is an important consideration. It makes no reference whatsoever to the question of priorities, to the cost of the proposal, to the additional facilities which would be required or to the difficulties of administering such an enlarged programme.

In many ways, I feel that this resolution is a typical example of the irresponsible approach which both Opposition parties are able to take on so many of these vitally important issues.

Mr. Gaunt: Who wrote that speech?

Mr. Olde: I believe they can take these positions because they do not feel in all sincerity that they will ever be called upon by the people of this province to implement their rash promises.

Mr. Gaunt: After the next election we will.

Mr. Olde: On the government side I think we fully appreciate the desirability of extending OMSIP as far and as rapidly as is possible, but we have been forced to recognize as the Oppositon parties refuse to recognize the burden which the taxpayers of this province are carrying at the present time, a burden which apparently is going to continue to increase in the years ahead. I think it is be-

coming clear to everyone that there are simply not sufficient funds for each level of government to implement all the programmes which are considered desirable at this time.

In the face of this situation, Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree with the Prime Minister when he says it is time for all levels of government to review their spending programmes with the greatest care and to establish proper priorities for the expenditure of their limited budgets. This is what the government of Ontario is doing at the present time. It affects every department in this government, including The Department of Health. Consequently we find that the hon. Minister of Health must establish priorities for the expenditure of his budget, which includes the field covered by this resolution today.

In presenting his estimates to this House on April 20 last, the Minister concluded by stating that since 1959 the amount of his estimates has increased from approximately $81 million until this year they are over $358 million. These figures, I suggest, give pretty conclusive evidence of the importance which the government of Ontario places upon our health services and the vast strides being taken each year to broaden the scope and to improve these services throughout the province.

Yet the Minister appreciates as all of us do here that much remains to be done and will be done as additional funds become available. I feel as he does that the extension of the services to be covered by OMSIP must be part of a carefully thought out long-term plan. Such a plan is now being developed. Let us look first at the subject of dental services. To provide dental treatment at public expense for one very small segment of our population, namely, the group from three to six years of age, a group which numbers about 625,000, would cost $5.8 million each year. I think that a fair estimate of the average cost of dental services per patient per year would be something in the order of $25.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): We are talking about chiropractors, not dentists.

Mr. Olde: There are more than chiropractors in this resolution. Therefore to provide a dental treatment at public expense, according to the terms of this resolution, for every citizen in the province, is likely to cost something in the order of $175 million per year. No mention is made as to how this cost is to be met. No mention is made of the very serious shortage of dentists which exists at the present time. No mention is made of the difficulties of administrating this programme, or the fact that the demand for dental services will undoubtedly increase as a result of their inclusion in OMSIP. No mention is made either of the fact that the treatment for services is but one aspect of this dental problem.

Of equal or even greater importance is the emphasis which we must place upon preventative measures. Thus, Mr. Speaker, this one example of dental services illustrates quite clearly the need to establish a firm set of priorities, yet the resolution before us calls upon our government to include each of the services willy-nilly in the OMSIP scheme. No one would deny that a very serious situation exists insofar as dental services are concerned in this province and, in fact, in the country as a whole.

In criticizing the situation recently in Ottawa, Mr. Justice Emmett M. Hall, who was chairman of the federal Royal commission on health services, stated that the shortage of dentists is greater than that of any other health workers. Mr. Hall had two suggestions to improve the situation:

1. Encourage more women to enter the dental profession.

2. Train dental auxiliaries or assistants to care for children's first teeth, including filling cavities.

He went on to state that he could see little hope of improving the standards of dental health in Canada until dentists are relieved of a great deal of work involved in caring for children's teeth. These proposals seem to me to be very sound and I hope that our government and the federal government will give them every consideration.

As you may recall, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hall's commission recommended that the dental health programme begin in 1968 with five- and six year-old children, increasing each year until, in 1980, the programme would cover all children up to 18 years of age. Such a programme would be possible only if dental assistants were trained, as in New Zealand and Britain, to care for the first teeth of children under the supervision of a dentist.

This is the type of approach which, it seems to me, must be taken to this problem. I would like to assure my good friend, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, that this is the type of plan which the government of this province is considering at the present time.

Now we come to the chiropractic services. Mr. Speaker, I fully recognize the value and the importance of chiropractic services and

support the desirability of including these services in OMSIP. In fact, at the last session—and recently in the Budget debate—I spoke on this subject, as did the hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

I was interested to see that the cost of this proposal for chiropractic services, which he quoted last year, was $6 million annually. This, I find, was based upon 1961 figures. The latest figures that I have been able to obtain indicate that the cost of initiating this programme in 1968 is estimated at $9 million. In any event, I fully support the government's intention to examine each of these areas and to establish priorities, not only as between the various groups mentioned in this resolution, but also within each group mentioned.

In the case of dental services, we have seen that emphasis should be placed initially on the care of the very young. In chiropractic services perhaps, the emphasis should be placed on the older age group—say from 30 to 35 years until the retirement age of 65.

Mr. Speaker, we could spend additional time considering other groups which are mentioned in this resolution, but I think that my point has already been made. The point is simply this: That, while no one questions the desirability of including these additional services in OMSIP, it is essential that priorities be established and a long-term programme be developed in accordance with the needs of the people of this province, their ability to pay for these services and the ability of our government to organize and administer the programme.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have rarely heard a more mealy-mouthed set of excuses for government inaction than those of the hon. member who has just taken his seat.

I will concede that there is one point in his argument—and I think it is a weakness in the resolution that the hon. member for Huron-Bruce has introduced—and that is the inclusion of dentists in this group. Obviously dentists are in a somewhat different category from chiropractors, optometrists, osteopaths and what is normally referred to as paramedical groups. I would concede that the hon. member for Essex South, in his criticism of what appears to be a lack of understanding of the problems involved in dental care, has one small point, and one only.

An hon. member: Who is the member from Essex?

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, Middlesex South.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview) I was going to say if he came from Essex South his remarks would be most appropriate.

Mr. MacDonald: Now that we have it corrected, perhaps the limited amount of time that that coalition of old parties has conspired to leave me with, I can have.

Mr. Singer: He is conspiring against the hon. member too.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously we have a great shortage of dentists and clearly, if we are going to move towards provision of this form of health service, I think it has got to be at the level of younger people, so that we can try to reduce the proportions of the job that we must tackle.

However, I am going to set that aside and come back to what is normally referred to as paramedical services, namely chiropractors, ostepaths, podiatrists, and so on. I want to—in the first point that I would like to make—go back to an exchange that took place in the House of Commons when the debate was going on. It concerned the amendment to make it possible for the federal government to share in the cost of a national health plan. The national leader of the New Democratic Party was commenting on December 6, and I quote from *Hansard* at page 10765:

> As far as we are concerned we would, of course, have preferred that the Act specifically state that optometric services, physiotherapy services, the services of podiatrists, osteopaths and chiropractors would be available. I think it would have been preferable to have had the paramedical services enumerated in the legislation. But since the Minister was not agreeable to that, certainly this is the best compromise he could have made. I take it this means that the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister, can extend paramedical services on a plan in a particular province, even though other provinces have not asked for a similar extension.

And then I leave the rest of the quotation to give the Minister's reply at that time.

> *Mr. MacEachen:* Mr. Chairman, I think the construction the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has put on the proposed amendment is correct, namely that it would be possible for one or any number of provinces to admit any health services.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately our Minister of Health is correct in his report to this House that the various Ministers of Health went down to Ottawa and ganged up on the federal government and that the federal government bowed to the proposal that this undefined concensus must be achieved before any province, presumably, is going to be able to move.

If one examines and tries to extract an exact meaning from the words used during the course of the debate in the estimates of The Department of Health, one could construe that it has to be almost a majority—that any one province is certainly going to be in a position to veto it, particularly if it is a province the size of the province of Ontario.

What the Minister has achieved, Mr. Speaker—let us face it—what the Minister has achieved is another opportunity to frustrate the development of a national plan. What this province of Ontario has done once again, under the "leadership" of this government, is to frustrate the extension of services—even on the part of other provinces who may wish to proceed with them—because of the so-called necessity for arriving at a concensus.

Let me move quickly, Mr. Speaker, to the question of cost. There is one basic factor in the consideration of the costs involved in the paramedical services, such as chiropractic and podiatry and optometry. In the instance of insurance companies with chiropractic, if I can take that as an example, a number of years ago, they voluntarily provided an extension of their coverage to include chiropractic without an increase in the cost of the premiums.

Mr. Speaker, we can operate on the assumption that insurance companies which are in business to make a profit are not going to extend the services—indeed, their normal procedure is precisely the opposite, that is, to reduce the services—if it is going to cost them any money. There is considerable experience, now backed up by medical observations that the hon. member for Huron-Bruce has already put in the record, that what happens in the use of chiropractic is that you reduce the overall cost of the health service; that what, for example, happens in some instances is, a person goes to a doctor once or twice and when he finds that he is not getting the satisfaction, the third time instead of going to a doctor, he goes to a chiropractor. As in the quotations which the hon. member for Huron-Bruce has put into the record, it is found in certain back injuries—in the experience of the workmen's compensation board—that the chiropractor has more to offer than the medical doctor, because he has a particular service that meets a particular need.

So I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister—at least, insofar as chiropractic is concerned—is drawing a red herring across the trail: there is going to be no appreciable increase in costs. Indeed, in some areas, there is going to be a reduction of costs because they can get a chiropractic service instead of going two or three times to a medical doctor and getting no satisfaction.

It strikes me as very strange, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister and this government should adopt that kind of an approach, because when we established OMSIP we established it by giving the doctors 100 per cent or 90 per cent of the schedule of fees for welfare cases, instead of the normal 30 per cent that they used to get. So we handed the doctors some $10 million out of the public treasury over and above what they had been getting before. Now we have seen the doctors unilaterally take action in increasing their fees. After the Minister spent about a month on his knees pleading with them to reverse their decision and they would not, now he has brought in an amendment to the bill and is handing another $10 million out of the public treasury to make $20 million more in medical incomes by an increase in fees and by full payment on welfare cases.

This government pleads costs, pleads that they cannot do it, but they are quite willing to accept a dictate from the medical profession. They are quite willing to pay the doctors fully on the welfare cases while they are excluding others on the health team.

As we stated during the estimates of The Department of Health, Mr. Speaker, this is a case of rank discrimination, and any amount of talk from the other side and any amount of mealy-mouthed excuses are not going to eliminate the point that this is discrimination, particularly when there is no major cost involved in it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the final point that I want to make in the two or three minutes that are left to me, is the proposition that it is passing strange that the senior—and I would be willing to concede them for the moment as the senior—members of the health team should be conceded an almost monopoly position. It is one thing for the medical profession some 20 or 30 years ago to look down their noses condescendingly at other professionals on the health team and say that they have nothing to offer. Indeed, one does not have to go back 30 years; no more than two years ago in the House, our own Minister of Health, a doctor, made some comment to the effect that he was not certain what chiropractic was, but he conceded that many

people felt that it was providing a service, and therefore he was not going to argue the point any further.

That rather condescending attitude of the medical profession towards the chiropractors is still there. But it is out of date, Mr. Speaker, and I would just like to quote, if I might, two or three observations from one of the most recent Canadian studies that have been made, the Lacroix commission in Quebec that looked into the whole position of chiropractics—I quote it for another reason, Mr. Speaker. A year or two ago, when the Ontario chiropractic association came to the government, and the government then used as its excuse the fact that it was awaiting the report of the Hall commission, it was indicated that the Lacroix report would be accepted as an addendum to the Hall commission report, all this was being awaited. Let us just briefly take a look at two or three comments in the Lacroix commission report:

> A doctor wishing to use manipulative treatment without having received thorough specialized training would commit as dangerous and inadmissible an act as a chiropractor who might attempt surgery without receiving the appropriate medical training.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have now reached the stage where there is considerable evidence that doctors are sometimes outside their field of skills in the manipulative process because they have not had the training. There is plenty of medical observation, some of which has been put on the record earlier by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, that doctors simply do not know this field.

I do not say this critically, they do not happen to get the training in that area. Chiropractors have it. They have a contribution to make in the health team.

The second quotation from the Lacroix commission:

> The physician who has received a complete medical training and has practised his profession regularly cannot, in our humble opinion, use manipulative therapy without grave danger unless he has received long and careful specialized training in the use of the manipulative method in treatment.

Another quotation, Mr. Speaker:

> The preponderance of the evidence received indicates that the teaching of this technique is not part of the medical curriculum and we believe that chiropractors who have taken a long course in an accredited school may have received instruction and training giving them a sounder preparation for the administration of the spinal therapeutic method than the physician who, in spite of his medical studies, has not been taught it.

Well I could go on. It simply documents, from a recent impartial observation by a distinguished jurist in the province of Quebec, after hearing representations from a full range of people including the medical profession, that doctors in most instances simply are not equipped, they are not trained, for this kind of service. Therefore why the medical profession, and indeed why this government, which presumably operates on the basis of public need, should exclude these people from the health team and should not include them under OMSIP coverage, at the moment I cannot understand.

I repeat, I think it is discrimination.

Mr. Speaker: This concludes the debate on the resolution.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into committee of supply.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

It being six o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 93

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1967

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Estimates, Department of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Spooner 3269

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Spooner, agreed to 3301

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1967

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, it has been common practice in the past, when presenting the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs, to describe in considerable detail the organization of the department, and the various programmes it administers. However, it is my intention to continue the approach I initiated last year: to use this opportunity to outline some of the highlights of the activities of my department, and to discuss some of the major problems facing Ontario's municipalities. I am sure members will agree that this will provide a useful framework for a meaningful examination of the policies and practices of my department.

Perhaps the one activity of municipal government which affects all citizens most directly in the long run is the planning and direction of the development of the physical environment. It is to this subject that I wish to turn first.

In the field of community planning, a trend which is gaining significance is the emergence of joint planning programmes to guide the physical growth of closely associated groups of municipalities. Several municipalities made important steps in this direction during 1966, and it is gratifying to know that other municipalities are giving serious and thorough consideration to initating such programmes. As I have mentioned on previous occasions, we will actively encourage any reasonable proposal for a broadly based joint planning programme.

There is no room for complacency, however. While many municipalities are participating wholeheartedly in planning programmes, there are many that are not. It is true that a substantial part of our population now enjoys the advantages of an official plan to guide and coordinate future physical development, but a disturbingly large number of communities do not have these important measures in force, and some that are in force are sadly in need of revision. As in the case of some official plans, some zoning by-laws that are in force are themselves "substandard," and require drastic overhaul. Most municipalities experiencing any significant degree of urban development have recognized the need to control the subdivision and use of land, but there are still municipalities that have not taken even these elementary steps to protect their citizens from unplanned and substandard development.

There is genuine cause for concern about the current housing shortage in many parts of Ontario. The government has announced details of programmes which will, I believe, materially alleviate this shortage. However, this is a very complex matter. Enough is known about the characteristics of this shortage—its regional patterns and differing effects upon various types of housing—to make it very clear that this scarcity cannot be attributed to any single cause.

It has been suggested in some quarters that the major responsibility for the shortage of housing lies in the subdivision process, and particularly in procedures that are unnecessarily complicated, rigid and lengthy. I do not accept the validity of this claim. The process leading up to the approval of a plan of subdivision is the means whereby the appropriate public agencies have an opportunity to assess the soundness of a proposed new addition to the urban fabric of our province. Even the most competent and responsible developer is likely to have only a short-term interest in a new development, compared to the continuing interest of the municipality and the province.

In our increasingly complex society, urban development must be viewed as a partnership between private enterprise and public agencies. The responsibilities of the public agencies are as important as those of the private developer. It is the public agencies that normally provide many of the services that determine whether or not a particular development will be successful. And we must not forget that it is the public agencies which assume the responsibility for maintaining services to support a development over the decades to come—and for correcting, at public

expense, any serious defects that may come to light as time passes.

We know from long and sometimes bitter experience that the proper time to resolve questions of land use, road patterns, standards of services, allocation of service costs, provision of educational and recreational facilities, and so on, sir, is when land is being subdivided. Failure to do this means running the risk of leaving unprotected the interests of future purchasers of land in the development, the interests of the municipality, and in many cases, the interests of the province.

As seen from this long-run perspective, the procedures for evaluating new subdivision plans is one major way in which we can ensure that our children, and their children, will live in an environment unspoiled by our mistakes. This is a heavy responsibility, and one entailing the expenditure of much time and effort by both the municipalities and the provincial government. Any attempt to reduce the time involved in this process must be weighed against this responsibility.

This is not to say that the present arrangements for approving plans of subdivision cannot be improved. To the best of my knowledge, most planning boards and municipal staffs are working efficiently in this field, and the increase in the number of local authorities with qualified planners on staff is continuing. At the provincial level, the total number of staff assigned to this work has grown and will be increased. However, I am not sure that this is sufficient. I have set in motion a thorough study of a large block of applications for approval of new subdivisions, to find out whether there are avoidable delays on the part of provincial or municipal agencies—or perhaps on the part of subdividers.

I should also note that the Ontario law reform commission has engaged Professor J. B. Milner, who is a member of the faculty of law of the University of Toronto, a past president of the town planning institute of Canada, and an internationally respected authority on planning law in Canada, to study and report on the present state of planning law in Ontario. Professor Milner is expected to examine this subject in depth, and I, therefore, anticipate that his findings will be of great assistance to me in assessing the efficiency of our present subdivision approval process, as well as the many other elements in our general system of community planning in Ontario.

The responsibilities of government in the area of subdivision development are only one example of the pressures being exerted upon local government by the rapidly changing nature of the society within which government must operate.

We have all been exposed many times to the projections and predictions of planners, economists and others concerned with the direction and effects of these changes. In particular, we have become familiar with the term "urbanization" as applied to the process of urban growth which touches every one of us, whether we live in a township, village, town, city or metropolitan community. We realize that it is no longer realistic to deal separately with rural and urban problems. It has become the every day experience of more and more citizens to cross municipal boundaries for goods and services, or to live in one municipality and work in another.

A significant indication of the fusion of town and country is revealed in the changing composition of municipal councils, where members may represent urban, suburban and rural interests, reflecting the mixture of our population and the diversities of our economy. The solutions which we have used in the past to reconcile these interests now provide but temporary remedies. The rate of urban growth now requires an attack upon the larger issues which confront not single municipalities, but large groups of municipalities.

As a consequence of this accelerating change, the resources of my department have been directed increasingly towards a programme that considers the needs of each municipality in terms of the role a municipality should play in a larger region or area. A prime illustration of this approach lies in the local government reviews, which we have undertaken in several areas in cooperation with municipalities.

Earlier in this session, the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) described at some length the progress we have made to date in seven areas where local government studies have been undertaken and also noted that certain recommendations have been submitted to me by commissioners reporting on three of these study areas. In the same speech, the Prime Minister also dealt with the basic principles which the government will seek to use in implementing any changes in the structure and function of municipal government. It is not my intention, therefore, to review the general situation.

I should acknowledge, however, that I am aware of other discussions taking place which may lead to new requests for local government reviews. In this connection, it is our

policy to encourage representatives of the municipal councils in an area to meet as often as necessary, and with members of my staff if desired, in order to reach the full measure of accord required for a successful local government review. Without this climate of mutual concern and an appreciation of shared responsibility for strengthening local government services, the value of any research findings may be lost, and the significance of any recommendations may not be fully understood.

Perhaps, this is an appropriate time to note that our programme of local government reviews has implications for my department's relationships with other departments of the provincial government. After a local government review is completed, I will consider the commissioner's recommendations, together with any briefs and comments submitted to me by local authorities, interested organizations and individuals. The proposals we will then put forward will give primary consideration to the appropriate level of responsibility for specific local functions and services. While our direct responsibility for the administration of legislation pertaining to municipal affairs keeps us in constant touch with other departments, we are now establishing a much closer liaison with those departments whose special interests or functions may be affected by changes in the structure of local government.

It may be possible at a future time to apply some broad principles in the re-organization of local government throughout the province, but our experience to date lends support to our policy of conducting further studies in designated areas over the next two or three years.

For example, while we are dealing with two cities, one county, three villages, and 11 townships in the Ottawa area, we must at the same time have regard for the special features and functions of our national capital. In the Niagara peninsula, where industrial growth is combined with a highly specialized form of agriculture, particular attention must be given to land use and the overall planning for future development. In considering the problems of Peel and Halton counties, we must be mindful of the role these two counties play in relation to Metropolitan Toronto on the east and the county of Wentworth and the city of Hamilton to the west.

I might add one further illustration, Mr. Chairman, of the need for giving particular attention to the special characteristics of the area where a local government review has been initiated. I am referring to the Muskoka district study which, after lengthy deliberations and a number of consultations with members of my staff, formally began last month. Until now, the local committees which have been set up in connection with local government reviews have been made up exclusively of elected representatives. In contrast, the Muskoka district committee will include, in addition to elected representatives, individuals nominated by the Muskoka district council to represent the interests of cottagers, resort owners, and the industrial community. Such is the relentless spread of urbanization that we can no longer classify the Muskoka district as an exclusively recreational area. Because of these changes in the nature of the area, we have ensured that we will obtain, through the liaison committee, the points of view of those who represent seasonal activities, the interests of permanent residents, and the needs of industries locating there.

The problems of growth and change have a direct impact on the financial position of municipalities. Our municipalities are faced with the need to provide new services, to expand urban services into areas which were previously rural, and to up-grade the standards of existing services. To ensure that funds are available to satisfy these and other demands places a heavy burden on the fiscal resources of the municipalities and the province.

It is vital that the province and municipalities determine a system of priorities to ensure that each service is provided with adequate finances. Fortunately, the steady growth in our economy has resulted in a healthy increase in the property tax assessment base of our municipalities. However, this increase in assessment has not kept pace with financial demands upon local government. In recognition of this, the province has raised substantially its contributions towards the cost of municipal services.

For example, grants for roadways have been increased progressively. In 1955, subsidies to municipalities for the maintenance and construction of roadways were $40 million. In 1965 this sum had increased to almost $130 million.

On social and family services, the trend is even more pronounced. In 1955, less than $9 million was paid in subsidies, while in 1965 the corresponding figure was $33 million.

There has also been a dramatic increase in the subsidy in aid of municipal services generally, a programme administered by my

department. In 1955 the unconditional per capita grant paid to municipalities amounted to $12 million. In the estimates now before us there is a provision to increase this subsidy by $1.50 per capita, and the total amount to be transferred to municipalities by means of this grant is estimated at $40 million. On the average, this may be expected to reduce the mill rate payable by the residential and farm taxpayer by almost five mills.

I have cited a few specific illustrations of provincial aid to municipalities. As has been mentioned previously in this session, it is significant that, for every dollar levied by municipalities, the province contributed 70 cents towards the cost of local services. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that in 1955 the corresponding figure was only 53 cents.

I need not remind you that the tremendous physical expansion experienced in this province has necessitated a corresponding increase in municipal capital expenditures. Municipalities have obtained most of these capital funds by public borrowing.

The governments of Ontario and Canada have made capital funds available to municipalities through a number of programmes in recent years. In 1966 the central mortgage and housing corporation and the municipal works assistance programme together made loans to municipalities totalling over $51 million. The Ontario government's capital financing programmes for municipal purposes, specifically the programmes of the Ontario water resources commission and the Ontario municipal improvement corporation, transferred a further $9 million to municipalities.

By far the most dramatic programme, however is that of the Ontario education capital aid corporation. In 1966, the corporation's first year of operation, municipalities and separate school boards borrowed over $121 million. As the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) pointed out in his Budget statement, because of the attractive rate of interest offered by the corporation – 5.5 per cent – municipalities will save $1.7 million in interest charges during the first year alone, and more than $24 million over the life of the debentures issued during 1966. We now anticipate that a minimum of $150 million will be borrowed from the Ontario education capital aid corporation in 1967. It is also noteworthy that this programme saves the municipalities substantial sums in underwriting and administrative costs.

A most important aspect of the financial operations of municipalities is the assessment of the real property tax base. To improve the quality of this tax base, my department is actively encouraging municipalities in the establishment of regional assessment systems.

I am pleased to report that, as of January 1, 1967, 24 counties and five territorial districts have established regional assessment systems which administer the local assessment function for member municipalities. The assessment commissioners and district assessors are responsible for making all assessments for tax purposes in 529 municipalities and 163 school sections in territory without municipal organization.

The shortage of trained and experienced municipal assessment officers makes it impossible for me to make the use of these systems mandatory throughout the province at this time. On the other hand, I am pleased with the progress to date, and at the present rate of growth the assessments for all municipalities and school sections, exclusive of the cities and separated towns, will be on a regional basis within three to four years. Accuracy and efficiency cannot be achieved on a crash programme basis. The addition of eight to ten new units per year is proving to be the best method of implementation.

In order to ensure that regional systems operate at optimum efficiency, my department has developed programmes to train local assessors in the use of modern methods and procedures contained in the new assessment manual. We are also developing new administrative techniques for the use of regional assessment officials. These include uniform data processing systems for the preparation of assessment rolls and notices, and improved methods of property inventory and mapping. My department provides financial assistance to counties, districts, cities and towns which utilize these new uniform systems and methods.

The regional assessment concept is proving to be extremely acceptable and useful. Each unit has uncovered a considerable number of properties which were either missing from assessment rolls or were under-assessed. As many of the regional units begin initiating re-assessment programmes, the full benefit of the centralized system will become available to all municipalities within the units.

So far, I have been describing various policies and programmes designed to meet the main problems facing local government. I should like to turn briefly to a discussion of the other major component of municipal government—the municipal administrator.

One of the most pressing problems facing all government is the need to attract and hold persons with the qualifications and educational backgrounds suitable to meet the challenges that face our society. In this, municipal governments are no exception. To meet this problem it will be necessary to increase the prestige of working for local government and to continue to develop both the formal and in-service training of municipal employees, in order to achieve a more efficient and professional oriented municipal civic service. Only in this way will our municipal governments be competitive in a highly competitive labour market.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that my department has an important role to play in attaining this objective. In particular, I would like to discuss some of the cooperative efforts in which we are participating with the purpose of creating an effective and efficient municipal civic service.

My department makes a substantial contribution, both financially and technically, to the development of adequate courses of study for clerks, treasurers and assessors, through the auspices of Queen's University, and in conjunction with the associations of municipal assessors and municipal clerks and treasurers. In addition, my department holds various workshops and seminars each year. These are attended by both municipal and provincial staffs and produce an excellent exchange of viewpoints and information on a wide variety of current problems.

If there is one underlying theme in local government today, Mr. Chairman, it is surely the theme of constant change. Our municipalities are living in an environment of increasing flux and mobility; and change will continue to occur whether we desire it or not. I have indicated some of the problems of change, and some of the policies being developed in my department to meet these problems.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud the hon. Minister for his address to us this evening. There was a lot of useful material for members of the Opposition to enable them to further the debate when we come to the individual items but, notwithstanding this, the fact remains that the provincial government, this government, is strangling our municipalities by failing to adopt a sensible approach to the current property tax prices and by refusing to take any initiative in putting an end to our archaic and inefficient municipal structure.

I do not think there is a member on either side of this House who would not honestly admit that we are in the midst of a crisis of municipal tax and administrative organization such as we have not seen in many years. But it seems that we, on this side of the House, are the only ones who intend to do something positive about it.

In yesterday's Toronto *Daily Star*, we saw the figures that spell out the inequality and the hardship that is imposed by the present tax structure. In fact, we have seen the figures in the newspapers from all parts of this province in the past month or so. Taxes at the local level have increased between 10 and 15 per cent across this province this year, placing a heavy burden on municipal homeowners and a further restriction on municipal councils, which have been trying to solve the crisis in housing and provide all the services that the problem demands.

Well, let us look at some of these figures in answer to the critics sitting over there. Here is how the taxes have increased in the metropolitan area: Toronto, up $43.25; they would have been up $56 except they cut back on general purposes by $12.75; Forest Hill, one of the areas which has benefited by this government's foresight and so-called amalgamation or partial amalgamation, up $73.85, this is on the average home; Swansea, up $85.55; Scarborough, $40.40, and I would draw your attention to the article that appeared in the paper only last week, that they cut their tax levy and admitted they did so by cutting back on municipal services.

York, $57, Weston, $96.60, this is on an average home assessed at $5,000. North York, $48.70, Etobicoke, $63.40, Mimico, $56.85, New Toronto, $54.35, Long Branch, $35.85, and there again they cut down on their general purpose levy. East York, $38.65 and Leaside, $79.10. Leaside has the best ratio of industry to residential properties of any municipality in this country.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The Provincial Treasurer said there was no increase in taxes.

Mr. Ben: As I say, this works out to an average of between 10 and 15 per cent. A large percentage of the tax increase is attributed to spiralling costs of education, a responsibility which lies more properly in provincial hands—in this government's hands. Therefore, it is this government which must assume the blame for the hardship and the suffering of these people who will have to meet this tax rate.

Mr. Sopha: Kick the rascals out.

Mr. Ben: As soon as possible. The high tax rates have driven many older people out of

their homes and into high rent apartments, or they have been forced to become local charges in county homes. Young couples are frustrated because the cost of purchasing a home has been pushed beyond their means. Local taxes on farms have mushroomed to impossible proportions in most agricultural areas, compounding the pressures which are forcing many families off their land and into urban centres.

This in turn is compounding the housing crisis in our cities across the province, since the tax load prevents municipal administrations from moving ahead with essential services to accommodate increases in population, the schools, sewers, watermains, urban renewal programmes, parks and so on.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: If you can tell me where it is coming from, I will thank you for it.

In short, the provincial government's stand-off attitude is crippling local municipalities without even giving them a crutch to lean on, that is what this government is doing.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): What about Mitchell Sharp?

Mr. Ben: Well, I will do some quoting from the *Daily Star* and I will let you know what is going on: "The school tax spiral, who should pay?" "School costs strangling new housing". That is the caption on it:

> The high cost of mortgages, soaring land costs and borough red tape, all contribute to our housing crisis. But it is the enormous load of school taxes borne by local municipalities that delivers the final crushing blow to the housing hopes of thousands.
>
> The brutal, economic fact is that low-cost housing is discouraged because it requires new schools, which increase the financial burden on municipalities. It cost $598 to educate each elementary school pupil in Toronto, compared to $347 in Brantford. About 75 per cent of that cost must be carried by local taxes, notwithstanding the slightly increased grants announced yesterday by Education Minister William Davis.

I am happy to see him in the House, to hear what the Toronto *Daily Star* thinks of this. This editorial goes on later to point out:

> Part of the financial burden for schools, of course, has always been borne by the municipal tax on industry, but the squeeze on the home owner, and on the municipal treasury, has been growing steadily worse.
>
> Many Metropoliticians—

and this applies to politicians in other municipalities in this province—

> —would much prefer stalling on housing while trying to attract high assessment industrial development that pays taxes and has no children to educate.

This is exactly what has been happening. Developers have thousands of lots in Metro that cannot be built on, because council has refused to accept the education costs that home building would entail. We are building fewer homes this year than we did last year. And, towards the end of the editorial:

> The Ontario Conservative Party itself, under George Drew, promised 24 years ago to pay 50 per cent of education costs, a promise that has yet to be kept.
>
> Rather than build paper houses through its disappointing home plan, Queen's Park should tackle Metro's housing problem at its root, the crippling burden on local real estate.

Our aim, the aim of the Liberal Party and its goal, is to have the province assume 80 per cent of the cost of education, on an average, throughout the province in four years. We say that this can be accomplished without tax changes, but by economies in government operations; by economic expansion in the province; by the readjustment of federal-provincial taxes; and by giving the matter priority over other government programmes.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Ben: During the next four years this government will be receiving additional revenues exceeding $1 billion, at the present rate of taxation. That alone is sufficient to pay for the programme we propose, providing there is a party in power which is prepared to accept municipal tax reform, and specifically an increase in the provincial financial responsibility for the cost of education as a top budget priority.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: The government has stated repeatedly that it is sitting back unconcerned awaiting the report of the Lancelot Smith commission. We have heard that song many times before. After the Smith commission reports to the province, the government will have to take several months to read and digest its findings. Then we will be forced to wait for a series of conferences with municipal and federal officials and conferences to determine how the recommendations jibe with the recommendations of the Carter com-

mission. Then more months of waiting. And then—if the pattern is similar to that followed by the reorganization of government in Metropolitan Toronto—we will be presented with another half measure. As a matter of fact, you can call this the half-pint government, because they always do things in half measure.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: We say that the tax situation in Ontario today demands an immediate policy decision, and that although the Smith report will be a useful guide to the ultimate reorganization of the municipal-provincial tax structure, the decision must be made now to have the province assume more of the cost of education. The government can no longer hide behind the skirts of the Smith commission—which has been studying this problem for five years.

But this government's procrastination, this Tory procrastination, has resulted in the adoption of costly, makeshift programmes, and even they admit that they are makeshift programmes.

In this session we had first The Department of Education's announced increase in school grants of $61 million on the $52.4 million of the previous year, which is an indication that the province is little more than keeping pace with the growing cost of education.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Ben: Second, we have had an increase in the unconditional grants which has caused further inequities in the tax structure, and Metro is a fine example of this.

Now, as is known, this grant goes to Metro. It is made by the province on a population basis and the city's population, being as large as it is, materially increases the amount of this grant over what the boroughs would receive as individual municipalities, since the greater the population, the greater the per capita amount paid.

Despite this large benefit, thus created by the city of Toronto, Toronto actually loses in its redistribution by Metro on a residential assessment basis. No other item of Metro revenue or expenditure is distributed in this fashion. The method of distribution whereby the grant goes to Metro and Metro pays the grants to the different municipalities on their residential assessment—

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): All we ever do is listen to the crying from Metro.

Mr. Ben: Well, I want that noted on the record. It shows that at least one member in this House does cry for Metro, which is something that you never hear from the government side. The only representative in this House that does look after the interests of the Metro area, happens to be in the Opposition benches.

Mr. Knox: Why would they not elect you to Metro?

Mr. Ben: That is why I got here. They wanted to keep me here to handle rowdies like you.

As I was saying, no other item of Metro revenue or expenditure is distributed in this fashion. The method of distribution has cost the home owners and they alone, in the city of Toronto, more than $1 million, better than one mill each year, during its existence. This year's increase in this grant has worsened the situation. All it would take would be a simple amendment to the Metro Act to rectify it, but this government will not do it—this half pint government, as I said.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Is Toronto in financial straits?

Mr. Ben: I will give you some more figures on good, little old Toronto. Obviously, the members in the Tory party who do come from the Toronto area have not seen fit to inform the government what is going on in their own city, so we will try to enlighten you in that regard.

Thirdly, we have had the elderly home owners' tax deferment plan, which is pure folly. The government's attitude is that senior citizens should not leave anything to their estate, not even a tomb stone to mark the fact that they had spent some time on this earth.

Let us read what the *Daily Star* has to say:

THE PROPERTY TAX FAVOURS THE WEALTHY

The city of Toronto in 1965, collected 82.1 per cent of all its current revenue from taxing such real estate as houses, factories and apartments, and yet this tax in several significant ways is the most unfair, regressive and inadequate of all the ways governments have devised to raise money.

In Metro Toronto, where half the property tax goes to finance education, it has had an effect of helping to create the housing crisis. Local councils are elected to encourage home building because it means higher taxes.

This I read to you, but you never seem to appreciate it. I will read another item:

> Provincial taxes must pay for schools. There is no reason, with the evidence now before him, why Premier Robarts cannot commit the government to accept a greater share of school costs. If Premier Robarts would consider raising the provincial income tax it is the one way that is directly related to ability to pay.
>
> The Canadian tax foundation has calculated that if the province were to take over the entire cost of education and finance it out of an increase in provincial income tax it would add about $87 to the income tax of a man earning $5,000 a year with a family of four. At present such a man who owns a house worth $15,000 pays about $225 in education tax. The saving for him therefore would be approximately $138.

Therefore, I can say that our party goes on record as saving the homeowner money by driving his income tax up. We are certainly in favour of saving him $138 a year and I am sorry to hear that the government is not.

> Prime Minister Robarts suggested last year it might be necessary to raise the provincial income tax when he failed to get all the money he wanted from Ottawa. There would be no administrative obstacle to Ontario setting an extra tax and having Ottawa collect it. The federal government already does it for Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

It ends up:

> If the Conservative government will not accept the larger share of the local education financing then it will have to make way for another party that will.

I take it you will take that to heart.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: We have always advocated the income tax system.

Now the *Daily Star* also had an editorial, as a matter of fact they carried it jammed into the article captioned Provincial Taxes Must Pay for Schools, and I took them to task today over a radio programme. They captioned it, Why Should We Subsidize the Heirs?

> The basic idea is or was to rescue pensioners who might otherwise be forced by fast rising municipal taxes to sell their homes. The Conservative government—

I am going to read the final part too, because there are a few buts—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, with very great respect, this matter is not before the House at the present time.

This bill is going to go to the committee and that will be the time when you can discuss that. There is nothing in the votes of The Department of Municipal Affairs in connection with the matter that you are discussing now. I just bring it to your attention. You can carry on, if the Chairman will let you.

Mr. White: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think it is interesting to observe that the Liberal critic can only read a series of articles from the Toronto *Daily Star* in substitution for what should be an Opposition party's position.

Mr. Sopha: That is not a point of order at all.

Mr. White: That is my idea of a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, my point of order was to bring to the attention of the Chairman that the matter he was discussing was not before the House.

Now I should say that I realize, and I think the members of the House should realize also, that this hon. member who tonight is acting as critic of this department for the Opposition was only given this task at noon today, and so—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: He is making a good effort and I will appreciate it; I just wanted to mention that.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, it is tradition in this House that the lead-off speaker be given as wide a latitude as possible within his field.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, first in answer to the naïve comment of the—I was going to call him the hon. chief government Whip—that I am doing nothing but quoting from the papers, well any time I have quoted from the newspapers I have indicated to this House that I have quoted from the newspapers; and I would suggest that the press has not composed one twentieth of what I have said. So I think the remark of the hon. member is completely out of order, although it is natural for a man of his intellectual ability.

Second, although this bill is not before the House, I have to dwell on the particular editorial to point out to this House where this government has failed completely. The Opposition parties have been pleading, screaming, cajoling, begging, for years now, that this government recognize that it must assume responsibility for education; that education and its cost is not something that ought to come on the shoulders of the home owner. But it has been without effect on the deaf people sitting on the other side.

What do they do? They bring in, as has already been described in the newspapers here editorially, a half-baked measure. All I can say is for a half-baked measure it displays a lot of crust, because that is all it is.

Instead of tackling the issue as they should have by assuming the cost of education, they bring in this so-called phoney scheme. It is referred to as a folly and it is only a temporary measure. It is not even a good temporary measure because if the taxes keep going up between 10 and 15 per cent the way they are going now, it is going to take less than three years to put these poor pensioners back in the position they find themselves now. If this government had assumed the cost of education they would not have to bring in these half-baked and half-brained schemes.

So I suggest that I am perfectly in order in discussing this editorial, even though the government may not find it to their taste.

Furthermore, if we are going to get on to the subject of the bill and getting back to the so-called discussions that the Minister referred to in his speech—discussing with the municipal authorities—what discussions were there with the people responsible for implementing this scheme on the local level?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You tell us!

Mr. Ben: There were not any, I did check. Were there any discussions between this Minister or anybody in his department with the city of Toronto for instance, to determine what the effect would be on the interim tax bills? They put out interim tax bills in the metropolitan area and I point out that the way the bill reads it is up to one-half of the taxes not exceeding $150.

Now there are many homes in the metropolitan area and elsewhere in this province where the total tax is not $300. It may be $250. The end result with an interim tax bill is that the municipal government may have to give rebates to these taxpayers with all the ensuing administrative costs.

Furthermore, has this Minister's department considered the cost of registering these cautions on title? I suggest not. They will work out to about $2.50 per property, plus the administrative cost and the legal cost and the cost of lifting of this lien.

In the town of Newmarket, for instance, with a population of 10,000, it has been estimated that there may be as many as 850 applications which could produce a tax deferment financed by the province at some $127,000. The province would provide this deferment interest free to the home owners. At the going interest rate the cost to the province would be roughly $7,000 annually. In addition it will cost another $2,000 just to have the lien on the owner's property registered, and several thousand more to pay for the administration of the scheme, both at the municipal and provincial level.

So we have created this additional cost, possibly over one dollar per capita and without reducing taxes by a penny for these people, because all it amounts to is a deferment or a loan.

Now we admit the plan might provide some temporary relief for overburdened senior citizens. But it is not tackling the problem. The fact is the provincal government has been running circles around taxation issues for years. Now it appears the paper tiger, inflated just as its ego is, has caught its own tail and it will only be a few more months, I think, before it punctures itself; and it is going to be high time at that.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: If you want to see what this government has done to help Toronto, just look around you.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): The hon. member does not really believe that.

Mr. Ben: I will tell you I am becoming more convinced every day. I am becoming more and more convinced, you know. At one time I was not quite certain, but now I am becoming convinced. Every time a new estimate comes up I become more and more convinced.

A prominent law professor, W. L. Morton, says: "The metropolitan city is congested beyond human capacity. Its only defensible function is as a target for nuclear bombs." Well the way this government is operating that is about all that is left for it.

Here are some of the current urban problems. There are many of them, but these are a few of them.

1. Debt: In Metro Toronto in 1957 on the general levy nearly 17 cents were needed from every dollar to service Metro's debt. In 1965 nearly 31 cents were needed. The comparable education costs were nearly 13 cents in 1957 and nearly 18 cents in 1965. I think the figure currently is about 37 on the general rate, 37 or 38 cents.

2. Population growth: In Toronto, six out of ten persons originally came from some other place, and I was surprised to read in the estimates for the city of Toronto for the current year that the population is up to 694,000. Everybody thought that the population was going to remain static or drop but it has risen to 694,000 persons.

The Royal commission on Canada's economic prospects estimates that by 1980 80 per cent of Canadians will live in urban areas. Ontario is close to that ratio now. By 1980 it is estimated that Ontario will have a population of 8.5 million—two-thirds of that in the golden horseshoe alone.

3. Transportation problems: Metro Toronto has the third highest density of automobiles in North America, almost twice the number of cars per square mile as Los Angeles. This creates tons of air pollutants and places tremendous strain on space, streets, freeways, parking lots and garages. We must free our cities to accommodate these burdens, to solve these problems.

We, the Liberals, believe in the principles of cities. We like cities. We want to see the province cut away the red tape that threatens to strangle them so that they may represent in a tangible form the best our society has to offer.

What is needed in this province is the kind of approach to urban problems that Drury adopted attacking the rural problems in the 1920's. At that time the government saw the agricultural community required senior government involvement to solve rural blight, and so today we must accept the idea that there must be senior government involvement to solve urban blight.

We propose what would be the equivalent of the Drury reforestation programme. The first step must come at the provincial level.

There must be a single government department which can coordinate all the bodies which now have their hands in urban renewal and planning. A department of urban and rural affairs which would take from the present Department of Municipal Affairs the financing and organization of local government, municipal law, municipal organizations, and financing municipal assessment, accounting, subsidies and pensions.

The community planning branch would become a key section, concerned specifically with unsnarling all the red tape in development—rezoning and building by-laws. The department would also take under its wing the Ontario housing corporation—from Economics and Development—and a single air and water pollutant commission. Then, with the elimination of red tape and the consequent freeing of land for housing development, the easing of the education tax burden and the very efficient handling of services such as sewage and water, we will be able to take on the now monstrous problem of urban renewal.

Now we come to the reorganization of the municipal structure itself. This government has demonstrated on many occasions during its long tenure that it is either unwilling or incapable, or both, of taking any kind of initiative to reform our municipal structure—which has long been acknowledged on both sides of this House as inadequate to cope with today's myriad problems. The most recent statement of policy of "peaceful coexistence," or "let us not do anything if we can avoid it" was in February of this year.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs admitted to municipal representatives during a meeting here in Toronto that he still has no final conclusions and convictions on the kind of municipal reform that is needed. Instead, he permits a patchwork system to evolve with no coordination between regions of the province, refusing to act unless municipal officials get together on their own.

In short, the government is exactly like a bad parent refusing to look after the best interests of its own children. The man who has been charged with the responsibility of supervising municipal re-organization, L. R. Cumming, says that 20 of Ontario's 38 counties are facing problems caused by urbanization and are in need of the kind of municipal studies which have been undertaken in centres such as Toronto and Ottawa. At the same time he admits ruefully that: "we must face the prospect of writing legislation bit by bit, region by region".

Now, after a statement like that, Mr. Cumming being able to say in the same breath that the dilemma is purely a local responsibility, is inconceivable.

The province must take the initiative. This is where the recommendations of the select committee studying our municipal structure came from, and this is where the legislation

redesigning our municipal system is going to be passed. The government's "fullness of time hour glass" is running out.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, after listening to the Minister tonight, I must say that I have been somewhat impressed by the quality of the advice which has been given him by his advisors, because part of this presentation does show some real grasp of what we are facing. And except for the section of the report where he joined with the Provincial Treasurer in that great paean of praise for the municipal grants to municipalities, I would say that in a vague sort of way there is philosophy expressed here which is needed.

I would also add that it is regrettable that the general point of view which has been given to the Minister, and that the Minister has given to the House, has not been expressed in the action of this government over recent years. Ever since the report of the select committee on municipal affairs was tabled two years ago this House has had every right to expect speedy progress in bringing the Ontario municipal legislation out of the 19th century and into this one. But this has not happened.

Not yet are we getting leadership from this government in rethinking municipal patterns so that the future of our communities, of whatever size they might be, are shaped primarily for the people living in them rather than fundamentally for the commercial interests which form them, and operate within them. I have repeatedly mentioned in this House the need to update our thinking about open space in our towns and cities.

I refer the Minister to the hon. Minister of Education who is here tonight, and the two of them ought to get closer together spacially, as well as in ideas. He has issued recently through The Department of Education a manual setting out standards and definitions of terms used in the planning of public parks, public recreation areas, and public recreation structures. Page eight of this manual says this:

> The following minimal standards are recommended for park areas:
>
> (a) neighbourhood use – one acre per 1,000 population; (b) community use–two acres per 1,000 population; (c) regional and specialized use–seven acres per 1,000 population. This means there should be a total of 10 acres of developed, accessible and usable park land per 1,000 population; (d) There should be an additional 10 acres per 1,000 population of land that is in its natural or undeveloped state, but that is usable or potentially usable by the public. This sets a standard of 20 acres of publicly owned park land of all types per 1,000 population.

So says the Minister of Education and it is good advice. I will concede that to him. In the face of this standard which has been set by the manual of The Department of Education, the five per cent of land which a municipality is entitled to take from each subdivision for municipal purposes is completely inadequate. This is especially so in our cities where apartment development is taking the place of single family plans upon which the five per cent was based.

The Minister has said that he would look into this problem, but so far there has been no amendment to The Planning Act. I hope that will come before too long. Meantime, we are crowding more and more people into less and less space. Land which should now be set aside to provide open areas and breathing space for future citizens is being used for buildings and lost forever to the public domain, unless at some later date the public is to buy this land back at fantastic prices.

Then, too, in this province we continue to string unsightly wires on poles along our streets. Most northern Europeans put a stop to this practice a couple of generations ago. Even mining villages in England have underground wiring and have had it for 30 or 40 years. Yet we persist in allowing our utility companies to blight the urban scene with their maze of wires which not only create ugliness, but which are also exposed to the hazard of ice storms and falling trees which can cut off services and cause extreme inconvenience.

Surely a wealthy province like Ontario can do what much poorer jurisdictions have done long ago and mandate the putting of our wires underground in the future, and then lay long-term plans to bury those which we already have.

Again, in recent days we have heard a great deal of complaint about gravel roads in many of our subdivisions. These roads develop potholes, they throw up dust and are susceptible to very great wear. Gravel roads with open ditches should be a thing of the past when we allow subdivisions in our urban areas. And I would hope that before too long this too will be dealt with by the Minister.

These are three important areas in subdivision plans, and so far there is no hint of any move to alter our Planning Act to mandate that these things shall take place in subdivisions.

Nor is there any apparent move toward a provincial land use plan to guide future development particularly around our cities. There was, it is true, one tiny nudge in this direction when the Minister designated the townships of Cartwright and Manvers as areas of subdivision control. He did this, so the release said: "To protect both municipalities from the possibility of substantial amount of unplanned land subdivision in the near future."

The Minister has also instructed his staff to offer all possible assistance to these municipalities in proper developmental planning.

That is a good move, but these are only two municipalities out of many where unplanned and chaotic development is taking place, and which threatens immediately to take place. The Minister, himself, pointed this out on February 13 of this year, when he spoke to the Ontario association of rural municipalities.

At that time, he said that of the more than 800 rural municipalities in the province, only 358, or 44 per cent, are in areas defined for planning purposes, and, of these, only 87 have official plans.

In his annual report, the Minister pointed out that only 17 per cent of the municipalities in the province have official plans. He also said that this 17 per cent represented 72 per cent of the total population. That is a good percentage of a population.

But while it is true, the fact remains that most of the land area of Ontario is not covered by official plans. Moreover, some of this is near our cities where unplanned overspill is now taking place. Then, too, many municipalities which do have official plans are not administering them effectively, because they have not trained staff to do it. This is one of the weaknesses which the Minister, himself, has recognized from time to time.

It is interesting to note that in his February 13 speech, the Minister said this:

> If you have a planning programme, then I suggest you examine it to make sure it is adequate. If you do not have a planning programme, and there is no sign of local initiative, then together we will have to find some way of getting the job done.

This was, I suppose, a gentle veiled threat, but so far there seems to be little of the suggested action on the part of the Minister. In Britain today there is legislation requiring each municipal authority to prepare a land use plan, and to keep it up to date.

This legislation says that the Minister must demand these plans and approve them. If there is no local action, then the upper level of government steps in to see that the job is done. I know the Minister is working here, through his officials, to persuade local councils to move in the planning field. But progress is minimal and time is running out.

In Ontario, GO-transit is about to begin operation. It is heralded as the forerunner of other rapid transit lines fanning out from our centres of population. The housing shortage in this province is fast becoming a major scandal—and the Minister mentioned this tonight.

It will demand speedy construction of new homes by the hundreds of thousands. These, in turn, will generate shopping centres and all the amenities of community living. The big question facing us now is where these new housing units are going to be located.

Are we to continue the urban sprawl around our present cities? Are we going to see ribbon development spawning on farm fronts along our highways? Are we going to put more emphasis on redevolpment of our city centres, bringing people back downtown, and providing them with open space, cultural facilities and clean air?

Or are we going to develop new towns, self-contained, adequately planned for people, linked by rapid transit with each other and with the city centre, and with properly protected green belts surrounding the built-up areas?

Certainly, there is pretty general agreement among planners that continued urban sprawl is undesirable and that the proliferation of ribbon development along our roads is good for no one except the landowner and the speculator.

But to prevent these things happening, and to assure that the tragic mistakes of the past are not repeated, the provincial government must give positive and immediate leadership in respect to the new urban communities which must merge from the present housing crisis, and for the redevelopment of our city centres which are in crying need of such redevelopment. So far, there is little indication that it is ready for this task.

This failure stems, in no small measure, from its stubborn unwillingness to bring our municipal structure into the 20th century.

Municipal experts to whom I have talked here, and in Europe, say that it takes at least 250,000 people to constitute a viable municipality today. This number of people would enable the local government to take advantage of automated machinery and of computers.

It would provide the tax base to pay for modern amenities demanded by modern society and it would make possible a high degree of training and competence in municipal staffs.

According to the 1967 municipal directory, we have 966 municipalities in Ontario. This includes 17 improvement districts and 38 counties as well as Metro Toronto. Taking out the counties and Metro, we have 927 basic municipal organizations. Of these, five, only five, are over 250,000 in population.

Even if we cut the desirable population figure down to 100,000 and tried to set up viable municipalities of that number or more, we would still have only eight Ontario municipalities in that category.

In fact, in this province, 834 municipalities are below 8,000 in population, 509 are below the 2,000 mark and 93 have 400 or less.

This means that, and these figures are startling, Mr. Chairman, 99.5 per cent of our municipalities are below the generally accepted figure for efficient municipal administration. Ninety per cent are below the 8,000 figure and 8,000 people just cannot operate a successful municipality in today's complex world.

Even if we granted that 100,000 people could set up an efficient municipal government, and they cannot, we would still have over 99 per cent of our municipalities powerless to face their local government responsibilities with any real degree of adequacy.

This is a fundamental reason why little adequate planning can be done in Ontario outside the large cities, Mr. Chairman. At best, well over 90 per cent of our municipalities just cannot afford the planners and the equipment necessary to do an effective job in this, as well as in other fields. I know the majority of our people live in the larger cities, but the pressures there are creating overspill into their weaker neighbours.

I also realize that the Minister is encouraging planning areas where several small municipalities combine to set up a planning board and to hire a planning director and a planning staff. But these planning areas have no real power. Any one of the small councils concerned can veto the plan for the whole area.

All this, of course, points up the desperate need for regional municipal government, of which so much has been said on this side of the House in recent years. Again, I point out that not one Minister in this House, except possibly the Minister of Municipal Affairs, pays any attention at all to most of our present municipalities and their 19th century form of government.

More and more, the functions of these governments are being taken over by the provincial Cabinet, as each provincial department carves out its own administrative districts and takes direct charge of many of those matters which used to be dealt with at the local level.

In effect, the refusal of this government to move more rapidly toward regional municipal government is effectively destroying local government in this province.

With every passing year, as pressures mount for greater efficiency, the ability of the average small, local council to cope with an increasingly complex situation decreases and, as more larger units of administration are set up by government Ministers, there remains an ever-shrinking area of responsibility for local councils.

But this government clings tenaciously to these small units. Perhaps it is because so much of its political machine is rooted there. To disturb these tiny municipal units might damage the Tory base. In any case, it was with some interest that I read the speech given by the Minister before the northwestern Ontario municipal association on October 7 last in Fort William.

He talked about regional development and the economic regions into which the province has been divided. Then he admitted something which has been pretty obvious for some time. "Because," he said, "of a changing situation and limited finances, this development programme can no longer forge ahead. So the government has decided to provide a new means by which area participation in development planning can be more effective."

He then went on to speak of the various devices through which he hoped the government would pump new life into the listless regional development associations, now renamed "councils." Then he said this: "Although there is a central Cabinet committee, I repeat, the existing power and authority of the municipal and county councils will remain unchanged".

This has all the appearance of sheer double talk in the light of what the Minister has said here tonight and it is double talk, too, in the light of the regonal surveys going on, even though those surveys have not been implemented as yet. Or perhaps it is just pre-election assurance to keep the party grass roots happy until after the next round at the polls.

Or perhaps it really does reflect the general attitude of this government in respect to our municipal structure. Perhaps after all the talk, this government still hopes it can limp along with development councils, with urban and area planning boards, and with large Cabinet administrative units, without the need for restructuring to regional municipal government.

I said last year, and I say it again, that local government can survive here, and I believe that it should, only if the smaller municipalities can combine around strong central cities in regional municipal governments, and then only if the functions being removed from them now by the Cabinet are handed back. These powers cannot possibly be returned to the small units we now have. They can only be turned back to political units large enough and strong enough to assume them and to successfully administer them.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton East): What is wrong with the units we now have?

Mr. Young: Well Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to outline that for the member's edification. Perhaps he cannot understand it.

Mr. Henderson: I can.

Mr. Young: I stress that unless this does happen and soon, municipal government in Ontario outside the cities will have lost all its meaning. Its function will be transferred to the administrative units of the provincial government. Perhaps this is what is wanted by this administration. This government has shown a strong desire to centralize power into its own hands. Its delay in facing up to regional government is hurrying the centralizing process, consolidating the Cabinet administrative areas and making far more difficult the emergence of genuine and strong regional municipalities.

We are paying an increasingly high price for this 19th century municipal structure. As a general rule, the per capita provincial grants to municipalities vary with the size of the local units. The smaller the population, the larger the grant, per capita-wise. What we are doing is subsidizing inefficiency in municipal government. Instead of using financial sanctions to persuade the smaller units to combine into larger and more efficient units, we are paying increasing grants to bolster their anachronistic and costly inefficiency.

Mr. Henderson: There is no inefficiency.

Mr. Young: That is one of the reasons for the municipal tax crisis today. Inefficiency always means higher costs in the long run, whether it is inefficiency in business or in government. When 99.5 per cent of our municipalities representing two thirds of our population are just too small for modern, efficient and effective government, then we are paying a staggering price for our neglect to bring Ontario local government into the 1960's.

The price being paid by the local taxpayer for this inefficiency is also becoming prohibitive. Three years ago, sir, I brought to the attention of this House the plight that was building up at that time in the township of Pickering. There, Bay Ridges was built. It was a housing development without compensating industrial assessment within the township. Its industrial base lies to the east and to the west. But Pickering is cut off from these bases by artificial boundary lines.

Bay Ridges is still on minimum services. The subdivider put in what he had to, sold and got out. In a so-called advanced province like Ontario, The Planning Act should never allow this skimpy kind of development, but it still does. Now, the pressing need is emerging for more adequate services and for more schools. But the Ontario municipal board says the township can have only one-third of the capital it needs, and it needs that capital mainly for new schools.

Pickering is part of a larger region. But because no move has been made to reorganize the area east of Metro into regional government, Pickering is faced with a tax hike of 16 mills, $80 for the average homeowner with a $5,000 assessment and is denied proper facilities for educating its children.

This is only one kind of situation in Ontario in this Centennial year of 1967. Everywhere mill rates are soaring and people are revolting against the unprecedented rise in municipal budgets. And municipal taxes and those tax hikes are hitting extremely hard in the fringe municipalities which are, in effect, dormitories for their more industrialized neighbours. These municipalities should not exist as separate entities. But as long as they do, that long will they, and the province too, pay the ever rising cost of failure to modernize.

This Tory refusal to update our institutions is also the cause of further trouble on the municipal front. Time was when land was the main source of wealth and the chief source of taxation. Consequently, the land bore the burden of paying for the primitive school, the poorhouse and the simple services demanded by a frontier community.

But today our main sources of wealth stem from our industry, our mines and our timberland. Nevertheless, we still cling to the outmoded tax system which puts too much burden on the landowner, and he is generally the owner of a small lot with a house on it, or a farmer who is receiving about half his proportionate share of the national income. During the years, demands have grown at the municipal level for more and for higher quality services. And these services are absolutely essential in today's complex society.

In the educational field alone, the Ontario institute for studies in education estimates that secondary school enrolment will climb by 44 per cent between now and 1976. Elementary enrolment will not grow as fast, but movement from rural to urban areas will require large numbers of new schools in the urban areas.

Something of the magnitude of the problem can be seen from the fact that the per pupil cost in Toronto elementary schools last year was $598. Yet a house assessed at $5,000 yields only $443 a year at a mill rate of 88.6, and that is for all purposes. This too points out the difficulty faced by the Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall). Many municipalities feel they just cannot afford to have low assessment homes built within their borders. So they resist Ontario housing and delay and block the progress of the Minister's plans.

As a result of the growing crisis, municipalities are trying to cut back on essential works. Hamilton has cut out a new sewage disposal plant, thus prolonging the water pollution situation in the lakes. Pembroke has tried to reduce its police force, but the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) vetoed this, so I suppose they will have to try some other economy measure. Toronto has cut traffic control and safety measures as well as cutting down on teaching staff. Pickering is cutting down necessary school construction.

In spite of all the cutting and paring, tax rates are going up drastically. On a homeowner with a house assessed at $5,000, it is estimated—and some of these are now definite—that taxes will go up by these amounts this year: In Metro Toronto, as we have already heard tonight, the average is $60, a range from $36 to $96 in the various areas. Pickering, $84; Hamilton, $20; London, $45; Kingston, $60; Oshawa, $40; Ottawa, $37; Chatham, $32; and Brantford, $50.

But real property can no longer sustain this tax burden. Tax rates now being set are certain to bring explosive results as the tax revolt grows and spreads.

Just at supper time tonight I had a phone call from Mr. E. Natali, 110 Gracefield Ave., in my riding. He said he wanted me to tell the Prime Minister and Mr. Pearson and the Ministers of this Cabinet that he was fed up with the tax rate that he is having to pay now on his home. He just got his bill and his tax had gone up by $50 this year.

He has a $4,000 income, he has a family, he has a five-room bungalow and he is paying $350 this year. He said he could just not afford it without sacrificing food and clothing for his family. So he asked me to convey this message to the Minister and to the Cabinet here and to this government; and I am glad to oblige them and to register his protest.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): What has Mr. Pearson got to do with it?

Mr. Young: Mr. Pearson has something directly to do about it, I will tell the member that in just a moment.

Mr. Whicher: I wonder if that member thinks he could really put the taxes down if he were in power.

Mr. Young: One thing is certain; revolt will force even this government to face reality. It will force a reassessment of the whole tax structure to bring it more into harmony with the wealth-producing apparatus of the present day.

The province must assume more responsibility for expenditures which are now laid on the municipalities. Two items which should be immediately taken over are welfare and the administration of justice. Then the province must ultimately assume the burden of education costs which are growing at too great a rate for the narrow-based property tax to carry.

We propose that this be done in a staged programme to give the province time to reorganize the tax system and generate the necessary funds for this transfer of responsibility. For example, to take over five per cent in the first year would cost about $50 million maximum, the second year $100 million. Our provincial gross product increased $2.2 billion last year—that is $2,200 million—

and it will probably increase as much this year. Surely ways can be found to use $50 million out of that $2,200 million increase to assist the municipal taxpayer.

Some of that $2,200 million could also be used to pay the full cost of welfare and justice. When we find we are increasing the productive wealth of this province by $2,200 million a year do not let this Cabinet tell us that they cannot find ways and means to subsidize the municipal taxpayers more adequately.

In subsequent years, additional education costs can be taken over as now neglected sources of revenue are tapped. Just today a brochure came from the Minister of Economics and Development. In it he said this:

> Ontario's mines account for more than one-quarter of Canada's national production. Ontario produces 41 per cent of the nation's metals; 77 per cent of the uranium, 73 per cent of the cobalt, 73 per cent of the nickel, 54 per cent of the gold.
>
> Ontario's steel production represents more than 80 per cent of Canada's total output. Ontario's forests provide one-third of Canada's huge pulp and paper production.

All this is true. We do have great natural resources. They constitute the raw materials used by our great mining industry and by our timber and pulp and paper industries. Yet very little is paid for these raw materials to the people of Ontario who own most of them.

In the fiscal year, 1965-1966, reports show that Ontario collected a revenue of $16.4 million from our total mining industry. This was largely in lieu of municipal taxes which are not paid to local governments. Because of this non-payment of municipal taxes, $5.4 million of this amount was rebated to the mining municipalities and $4 million was spent on administering The Department of Mines. This leaves a net income for the people of Ontario of just over $7 million from all the raw material from all the mines in all of Ontario.

Mr. Whicher: How much corporation tax?

Mr. Young: I will come to that.

We also collected on stumpage dues and other levies on our forest industry the amount of $17.2 million in 1965-1966. Our expenditures in servicing the forest land is hard to assess.

There was $2.7 million of directly traceable expenses. But basic organization in the department cost $24.3 million. Part of this would be chargeable to parks, fish and wildlife. But the most of it would go to forest services. It would seem, if we had the detailed figures—and perhaps we will get them in the next estimate—that in the year we netted little or nothing, and likely less than nothing, from our timberland.

The year 1965 1966 was not unusual in this respect. But even if we forget this cost of basic organization and charge it all to parks, fish and wildlife, then we would still have something like $22 million net from our forest and mining resources. These combined forest and mining enterprises constitute a $2 billion industry.

But while we netted this small amount from the raw material we own which was used by these industries, one of these corporations alone, Inco, netted $118 million in clear profit last year and $143 million the year before; and that is after all taxes and all expenses.

This government charged that corporation something in the nature of $7 million or $8 million—the Minister will not give us the exact figures—in lieu of municipal taxes and for the underground raw material which we own. Out of that, the company made a clear profit of well over $100 million a year, and makes it regularly.

Surely there is a source of revenue here. We could charge the corporation using our timber and mineral ore far more than we now do for the raw materials out of which they make this kind of money. We could charge stiff royalties for our metal and higher stumpage dues for our timber and pulpwood and bring the revenue thus realized into the provincial Treasury to help pay for the cost of educating our children and thus assisting the hard pressed municipal taxpayer.

Mr. Sopha: But to be fair, they paid something towards education too.

Mr. Whicher: Give us another example besides Inco.

Mr. Young: Other sources of ready revenue have been outlined by this group from time to time. The weight-distance tax on commercial highway users, so long ago recommended by the Prime Minister of this province and the committee headed by him. As well, a broader income and corporation income tax base with fewer loopholes, as recommended by the Carter commission, would greatly assist in moving the burden from the small property holder to the large-scale industrial and raw resource users of this

land. The long overdue capital gains tax, also strongly advocated by the Carter commission, would end the tax holiday which this kind of wealth increase has enjoyed, and establish the principle that our tax system should be based on ability to pay.

In addition the federal government must be urged to play a more active role in solving the problems which our developing urbanized society is creating. The Speech from the Throne at Ottawa this week had a few hints indicating that the federal government was awakening to its responsibilities in this field, and we hope it is. With costs at the provincial and municipal levels rising more rapidly than at the federal level and with the more flexible tax sources in Ottawa's hands, federal assistance for urban betterment programmes is absolutely essential.

We must press there for more help with anti-pollution programmes, transit networks, urban renewal, land assembly, recreational facilities and other programmes for solving the problems of urban life.

This government must face the facts of municipal life. A tax crisis of major proportions is with us, yet at the same time we have the resources and we are generating the wealth to meet that crisis. However, the archaic institutions to which this government clings with such tenacity, put the burdens in the wrong places and crush the small taxpayer with too heavy a proportion of the cost of the services necessary in our society.

As this government well knows, the storm signals are out. And because they are out, an election has been delayed. The people of Ontario are moving toward a new concept of life, and part of that concept is a reorganization of government from top to bottom. The winds of change are blowing and the rising tide of popular demand cannot much longer be stayed by the King Canutes on the government benches. Regional government must come, and soon. A revamped tax structure must redistribute the present tax burden. With a New Democratic government in this province, after the coming election—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: These things will be realized, and that day just cannot come too soon for the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I might make a few comments. I have some difficulty in restricting my comments to the vote that is now before the House, because the commentaries by the two hon. gentlemen have reached rather far afield, and I am not criticizing that, that is perfectly all right. But my particular concern is the votes that are before us in this department.

I realize that there are urban problems in the metropolitan area that the hon. critic of the official Opposition spoke about. As far as cutting away red tape is concerned in dealing with urban renewal projects, in dealing with subdivision plan approvals, in dealing with planning amendments and amendments to various by-laws that I have to deal with, we do our very best to eliminate red tape. But I think it is inevitable that in every function of this kind, concerned as it is with the welfare of people, and there are always two persons involved in so many of these things, their opinions and their rights must be respected.

In dealing with these matters there are built-in safeguards for land owners, for land developers, for people who have interests in these various functions that are performed by municipalities and performed by The Department of Municipal Affairs. I think that the best interests of the population are served properly by a certain amount of red tape and I am not criticizing in mentioning it. I do know that it does exist and I suggest to you that we in the department do our very best to eliminate red tape if at all possible.

I mentioned as an example in my opening remarks that I had asked for the complete examination of a large block of subdivision plans, to ascertain just where delays did occur. I get letters from people who write to me and say: "I have had a plan before your department for so many months, and I am not getting any action, will you please look into it." I suggest to you that on all the occasions where matters of this kind have been brought to my attention, I have found that the delays were not occasioned by department personnel, but were occasioned by someone outside who had an interest in this particular subdivision plan.

I hope that we can acquire more staff, and if you look at the annual report of the department which has been in your hands for some time, you will find that for instance, in attempting to enlarge the planning branch staff this year, it has been necessary for us to obtain staff from the United Kingdom. We have made many attempts to engage staff in Canada and the United States, but without success. We then advertised in the United Kingdom and were able to engage a number of qualified planners who have come to our department.

Of course it is going to take some time for them to become oriented, if I may use that word, to the functioning of our particular form of operation, but when we consider the success that we have had with enlarging the staff, for instance, of the finance branch some years ago, when we brought staff in from other jurisdictions, we have been very pleased with the work that they have performed for us. I can hope that we will have the same success with the planning branch staff that we have brought in from the United Kingdom.

Mr. Whicher: Do those people from the British Isles understand our problems as soon as you bring them over?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I think you could say they do.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Most of the people work for the CBC, though!

Mr. Whicher: You will soon have everybody working for the government. You cannot get any more Canadians.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: As a matter of fact, as an aside—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is an interesting comment from a Liberal with a small "l" or big "L".

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Spooner: There are more good jobs than there are people to fill them in Canada today, I think you can say that. I operate a very small business. I would like to hire a good man. I have given up, what is the use? I am wasting my time.

Mr. Whicher: You are giving so much welfare out nobody will work any more, that is the reason.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): You have been asking for more welfare?

Mr. Whicher: That is right. Nobody will work any more.

Mr. MacDonald: The Liberals are more Tory than the Tories.

Mr. Whicher: You have got them on welfare. Yes, I can apply for a job.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I will be glad to consider your qualifications.

Mr. Whicher: Well I will tell you, things will speed up over there. Either that, or I will be fired in about 24 hours.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh no. we will give you more time than that. Let us get back to the farm.

The hon. member on behalf of the New Democratic Party spoke about the five per cent requirement for public lands in subdivisions. I might bring to his attention that The Department of Education bulletin which you quoted from is not inconsistent with the standards of The Department of Municipal Affairs, not at all.

The five per cent qualification is not meant to cover all municipal open space requirements at all.

Mr. Young: But it does in most places.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, if this is deemed inadequate by the municipality they can require the developer to provide private open space when the development occurs, through zoning by-laws. The municipality can also, should they wish, purchase land for open space and for park purposes, if they believe it is necessary and appropriate to their particular needs.

I agree with you in connection with the unsightly wires on hydro poles, but there is always the question of economics in these things, and we talk about the high cost of housing and the high cost of urban renewal projects, and the high cost of this thing and that thing.

To give you an example, in one of the urban renewal projects in this province, it had been recommended that underground wiring should be installed. Of course, it was necessary for us to obtain a figure as to the cost of this additional work. When that cost was made available, it was so high that our federal partners and our municipal partners and ourselves could not see at this time the justification for that expenditure. In order to provide more housing for the purposes needed we said: "Well, we will just have to put up with only a small portion of this urban renewal project having underground wiring."

Mr. Young: I wonder if the Minister would permit an observation at this time? It is just this, Mr. Chairman, that in my experience in this field—and I have talked to a great many people in the field of development—that if and when these conditions are mandated, underground wiring for example, then the subdivider knows ahead of time what his ex-

penses are going to be and he offers less for the land because of that.

In other words, these mandated conditions which make for better living and better communities ultimately come out of the speculative value of the land. That is, instead of going through the hands of two speculators, each one making $5,000 an acre out of it, it may go through the hands of two speculators, each one making $2,000 out of it. In other words, if these conditions are laid down and they are known ahead of time, that speculative factor will be a little less in order to provide for the services demanded.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is one way of arguing the point, but I am just giving you a personal experience which I had quite recently.

Mr. MacDonald: How do you explain Britain and European countries financing such underground wiring?

Mr. White: You had better check that out with the member for Woodbine.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The hon. member was speaking about bringing municipal structures up to date and remarking that a viable community had to have a population of 250,000 people. Well as you so ably presented your case, there are only very few communities in this province which have that many persons living in what would be the viable community.

Mr. Whicher: You could shoot everybody else.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Shoot everybody else! I do not think I would agree with that.

Admittedly there are many small communities in this province and they have great difficulty in obtaining the services of properly qualified administrators, clerks, treasurers, assessors and so on; but I do not know how you can add to the population that fast in order to meet the criteria you are trying to achieve.

Mr. Young: Create larger municipalities!

Hon. Mr. Spooner: We are doing exactly that. Our local government reviews are based on that premise, that in order to obtain greater efficiency there has to be a consolidation of services and a consolidation of the administration. I suggest to you that we are making progress in that respect.

We have not as yet reorganized any of these areas because there has not been sufficient time.

We did receive a report of the studies conducted in the Ottawa-Eastview-Carlton county area. I examined this report, it was examined by the municipal leaders, and in due course of time I went to Ottawa with some members of my staff. I presented a case before the municipal leaders and said, "This is what I recommend."

I am giving them time to analyze that, because I suggest to you that without the support and the cooperation of the local people, there would not be enough of an army in Canada to support a dictator who would want to shove these things down the throats of people who do not want to cooperate. We are working on that basis, but there must be cooperation at the local level in order for us to make progress.

We received the local government report on the studies conducted in Lincoln and Welland counties. The important thing there—and conditions there vary so much from the Ottawa-Eastview-Carleton county area—the situation in that area indicated that the first thing we have to discover is how much a reorganization is going to cost some of the municipalities that are greatly concerned about it.

When we examine the tax base, or the base for dividing costs, we found that there is so much disparity between municipal assessments in the various municipalities that I then made a proposition to these people that the province would undertake to pay a large portion of the cost of a complete reassessment in the two counties. Then we would be in a position to tell them just how costs would be reallocated.

I think that is important. We cannot go into areas like that and say, we think it is going to cost you so much in the year 1969 or 1970; when we know very well it would not be honest, we know very well the assessment varies so much from one municipality to another, particularly in one of those counties.

Mr. MacDonald: How long does the Minister estimate the reassessment will take?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The reassessment would take at least three years.

There again we are faced with the problem of staff, because you must continue the ordinary assessment functions in each municipality. My assessment branch staff and others have looked into this situation and they have come to the conclusion that by using the staff

that we could loan from the department and the staff that could be available from the municipalities, because they would not be conducting as complete an assessment each year as they would ordinarily, that it would take at least three years to perform this particular reassessment task.

Mr. MacDonald: And any action on the Mayo report would be postponed?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Would be postponed! I should qualify my statement respecting reassessment that in my opinion this is the number one requirement. Now then I have so advised these municipalities. I have asked them to consider my proposition and I have already received some reaction from some of them; and I suggest to you it is mostly favourable.

But there may be others who come up with a better scheme than the one I have proposed. I am willing to listen to that; but we are prepared to make a rather large grant toward the cost of this reassessment, because I think that basically is the point that has to be settled first.

On the area that was mentioned, the area located east of Toronto, there have been a number of discussions between myself and officials of the department regarding the possible setting up of a regional organization east of Metro. That is being examined rather quietly by a number of the municipal leaders in that area.

The member made some reference to the Speech from the Throne in Ottawa this week where comments were made with respect to what would appear to be some rather important statements contained in that Speech from the Throne which might have some beneficial effects in the provinces of Canada.

I was in Ottawa for several days last week meeting with other Ministers of provincial governments and also with some of the federal people with regard to a number of matters that are mentioned in the Speech from the Throne which was read just the other day. I would think that the federal government has over a period of time acquired a greater appreciation of some of their responsibilities with respect to matters that are now entirely or mostly provincial responsibilities. I would hope that we will, as the session of Parliament progresses, see some rather interesting legislation which would indicate some federal support to a number of provincial functions and municipal functions.

As the representative of Ontario I have extended our cooperation to the federal authorities and have said that subject to comments of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I am prepared to say that we are prepared to accept any financial undertakings that they might see fit to make that would apply Canada-wide.

I would hope, sir, that I might be in a position to answer the particular questions on individual votes, and we may proceed from there.

On vote 1401:

Mr. Sopha: I suppose matters of policy fall under the head of the main office. In a recent celebrated radio programme, the Prime Minister of Ontario expressed the opinion that the churches should be taxed at the municipal level.

Now may I ask the Minister if that is the policy of this government and his department? And may I ask what steps are being taken within The Department of Municipal Affairs to implement the policy that the Prime Minister has apparently laid down, albeit through the medium of a radio interview?

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member for Sudbury will agree that this should come under vote—

Mr. Sopha: Oh no, I do not agree with that. This is a matter of policy.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I think I can answer it now, Mr. Chairman. I might say, sir, that this is not government policy and I think the Prime Minister—

Mr. Sopha: When the Prime Minister is speaking is it not government policy? I wish he was here to hear that.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I was going to suggest to you, with great respect, that if you wish to place that question before him when he is in the House tomorrow he will be very pleased to answer it.

An hon. member: Take it up with—

Mr. Whicher: Take it up with the other London man.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: We must bear in mind that the question of exempt properties within municipal boundaries is becoming more and more serious. As an example—well, it is all right for you to laugh, you have not been here all day nor all night and I do not appreciate the giggle, I am trying to be serious.

Mr. Singer: I will laugh if I want. If you are so sensitive then do not make such silly statements.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is not a silly statement.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Let us be most serious now.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: As an example, there is a section in The Assessment Act which has been there for a long number of years dealing with the exemption of properties owned by certain recreational associations. Some of these associations are acquiring large tracts of land, and I suggest to you that there should be a limit placed on the amount of land that they can acquire in municipalities that are far removed from the area where the persons who make use of the recreational facilities live.

The result of that is an imposition on that particular municipality where the land is located to provide services without sufficient revenues. This question of tax exemptions is one that is under study and review, and in due course of time I would hope that we would see some reduction in what has become quite a serious situation in many communities.

Now, with reference to the Prime Minister's statement about church properties, I would say to you that that is not government policy as it is presumed to have been enunciated by the Prime Minister. If you would like to ask him the question when he is present, I am sure that he would be willing to answer it.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I must assume that the Prime Minister is afraid of Gordon Sinclair.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Afraid of Gordon Sinclair?

Mr. Sopha: I must assume that. He is in some trepidation of Gordon Sinclair, because Gordon Sinclair's views are well known. He had the first citizen of Ontario on his programme and he put the question right to him. He laid it right on the platter to him on the programme and I have heard a replay of it—that is the programme where he appointed the Provincial Treasurer Lin Piao his number one man and he made the rest of you second class citizens by doing it. However, I pass that over.

But Sinclair put it to him and they say Sinclair nearly fell off his chair when the first citizen said, I agree with that, that they should be taxed.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, I cannot argue with you.

Mr. Sopha: That is his own opinion?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He did not get a chance to go on further.

Mr. Sopha: That is his own opinion? Well, let him speak for himself. That is what he said. But I do say this though, that what the government wants to consider is that if they remove these exemptions from the churches it will increase the burden on that portion of our citizens that support the churches. I do not know what proportion it is that actually pay any money by way of gifts or offering to the churches, but I would judge that it is not a very impressive percentage of them. They will have to bear the burden by increased givings to the churches in order to pay the cost.

But the only thing that is bothering me about it—and seldom do I approach a subject that I do not express an opinion—is that when the government comes along to expropriate some of the land—there have been many illustrations of this—the churches want the full value of the realty and they do not make any allowance for the fact that for a good many decades they have had the gratuitous benefit of police and fire protection and of street lighting and all the other services.

Mr. MacDonald: And no liens.

Mr. Whicher: It is a wonder the government has not put a lien on it.

Mr. Sopha: And no liens. That society has provided them municipal services, but they never make an allowance for the fact that they got those benefits from society.

One illustration, without singling out any one group, is that right over here, right next door to us, when that land had to be acquired for the building of those office buildings over there, it becomes apparent they got the full value and the man with the cheque book, the Minister of Public Works had to pay them, I forget now what it was. I will be corrected, it was either $4 or $5 million.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Where was this?

Mr. Sopha: Right next door. East block. Beyond the East block. Wellesley and Bay. Well, what way am I pointing? Straight ahead.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I thought you were pointing down University Avenue.

Mr. Sopha: I am told that a charitable organization has owned that land since about 1890 and had held the land free of municipal taxes up until the time that the province had to bargain for it, and the Minister came with his cheque book and he gave them the $4 or $5 million which—

An hon. member: Taxpayers' money.

Mr. Sopha: Taxpayers' money, yes, and they put away and invest. One would wonder what an organization would do with that quantum of money that they got. As I say, that is just one facet of it that has always bothered me. And who am I to say that maybe Sinclair is right?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are on both sides now.

Mr. Sopha: He says that he does not believe in the Almighty and maybe the rest of us are wrong and maybe he is right. But he also says that if at the time he breathes his last that he realizes there is a hereafter, then Sinclair is going to be the biggest fool that ever was created.

An hon. member: Who will know that?

Mr. MacDonald: He will send a message back through the Liberal leaders.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Who will know that? But one thing is clear, the Prime Minister really went for him, and he did not want to tangle with Gordon Sinclair. Throughout the whole programme of course it was quite apparent that the Prime Minister did not want to tangle with Sinclair. He did not want to tangle with anybody on that programme. And when Sinclair raised it—

Mr. MacDonald: He is fun to tangle with.

Mr. Sopha: He is quite a Tory, Sinclair.

Mr. MacDonald: The best foil in the world.

Mr. Sopha: He is quite a Tory. But I am disappointed, I really am disappointed, and I conclude on this note, that apparently the Minister of Municipal Affairs has more power than I thought he had. I thought he had been relegated to the nether regions since the emergency of the number one man in the government, the Provincial Treasurer. The Prime Minister can talk one way in an election year, but the Minister now tells us quite frankly—and he is always frank with us—that notwithstanding those utterances of the head man of the government, that is not government policy. Maybe someone will tell the Prime Minister that the Minister said that, and maybe he will be reading The Unemployment Insurance Act tomorrow.

Mr. Whicher: Maybe we should adjourn and find out what is going on.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, are we going to leave the discussion of assessments and exemptions until later on, or do we intend to proceed under this section?

Mr. Chairman: We will deal with the assessment under vote 1404. I think that will be in order.

Mr. Ben: So we will drop this and no other member is going to get up and enter on discussion of assessments?

Mr. Chairman: I would say that would be the proper procedure.

Mr. Ben: Fine. Mr. Chairman, over ten years ago, I had the pleasure of touring the east coast and Cape Breton Island especially. They have a golf course there, Keltic lodge golf course, and some hon. members here may have played it. It is a fantastic course and I recall, at the time, that the fee was only 50 cents a round.

It is in a national park—I think Cape Breton national park—but although it was a most fabulous course, beautifully laid out and with a fee of only 50 cents, you had difficulty getting a caddy to go the full 18 rounds.

The reason for this was that they wanted to take advantage of the layout which, they tell me, is supposed to be similar to St. Andrews in Scotland. The course was so designed that the distance you travelled from the green to the next tee, was longer than the distance from the tees to the greens, and the result was that the caddies would only go—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am sorry, I cannot follow you because I have never played golf in my life and I do not know anything about golf courses. What is the point that you are trying to make? Should it be assessed or otherwise?

Mr. Ben: The point is the caddies would only go 14 holes; they would not play the whole course because more time was wasted—

Mr. MacDonald: What vote is this on?

Mr. Ben: —walking from the green one finishes, on to the next tee.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Minister wants you to explain the difference between a tee and a fairway.

Mr. Ben: —playing the game so to speak. The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is this: on the business of processing plans, as for instance, in this city where you have to go through about 20 different departments, including this government, the result is, I rather suspect, that more time is lost going from department to department than perhaps is spent by departments processing the plans. I hope the Minister now sees the—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Now that you are into plans and have forgotten all about golf courses, that is okay with me. I am with you. We are now on the same wave length.

Mr. Ben: So much time is lost going from one department to another department with these plans, and the plans have to wait there until somebody picks them up and gives them his attention. When he finishes, he writes some notes and it is sent on to another department where again it must wait in a basket.

Mr. Chairman: Is the member on vote 1401 or 1402?

Mr. Ben: Absolutely.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Vote 1402.

Mr. Chairman: The planning branch is under vote 1402.

Mr. Ben: I beg your pardon? I am referring to the statement the hon. Minister made.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1402 is community planning.

Mr. Ben: This is not community planning.

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with vote 1401, and you were talking about community planning.

Mr. Ben: No, I was not. I did not mention the word community at all. I am talking about subdivision planning.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member to confine his remarks about planning to vote 1402.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: They are, but it is still on policy. It is a question of policy.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I think I can answer that.

Mr. Ben: I have not made the point yet. You are a mind reader now.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I will be quiet. You tell me when you want to ask the question.

Mr. Ben: The only thing is that there be one department set up, staffed with people who have knowledge of the requirements of the various departments that must now peruse a proposed plan.

This knowledge could be acquired by seconding people to other departments to acquire this knowledge, so that when the plan of subdivision comes, it would go to one committee, or one department, charged with approving the plans on behalf of all the departments involved.

Mr. Chairman: If the member will just excuse the interruption for a moment, I think we agreed that we would discuss these votes, item by item, under their proper headings. We have completed the policy discussion. We are dealing with vote 1401 and I see nothing in there about plans.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, if I may be so bold, one would gather from the items that are before us that this is a very compact department. You have mentioned community planning. It mentions salaries, travelling expenses, maintenance, expenses on survey and design of townsites. So this does not fall within this particular vote, 1402.

The next vote is municipal finance, salaries, travelling expenses—vote 1403. It does not fall within that department.

The items under municipal finance are municipal accounting branch matters, it does not fall within that. Municipal finance branch, it does not fall in there, municipal subsidies branch—

Mr. Chairman: The processing of lands comes under vote 1402.

Mr. Ben: It does not come under vote 1402. It says, "Expenses on the survey and design of townsites," and I am not dealing with the survey or design of townsites.

The next vote, 1404, is municipal administration. In other words there is not another item under which you can discuss the processing—

Mr. Chairman: Under vote 1402. The processing of lands comes under vote 1402. The community planning branch.

Mr. Ben: If you so want to rule, but I suggest it does not come under there.

Mr. MacDonald: He is the chairman.

Mr. Ben: He is the chairman. All right. Let us take another topic.

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with vote 1401, and we will confine planning and plans to vote 1402.

Mr. Ben: Vote 1401, it has there, under five—commissions, inquiries and research on municipal government.

Mr. Chairman: The main office vote, right.

Mr. Ben: That is right. Five is grants and expenses to encourage research, to develop new techniques and all the rest of it there.

Mr. Chairman: Anything on the main office vote?

Mr. Ben: All right, fine. Let me discuss Metro. It is unfortunate that the hon. member for Lambton East is not back here, because every time I mention that word he just cringes.

Mr. Young: He can discuss Sarnia too.

Mr. Ben: But we will discuss Metro and the after-effects of what this government did to this fine area when they just about completely destroyed it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. This is really a main speech for one of the critics to make on the main vote. The hon. member is not sticking to the vote and I understand the hon. member has already spoken as the critic for his party.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale was speaking in the first instance on certain matters of policy, and then he was speaking about matters of planning. I want to point out to him that vote 1401 is the main office vote and it specifically mentions the items that are covered in that vote.

Mr. Ben: That is right. Commissions—the Goldenberg commission and inquiries and research on municipal government. I am completely within this item.

An hon. member: It is in the public accounts.

Mr. Ben: Absolutely within this item.

Mr. Sopha: $46,446.91.

Mr. Chairman: Carry on.

Mr. Ben: I am speaking on Metro and the type of government—regional and municipal government. Commissions are designed to look into these things and we had a commission and the Opposition asked that there be a complete amalgamation—but this government refused. They had a better system. Now what is the result of this system as reviewed by the present facts?

There is another—if I may again be permitted to quote from the Toronto *Daily Star* an editorial captioned: Metro a Big City with Small Minds.

Mr. Sopha: You know I have said that for a long time.

Mr. Ben: Now it says:

> Premier John Robarts' reorganization of Metropolitan Toronto into six boroughs instead of 13 municipalities, is turning out to be a half-baked solution to the problems of governing this area. It has not succeeded in bringing the resources of the entire community to bear on many of the problems that we share as Metro Toronto citizens. It has failed to unite us in support of public projects—an arts centre, a sports stadium—that are worthy of a great city.
>
> It has not reduced the petty squabbles between the suburbs and the city. It has stalled or destroyed housing education and transportation programmes that would benefit the whole community. The evidence of these failures is before us every day.
>
> Point. Public and private housing, both urgently needed, are being held back by borough boundaries. Each of the six has its own building code and this, in addition to harassing contractors, adds an estimated $200 to $500 to the cost of a house.
>
> Point. The last major obstacle to the settlement of the teachers' salary dispute is retroactive pay. Teachers in the other boroughs are holding out to see how much the city of Toronto teachers get then they will try for the same. If Metro were amalgamated, it would be understood from the start that a settlement would apply to all and there would be no playing off one against another.
>
> Point. This metropolis has no worthy Centennial project that can be completed in 1967.

Think of that for the province of Ontario.

Mr. Young: North York has one.

Mr. Ben: I quote:

> Because suburban boroughs wrapped in their own parochial dreams of glory, won't

get behind the St. Lawrence centre project in the city.

Point. The Toronto transportation commission is harassed by similar local disputes. The city of Toronto protested this year when Metro council made a perfectly sound move to relieve the TTC of municipal taxes.

And there I disagree with this illustrious newspaper. I do not think it was a perfectly sound move, I think it was an asinine move.

It ends off by saying:

A great dynamic community is being prevented from acting like one. It is indeed being encouraged not to act like one by interior boundaries which break up its natural unity. All residents of Metro suffer for this in one way or another, in housing or public transportation or planning or in unnecessary cost of doing business. We will continue to suffer so long as our big city remains divided according to the perspective of small-town minds at Queen's Park.

Mr. Henderson: Just speak for yourself.

Mr. Ben: I am referring to the hon. member there for Lambton East who twitches every time I mention the word "Metro".

Mr. Henderson: The member is speaking for Metro, I am speaking for Ontario.

Mr. Ben: He is speaking for Ontario. While you are speaking for Ontario, you are throttling the bread basket of this area.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Ben: I want to deal with some of the other items under assessment, but we will be discussing that later. This shows us what has happened to this area, which I say is the bread basket of this province. These small minds can harp all they like about discussing Ontario, but their money comes from the city of Toronto and the metropolitan area.

Mr. Henderson: Oh, no.

Mr. Ben: That is where we are able to get the money to pay the grants that they get from this province.

Mr. Henderson: We support you.

Mr. Ben: And what do they do? They try to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. Well, they are going to find out what is going to happen to them when they keep on throttling it to death.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a good thing the member for Grey North is not here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Sudbury could not take it, he left.

Mr. Ben: All they can do, these petty minds here, is to get up and say: We represent the province." The Tories in this Legislature do not appear to be representing anybody except their own interests. That is about all you people represent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Ben: Some day we are going to get some intellectuals on the other side, some people with a little bit of ability who can add two and two together, and in this province we will start moving. Until then, you are still going to get a lot of yacking, or quacking like a barnyard of geese, that is all you are going to get from these people.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister some further questions about the Mayo report. I can understand his problem in the Niagara frontier, a problem which is compounded, I think, by the failure of this government to act quickly enough. This could be seen coming over the last decade or more, and action should have been started sooner. But since it was not, then he is caught in this assessment squeeze at the present time.

I would like to call to his attention the situation on the other side of the river of which I have already spoken of in this House. There is very rapid development now going on on the New York side of the Niagara, where the city of Niagara Falls and the whole region is in for redevelopment. The whole interior of that city is going to be torn apart. They are planning on a very large tourist influx, they are going to rebuild their airport into a major airport and a major portal, they are going to work with rapid transit and they plan to bring in from all over the world a great influx of tourists over the next few years.

This plan will take some time, there is no doubt about it. Things like this cannot happen in a hurry. But I would say by the end of the decade, they are going to be in a position where there is no question that the influx of tourists will be tremendous. They suddenly discovered they had a tourist attraction in Niagara Falls and that city and the state is moving very, very rapidly.

I would hope that on our side of the river, we can match that kind of development, we

can be ready with redevelopment of the city of Niagara Falls on our side, with plans for rapid transit, getting the cars out from the lip of the falls and around the river, with some other form of transit coming in there. This means that regional government has got to be there in time to meet this challenge.

Is there any way the Minister feels this process can be speeded up? I was very disappointed tonight to hear that it will be six or seven years likely before we can really look forward to the implementation of the Mayor report and its ramifications. Surely there is some way by which a little more speed can be achieved here so that development can go forward to match the development that is certain to take place now on the American side of the frontier.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member said it was going to take ten years on the other side so what is the matter with six or seven on ours?

Mr. Young: In answer to that, Mr. Chairman, if I could answer the hon. Minister, is that if we take three years for the assessment, another three years to get regional government into effect, we are going to have no time left for the redevelopment that must take place within that ten-year period. That was my point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What the hon. member does not say is that they will also have those problems on the other side of the line.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: May I just take a moment to reply to the hon. member with respect to his comment regarding Niagara Falls? At the present time, there is an urban renewal study under way in Niagara Falls with the support of the department, and I think I could suggest to you that the people of that area are cognizant of the situation which is being improved on the opposite side of the river, across the border. I do not want to say anything in the way of a disparaging remark about the American city of the same name as the one in Ontario, I was there about, oh, it must be 25 years ago—

Mr. MacDonald: It has not changed.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: If it has not changed, it is the dirtiest place in the world. They certainly need urban renewal.

But we have a study under way, and what happens in a study is the development of a possible project, and then the more detailed engineering is the next step. Our federal associates are involved in all of these things, of course, with ourselves and the municipalities. Then you have another very important organization in the Niagara Falls area, and that is the Niagara parks commission which, of course, is performing a very important service.

Mr. Young: It is being reorganized.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It is being reorganized under a very efficient chairman, and I look forward to some great things in that area.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): We have not seen that yet.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: You just wait. The chairman was named only a short while ago. He has to have some time to begin the reorganization and put it on a proper base.

Mr. Singer: That old chairman was no good.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am not saying anything about the old chairman, he is a very, very fine man.

Mr. MacDonald: How about the member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar), how is he?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I have no idea, he is not here just now and I do not know how he is. As far as Niagara Falls is concerned, I think it is being taken care of in normal procedures.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would comment on the Ottawa study? We had some discussion on this a year ago and I have read with great interest the Minister's proposition to the area made recently, and the proposition as to what regional government should constitute there. He laid down a very interesting outline, not entirely agreed to by everybody there, but at least he did move to lay a proposal before them.

I wonder if the Minister would tell us what the prospects are for some action there; what the reactions may be up to the present time to his proposal; and what hope there is for action in the Ottawa area?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the information which I have received—which I have not examined recently, within the last several weeks—would indicate to me that the proposal I placed before these people is meeting with a considerable degree of acceptance. The municipalities with the larger populations are certainly much in favour of the proposals which were made

to them by myself on February 1 of this year.

I would think that if we can obtain general acceptance of at least a number of proposals which I have made during this year, then if legislation were required it would be placed before the Legislature in 1968 to become effective, I would hope, January 1, 1969. That is the plan which my staff and myself have in mind in dealing with this matter.

I have had some personal contacts with a number of municipal leaders recently in Ottawa and I know that they have followed my suggestion about having an inter-municipal committee to keep the problem under discussion. I think they are meeting with considerable success at that level.

It is not all roses and I must say to the members that there are some municipal leaders who are not in favour of making any changes. But I suggest that with the demand and public pressure, along with the support of the department and others in the area, we will see some changes take place in that great area of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: Would the Minister inform us how the study is progressing? I think it is under the aegis of Mr. Sawchuk in the Sudbury area. Would the Minister tell us just what that study is supposed to encompass, and how far it has gotten?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not know that I can give you a complete summary of what it is to encompass, but in general terms it was to attempt to develop what would be a complete examination of the municipal structure and responsibilities in the Sudbury basin. The report has been filed, completed, the maps have been prepared, and this week —I think it was Monday—I approved the order for printing, I believe, four or five hundred copies of the report. As soon as we have that, then the consultant will be in a position to hold a meeting and present its report to the municipal people in the Sudbury basin.

Mr. Sopha: Is it going to lead to a comprehensive study, in the age of studies, of a system of regional government for the Sudbury basin?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I believe that would be the general idea. I do not want to try to anticipate what the opinion of the municipal people will be, so I must be very careful in making that kind of a statement. I would hope that this would be the natural outcome of the Sawchuk-Peach report.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have two questions, my first one, going back to the Ottawa area again. I noted with interest the fact that the government's advisory committee on Confederation had had a thorough study done, rather a lengthy study, on a federal district area organization that might encompass Hull and Ottawa. Is the government giving any consideration to the possibility of this kind of a development in the future, or have you, in effect, two parallel developments, and at some point in the future they will have to be brought together? Is that the policy?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I may say, Mr. Chairman, in answer to that question that the committee on Confederation commissioned Dr. Rowat to prepare this study. It has nothing to do with government policy. As far as I am concerned, the government policy is as I stated to the Ottawa people on February 1, 1967. I suggest to you that because of the reaction from Quebec—and I only get that from reading some items in the newspapers—I doubt that in your day or mine or those who are here who are much younger, we will see a national capital that will extend and include parts of what are now lands contained in two separate provinces.

There is a possibility that the federal government, through the national capital commission, could be of a great deal of assistance to the two communities and their surroundings of Ottawa and Hull in creating, or assisting in creating, what would be to all intents and purposes a very beautiful national capital. I think all Canadians are in favour of that. But to say that you would set up what would be a 13th province, I doubt very much whether that will occur in our day.

I realize that things change. What may appear to be white today is black tomorrow. But as far as I am concerned, I say to you that the Rowat report does not indicate the policy of the government of Ontario. It is not acceptable. It has never been discussed. It was a study commissioned by the committee on Confederation for their own purposes. What those purposes are, I do not know, insofar as this matter is concerned. I am concerned with the re-organization of municipal government as now constituted in the Ontario municipalities where the national capital is located.

Mr. MacDonald: I have one more question, Mr. Chairman. My second question was to solicit from the Minister some comment on one regional study which accidentally or

otherwise he has not referred to, namely, the Plunkett report.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The Plunkett report was presented to the municipal leaders, as I remember, late in the fall. I asked the municipalities to study the report and to let me have the benefit of their advice. As an aside, I might tell you that there are not very many who are in favour of the recommendations in the report. I would hope that later on this year I will be in a position to meet with the municipal leaders and discuss the whole situation.

Another matter which has come about since then and which has some relation to the Plunkett report and the re-organization of municipalities in Peel and Halton counties is a request from the city of Hamilton and the county of Wentworth that a study should be undertaken there. We have now a liaison committee working composed of representatives of those municipalities. It could very well be that we would proceed with the report in Hamilton and Wentworth and leave aside at the moment any, shall we say, drastic re-organization of municipal government in Peel and Halton, because of the influence that the new study or the new area study may have on what we already have.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question at this point?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, he has been asking questions all night.

Mr. Chairman: I have been trying to give the floor to the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Well, Mr. Chairman, mine are on a completely different topic, and I prefer to wait until this topic is covered.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, this is what bothers me, I have been listening very carefully to the Minister explain about the Plunkett report and the report on Niagara and the Jones report on Ottawa. There is a study going on at the Head of the Lakes, and there is another one commissioned in the Kitchener area. Every year in these estimates, I have been throwing the same questions at the Minister—what is government policy?

The government policy seems to be to study, to study and study and study and restudy. When are we going to get any action in municipal reorganization? Six years, seven years, ten years in the Niagara peninsula? The Minister must remember. I spoke on this six or eight years ago in the House, and I listened at that time for over an hour regarding the variety of studies that had already been done in the Niagara peninsula. Now we have added another one to the thing and there is still no government decision.

Has the Minister any policy in regard to municipal reorganization, other than to hire a variety of people to do studies, then to study the studies, then to discuss the studies with municipal representatives, then to study the result of the discussions and then to contemplate what is going to go from there on in. Very simply, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this government governs or just studies.

Does the Minister really believe in municipal reorganization? If he does believe in municipal reorganization, in what form is he going to direct municipalities to reorganize? It must be obvious, by this time to this Minister that there has to be some sort of new system for a multiplicity of areas in the province of Ontario.

How many years is it since we received the report of the select committee on municipal affairs? Later on, when we get to the assessment matter, I will tell you about the recommendations in that report concerning exemptions. The Minister is still studying that recommendation. How long does he study before he makes up his mind? How long is it that we are going to be tied down to a system of municipal government evolved by Mr. Baldwin in 1849 and has not been substantially changed since.

If it is important to do yet another study in the Niagara peninsula, if it is important to commission Mr. Plunkett or Mr. Jones or Mr. Sawchuck or whoever you have commissioned to do these studies, then surely the government must have some thought about what they are going to do with them.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member for Downsview that before his arrival tonight the Minister did speak on this very point, the matter of implementation of Plunkett's report.

Mr. Sopha: He said he was studying it.

Mr. Singer: He said he was studying it. I have listened to him reply to the member for York South about the Plunkett report in Halton and Peel; to my colleague, the member for Sudbury, about the study in the Sudbury basin; the member for Yorkview about the Ottawa study, and the Niagara Falls study, but not one of these has given any

indication to the Legislature and to the people of Ontario when the Minister is going to act. How many years does it take before the government finally makes up its mind that this is the way? We have come to the end of studying, we have come to the end of consulting and now we are going to move.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member for Downsview that these points have been raised, and the Minister did comment on them earlier. However, if the Minister would like to comment again on any points raised by the member for Downsview, it is perfectly in order.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not think I can add any more to what I have already said, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: My, you are a good studier.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Chairman, not to dwell too long on the Plunkett report, you mentioned, that is the Halton-Peel—

Mr. Sopha: What was his plan?

Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, he mentioned further consideration including Wentworth and Hamilton. Will that mean that you will have another commissioner appointed, or will they just study the Plunkett report in relation to Hamilton and Wentworth?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is not what I meant, if you gathered that impression. I said I had a request now, and I have met with the municipal representatives of the city of Hamilton and the county of Wentworth municipalities who would appear to have come to the conclusion that they should re-examine their local government functions as they now exist. In making the remark with reference to the Peel and Halton Plunkett report, I said that it was quite possible that when I began dealing with the recommendations of the Plunkett report, knowing that there could very well be by that time a commissioner appointed to examine into the local government situation in the city of Hamilton and the county of Wentworth, that it might be desirable to withhold dealing with the Peel-Halton county situation in the hope, perhaps, or the possibility, that the results of the Hamilton-Wentworth study might indicate that the two areas, the four municipalities and their components, might be looked at in the light of one group of municipalities, and one report instead of two separate entities.

That was the point that I tried to make. I am not saying that is the way I am going to do it, because I am not satisfied yet that the Hamilton-Wentworth study is going to proceed—or if it does, then I think I have to bear in mind what has already taken place in Peel and Halton counties.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is going to carry on with these reports, I would prefer this to be completed before I get onto my topic.

Mr. Sopha: What may we expect when the Smith committee reports? Are we going to have more studies? It is likely that the Smith committee is going to report in a much different environment than the Carter committee reported. They have a government with two years yet to go in office in Ottawa and now, I observe, not without some degree of amusement, of course, that the Minister of Finance wants people to write to him about the Carter report.

I am not going to write to him, but as soon as the bank increases the interest on my overdraft, I am going to write to him and say "Thanks" to him. But this government is going to get that Smith committee—

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Better still vote against him in the by-election.

Mr. Sopha: Oh no, I will not do that. I would be a part of a very small minority if I did that.

This report is going to be delivered, either on the eve of the calling of a general election, or in the midst of a general election in this province.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: How do you know that?

Mr. Sopha: And once the government receives this, I say to my friend from Downsview, then they are going to be up against it because the people of this province will not tolerate that same attitude, that we are going to study these proposals and appoint a committee to study the Smith committee report.

Of course, it is truth to tell that I want to make two reflections, the Minister of Municipal Affairs—

Mr. Chairman: Is this on vote 1401?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, you want it on vote 1401? All right. Item number four. My own eyes do not tell me $185,000 for studies on municipal government.

Mr. Chairman: On municipal government, not taxation?

Mr. Singer: Oh, the Smith committee deals with municipal government.

Mr. Sopha: I want to make just two reflections. The Minister of Municipal Affairs—good fellow that he is—is a pleasant comradely sort, but there are many in the province at the municipal government level who know that he has swept problems under the rug for a good many months in blaming it on the Smith committee and its failure to report.

Mr. Singer: But he is studying it.

Mr. Sopha: That has been an old dodge all around the province, "We cannot decide the solution of your problem until we hear from the Smith committee". Many a municipality has suffered and ratepayers have suffered because of the delay, that embarrassing delay of that report.

Mr. Singer: Pickering township. Did you read about that in the *Globe and Mail* this morning, Pickering township?

Mr. Sopha: And the other reflection that I wanted to make is that whenever the Smith committee reports in the midst of an election or otherwise, this party will be ready to say what it is going to do about its implementation, after we give it a minimum amount of study.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: A minimum amount of study; we will be ready, but with all the practice these people have over there, we will ask the electorate to be wary of any injunctions delivered by them about further study of it, and consequent delay, for a number of years.

You stand here and you listen to the member for Yorkview and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, they get up and they echo all this business about change, you know we live in times of change—as if change was just discovered.

Everything in the universe since the beginning of time has been in the process of change. It is always changing, everything changes. There is nothing that is static in the universe. The problem is not to recognize change, the problem is to accommodate oneself to change.

Change is not an objective, it is a subjective phenomenon and government has the responsibility to keep up to date and accommodate itself to a world of change. But where is the evidence with all these studies of the accommodation to the change?

Contrary, the words of my friend from Downsview, himself a leading figure in municipal government of yesteryear, are exceedingly well taken. He was reeve of the largest township in Canada. That is correct, is it not? The largest township in Canada. Here is a man who comes here and speaks with authority, based on experience.

And we know only to well and I know, and I can stand here and say it, that instead of having relief and amelioration of our people's circumstances, we get stopgaps, with a promise of something at the end of the rainbow.

Mr. Singer: And a lien.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, and a lien, something at the end of the rainbow which, one gets the impression, is beyond the next election all the time. Pshaw on their studies.

It ought to have been years ago, that the privileges accorded to mining companies in the Sudbury basin—disgraceful privileges in an age of democracy, sir, that a government in office 24 years would allow that company to evade its responsibilities in the municipal field. Shameful and shocking.

The number of times that I have said that the company has never criticized, or never confuted me for ever having said it, or never argued with me. Apparently, the company is willing to accept its responsibility at the municipal level.

But that does not attend the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is perennially studying it and who is also, of course, using the handy device of taking part of the wealth created in the Sudbury basin into his own municipality, into the Teck township municipality, where this method was invented, and foisted upon the rest of us. He is content to continue to do that.

One begins to wonder about whether a government engrossed in studies, is ready to face up to basic philosophical problems, basic problems to human nature, problems as old as Aristotle's writing of his thesis entitled "Politics."

People in equal positions should be treated equally, he said. People should be treated equally. But if the smelter at Hamilton and the one at Sault Ste. Marie, pay taxes to municipal government, why should not the one at Copper Cliff pay it? People should be treated equally, that is an axiom of democratic government.

We do not need to continue to study—study is a device to evade responsibility. You give the impression that you are engrossed in deep intellectual effort by studying, but north of the French River, we recognize that, in regard to Metropolitan Toronto, Mr. Greene says – and he gets considerable support – he says his government's only concern is about the golden horseshoe.

They do not have studies any longer, they have a new form of Metro government, do they not? They have a new form of Metro government, no studies. But in Halton, Niagara peninsula, Ottawa, the Lakehead, Sudbury—there are studies. We still have studies. I wish the Minister of Education would give them all degrees as a result of all these studies that they are engaged in.

I have said many times, if you laid out, in rigor mortis, all the people hired by this government engaged in studies, you would need a cemetery bigger than Mount Pleasant to put them in. There is a massive army of people in studies.

I say to the Minister, and I will say elsewhere in the forthcoming provincial election, and we will talk in the Sudbury area, Nipissing and Algoma and throughout the whole of the northeast—we will talk about his studies and his failure to crystallize the studies into any form of definitive policy to better the condition of our people.

If I ever get into a state of equilibrium, to get down to illustrative terms about it, if I am ever in a state of equilibrium about it all I have to do is point the car to the road from Paris Street to the university, which is 8,100 feet away. That is all I have to do, drive it over that 8,100 feet of road and then I can see, I can feel it.

My car is tortured for the neglect of our community. A fine university built up on the side of the mountain, on the Laurentian rock, paid for by a large grant from this government—and I might say to my friend from Yorkview $3 million from International Nickel Company, another half-million from Falconbridge, $100,000 from KVP Company, to show their participation in education.

A fine university but a disgraceful road. A shameful, shocking road to ask the hundreds who go to that university to travel over; and evidence of neglect.

We cannot have a road to the university because we do not have the money. We have not got the money because we have not got the assessment. We have not got the assessment because the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Mines and the rest of those who make policy in the government say to the International Nickel Company: "It's all right. Take your $143 million, take the profits you reap from the ground; but we do not expect you to bear your equitable share of the municipal services for the population you create."

That is the old refrain and it is strange, back in my own community, what acceptance that refrain gets. I suppose it is demonstration of the old and ancient adage that the truth is acceptable, the falsehood draws scorn and disappears but the truth is always acceptable.

I regret to say, I say this in conclusion and perhaps it is the last thing I will say in this session on the mining revenue payments, I regret to say that among the good citizenry there is a suspicion directed at this Minister that for some reason known to himself he lacks zeal for Sudbury, he lacks zeal for Sudbury for some reason. It is ascribed to be a personal thing with him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is a golden horseshoe man.

Mr. Sopha: Well he has a great deal of zeal for the Timmins area, that is demonstrated, a great deal of zeal for his own area. His acquisitiveness for his own area is well remarked and to be seen in tangible terms in an area of mining activity much less significant than the Sudbury basin, which pours out the major portion of the wealth of this province in terms of its minerals.

The Minister of Mines knows it too. The Timmins area is of relatively less significance but we have noted, and I hope not out of a narrow and mean spirit of jealousy, I hope not out of that, sir, but we cannot fail to note, and I must say it to his fellow colleagues in the Cabinet, that he demonstrates great acquisitiveness for his own area. When the Prime Minister got up in the House and announced the increase in the mining revenue payments, it was noted in the Sudbury area that whereas Sudbury's went up about 750, about a quarter, Timmins' doubled; they got twice as much. There might be reasons for this, but that is so, that is my recollection. That is all I want to say about it.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, could I come back from the ethereal areas of the north, the great open spaces up there, to the cramped area between Metropolitan Toronto and Hamilton? Again we come back to

the fact that this government has failed to coordinate its studies in an area which is a unit. I would think that the Minister would have seen to it that if we are going to have a study of the Hamilton area it should have been concurrent with the Peel and Halton one. The thing that well might come—

Mr. Kerr: Ask Hamilton, that municipal council will not agree to it!

Mr. Young: I say the thing that well might happen is that when this study is completed it will be seen at that time that Halton county ought to go in with the Hamilton area and Burlington, and that the Peel section should come into an enlarged Metro which would go north to the watershed. This kind of division may well come, but in the meantime we have the other study which is before us today.

I would like to ask the Minister if he has had any great reaction yet to the suggestion that the line should be changed from north-south to east-west. I do not know whether the Minister of Education had something to do with this brilliant idea or not, since the political lines seem to drawn somewhat like this.

I can see progress in getting some of these small municipalities into these combined regional governments, so-called, but when you swap a north-south line for an east-west one you simply leave two counties as we have them now, with just different directions; so you are cutting up what should be a unified area. It should be a unified area and not in effect split between the two, simply swapping one for the other.

Has there been any real reaction to this new proposal of cutting the two counties north-south instead of the way they are?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The reaction, as far as I know, has not been favourable to that suggestion which is in the Plunkett report, because it would appear that would have the effect of restricting for many years to come any development in the northern parts of both of the counties. That is the natural reaction I think that comes from those people, and rightly so. What will be accepted from the Plunkett report is a question—it has just been received. The hon. members say, "Oh get in there and fight, and do this and do that fast."

Mr. Singer: When will you make up your mind?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: We would give it minimum study; that is what the hon. member for Sudbury said, "a minimum study". Now I do not think he really means that.

Mr. Sopha: Yes!

Hon. Mr. Spooner: He would be of exactly the same opinion as I am, that you give it sufficient study so that you are sure that exactly what you are doing is going to be right and proper.

Mr. Singer: But you are never sure.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh yes I am.

Mr. Singer: The only time the Minister ever moved was when the water stopped running in Metro Toronto, that is the only time he ever moved.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: What about Metro? We presented a bill here in the last session of the Legislature and you voted for it.

Mr. Singer: That is right, I did.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I am compelled to rise on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member state his point of order?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. This Minister misinterpreted or deliberately distorted what I said.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, I wrote it down.

Mr. Sopha: I said the Smith committee report will be received either on the eve of an election or during its course; and I said in that context this party will be prepared to say what it will do with the Smith committee report if elected, with a minimum of study.

An hon. member: That is exactly what he said.

Mr. Sopha: Our leader when, he gives it a minimum amount of study, he will make his pronouncement.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Now I do not expect to be hurried on this. I want to make it absolutely clear that we will be prepared to say what we will do with the Smith committee report and the people of the province will expect from that side of the House that this government, asking the people to favour it with confidence in its return, will be prepared to tell the people of Ontario what they are

going to do with it. If your spokesman is the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I warn you—

Mr. Chairman: Order. The member has not raised a point of order.

Mr. Sopha: He is going to say that they will study it, that will be his response. But let somebody else from the government, the Minister of Education or some other spokesman, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) or the other big spenders in the government, the last of the great time spenders, let them be prepared to say—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member this is not a point of order.

Mr. Sopha: I wanted to put the record straight.

Mr. Chairman: You have made your point and the record has now been straightened out.

Mr. Sopha: Perhaps that phrase "a minimum amount of study" was unfortunate. I do not want to pin it on the leader of the Opposition who is not in his place tonight but is engaged in very important business in the public domain elsewhere. Let me say for him, consistent with telling the people what we will do, he will give it a reasonable amount of study.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Sopha: Let me just add this sentence; and demonstrating the qualities of courage that he has heretofore—

Mr. Chairman: What has this to do with the point of order?

Mr. Sopha: This young man from Brant, in saying we will take over 80 per cent of the cost of education, then consistent with those qualities of courage he will be prepared to say what he will do with the Smith committee report.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister was making remarks to the House. Is the Minister finished?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the hon. member's point of order, I wrote down what he said with respect to the Smith committee report. I wrote it down right here and he said that when they received the Smith committee report that they would give it minimum study. Those are the words he used and I presume from that that they would then say, with a minimum of study, we accept the thing holus bolus.

An hon. member: Or reject it.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Or reject it holus bolus; with a minimum of study, just like that.

Mr. Sopha: It is against the rules of Parliament to ascribe motives to another—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I was going to give the hon. member some figures on tax revenues in various municipalities in the province, but I do not think I want to go into that. I would move that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Sopha: I am not one of those who changes my remarks in *Hansard.*

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sopha: I am not one that does that. I hope that *Hansard* is getting this down.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we shall proceed with the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs and as, if, and when those estimates are concluded we will then follow with the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests.

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.05 o'clock, p.m.

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2